

confederation *per se* and in itself will set to rights the basic economic maladjustments from which arises the necessity for a wider distribution of the cake. Not that that is anything to confederation's detriment. To adjust those maladjustments you have to do more than change the form of government, you have to change the economics that men live by. In other words, as far as I can honestly and in conscience go at this moment is to say this: that I think that confederation is part of the answer that I am looking for, for Newfoundland, but that it is still not the complete and final answer. No form of government can be that. The complete and final answer to a more spacious destiny can come only from among the people themselves.

I look in the first instance to the co-operative movement to set to rights the basic economic maladjustments of this land. Someone, in a rather obvious attempt to smear the movement, called the co-operative movement communist. It happens to be the very antithesis. The co-operative movement is private enterprise carried to its logical conclusion, for the aim of private enterprise is ownership, and what the co-operative movement seeks is the widest ownership for the greatest number. I am convinced that Newfoundland cannot afford not to have a largely co-operative economy, but I know that such an economy is not going to emerge next year, or the year after, or the year after that. All we have to show for ten years of effort is a few hundred organisations from the first 10,000 disciples. That is a creditable showing. But I nevertheless doubt that the co-operative movement can take up the slack in our economic and social system fast enough.

That leaves only one other acceptable formula immediately available that could be employed to achieve a more equitable division of the cake; that is participation by labour, through ownership, in that margin of return from commerce and industry up till now earmarked for the recompense of capital and management. Various labour and protective unions have done much to have the cake and pass it around more generously, by securing a greater return to the labourer for his hire and to the producer for his produce. But there are real economic limits to just how far that can be carried, particularly in a country of primary production whose industries must endeavour to

hold their own in the rough and tumble of world competition. There is just so far that collective bargaining and mutual assistance associations can go to achieve wage increases for the labourer, and price increases for the primary producer, and thereby increase the common man's share in the national income. Some unions and associations are well along toward that point of just-so-far already. But even if further increases could be achieved, they would not alter the basic insecurity that attaches to the lives of the wage-earning class, would not guarantee them permanently a larger slice of the cake. That can come only in consequence of ownership.

It could very easily be that we shall shortly witness a great translation of most of our people into wage earners in consequence of an industrial revolution in our fishing industry. Predominantly, our people have always been and still are of considerable personal independence in industry. That independence has been founded upon their ownership of their own instruments of production, upon their ownership of their own fishing boats, their own fishing gear and their own fishing rooms. But we have now come to the point where a considerable mechanisation and centralisation of our fishing industry is inevitable; either we shall have that, or we shall have no fishing industry. It is easy to foresee how such mechanisation and centralisation could lead to the creation of a large fishing proletariat employed as wage earners on draggers, at processing plants, at central curing stations and canneries, but not participating in the ownership and earnings of those new fish enterprises. The creation of such a fishing proletariat is something to guard against at all costs. It could lead only to great dissatisfaction, great unrest, maybe even strife. I am convinced that it can be avoided only if some formula be worked out to provide participation for fishermen in the ownership and earnings of such new fishing structures as may emerge.

It is not for me here to indicate in what fashion all that may be brought about. But for the peace and the happiness of this land, the effort had better be made to bring it about, and not only in the fishing industry.... We have to have for the future a more even distribution of the national income than we have had in the past. We can achieve such results if we are willing to make the