to wonder if I am going to contribute to that irrelevancy, which though perhaps unnecessary, is nonetheless natural, in view of my first quotation, which speaks of new industries being created in the city of St. John's.

I assure you I am not, although, when it is considered that the bulk of the secondary industries are concentrated in the city, both myself and the other four gentlemen on my left here, who represent that city, as well as the convenor of the Local Industries Committee, Mr. Hickman — all five of us might be more than justified in holding forth on the merits of such local industries, as long as some other members have railed against them, and advocated their abolition or their restriction in one form or another.

I don't think the people of St. John's either expect or want such defence or explanation. They will agree that the pros and cons of such a policy are something for a government to concern themselves with, a democratic government too, when perhaps one political party might make free trade and anti-protectionism and even abolishing of local industries a plank in their platform on which they might try to be elected, and then bring about such reforms.

From the days of Adam Smith, the famous English economist, whose treatise The Wealth of Nations was published in 1776, the doctrine of free trade has been known. Its first application came with Pitt's commercial treaty with France in 1786, which removed many of the prohibitions and duties that had previously obstructed legitimate trade between the two countries, but the outbreak of the Napoleonic wars checked its workings. Down through the centuries the protagonists of free trade and protective tariffs have been battling the subject, and there is still a wide difference of opinion as to the respective merits of either policy, and the existence of protective tariffs in most countries of the world today would seem to prove that the free trade doctrine has not as yet won the allegiance of an overwhelming number of disciples. The breaking down of all international barriers and tariffs would seem to be essential to the satisfactory working of the doctrine, and perhaps it may be said that the ultimate fulfillment of the dream of men like Adam Smith, Mercier and Le Trosne lies in the present dream of the peoples of the globe for the "one world" that Wendell Wilkie

sought, and which today has its shaky beginnings in the United Nations Organization.

I do not wish to become involved in a theoretical discussion on free trade and tariffs - protective or preferential. Such a discussion can be highly academic and of little value to the ultimate conclusions of the Local Industries Committee or the Convention as a whole. I do agree with the Committee's conclusion "that the local industries of the class investigated by us do have a definite bearing on the economy of the country and contribute in no small way towards the employment and support of a large number of people, and that encouragement should be given to the establishment of all local industries that could in any way contribute the same benefits to the economic structure of Newfoundland". I also find myself in agreement with their statement in the last paragraph of page 9 - "The question of local industries in relation to tariffs and customs duties, as affecting the cost to the consumer, was taken up by your Committee, and it should be noted here that your Committee is not satisfied that the high customs tariff under which certain local industries operate may be in the best interest of the country as a whole, and we believe that such matters should be investigated." Again I say, that it is a government's duty to conduct such an investigation, and it is not a task that comes within the scope of this Convention.

Quoting again from the report: "...the Committee felt that it would require the investigation by accountants and/or economists in order to determine the degree of protection in connection with revenue tariff." I have to disagree with Mr. Smallwood's inference in Friday's debate that the Committee was lacking in appreciation of its task as well as its powers, by not getting such accountants or economists to assist them. By the same token all committees of the Convention would be so lacking, including the Committee on Transportation and Communications, which on certain matters, notably the railway, professed its inability to make a proper assessment of all the figures and factors that went to make up their comprehensive report.

This observation serves to give an opening for my own opinion as to the degree of co-operation which the Convention on the whole has received from the existing authorities in the carrying out of its task. When this Convention began, the