

of a certain unit of statistics not in here at all. There are 10,000 people in the co-operative movement in Newfoundland, where in 1934 there were not any. If there were we will probably hear from them.

A lot of our troubles here might have been saved if we had agreed at the beginning of the debate to define our terms. I do not hold entirely with the view that debating a report is a waste of time. I can sympathise with that view, and particularly after hearing some of the debates we had on some of the reports. I feel the big question is not the report; it is the economic condition of the country. If the report serves no other purpose than as a starting point from which to assess the economic condition, it is our business to evaluate the economic condition as we see it, and get on with what we are going to do about it afterwards. Perhaps if we had defined our terms we would have saved ourselves a great deal of needless discussion. There is the term "country". There is the term "self-supporting". It has been said here that no country is self-supporting; in that case there is no use discussing it. Suppose we use the word "solvent".... What do we mean by "the country?" Do we mean the government of the country? I would excuse, readily, any man who had spent considerable time in the government, if such a one were to consider the country as the government. I find it less excusable for a representative of the labour movement referring to the government as the businessmen of the country. Democracy must be in the interest of the majority. We must consider whether or not the country is economically sound on the basis of whether or not the economy is sound in the interests of the majority. We must consider whether we are completely and 100% self-supporting; we are not, if you think of all the people who are more self-supporting than in 1934. And yet I wonder if that is a fair comparison to make. In 1934 we were going through unusual times. It has been said that the world was upside down. It was inside out also. Has the position of the majority of the people changed in relation to the economic entity that is the state? As one interested in these matters in point of view of co-operatives, that is something which causes me very great concern.

....I hold and have held for many years that this country is capable of producing a frugal living for the majority of the people. I do not think that such

is possible under the economic set-up we have at the present time. I think we need better economic arrangements than we have. I do not think that under such an economy there is room for millionaires — I would like to see 325,000 of them here in Newfoundland. I do not think our economy can make the majority of people self-supporting and still allow 66 corporations in a population of 325,000 people declare net taxable income of \$250,000 each; which makes it one for every 500,000 population.

Also I do not agree with the philosophy which expresses itself in these terms, "the poor you have always with you". That was the attitude adopted by tired and effete governments a little over a generation ago, that produced in large measure the chaos that we have in those countries today. The modern statesman does not accept that view. It smacks of defeatism. It is certainly not a philosophy for avowed optimists.

I find it necessary, when considering a subject like the economy of our country, to be critical. I know ... that I will be accused of running down the country. I will, perhaps, be further accused of running down the country if I suggest that if you put a group of Scandinavians in southern Labrador or northern Newfoundland they would make a good living for everybody. Why? Because they would work harder? No, they couldn't. Because they have a different sense of social justice from ourselves; because they have a co-operative economy based on that sense of social justice. One thing has not changed since 1934 — there is just too much of every man for himself; we want to make our own little pile quick. Perhaps this would be a good time for me to disassociate myself from the 44 hard-headed businessmen we are all supposed to be.

I find very little in the report relating to the standard of living of our people. I want to make one discrimination of terms between standards of living and scales of living. By "scale of living" I mean that which we have achieved as compared to that which we aim at — which is the standard. Our scale of living has immeasurably improved since 1934, but if our scale of living has improved, standards have also gone up since 1934. We must consider...is there enough left over unto our people to provide them with the good things of life? You will notice I have upped the ante from three square meals a day. My contention is,