

those branch factories were brought to this country by Conservative protectionist policy under Conservative governments. Now I ask: Does anyone think that Canada as a whole can get any new industries so long as an industry in this country cannot secure the benefits of the special provisions of our tariff laws for goods of a class or kind made in Canada until their production equals ten per cent of Canadian consumption? How on earth will they ever get started under those conditions? Obviously they cannot start with a ten per cent production, and so they are going to have a greater handicap against them in their infant stages than when they have learned to walk and have reached a ten per cent production. I say to the house that the detriments of this trade agreement are not only that it fails on balance to create jobs, but I fear that it will cause a loss of jobs to many now employed, and therefore, because the detriments outweigh the advantages, I shall vote against the agreement.

Now that I have a moment or two left I want to refer to some of the statements that have been made by hon. members in this debate. More than one hon. member who has spoken in support of this agreement accused the Conservative party of following a doctrine of economic nationalism, and even when I enunciate that now, they applaud. They alleged that this trade agreement would be the end of economic nationalism. Well, economic nationalism, as I understand it, is a national opinion on the part of the people in any one country that they should preserve their own domestic market for any products that can be made in their own country, and at the same time unload their exports on other countries of the world. No one realizes better than I do, the fallacy of the doctrine of economic nationalism. But the difference between the doctrine of economic nationalism and that of sacrificing the interests of one's country in order to develop trade is a matter of degree. I do not favour economic nationalism, but if opposing this trade agreement is economic nationalism, then, sir, I must stand convicted.

The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Thorson) introduced into this discussion a note to which I feel called upon to refer. He claimed that this trade agreement was the beginning of the end of economic imperialism. Economic imperialism, I suppose, I might define as a national opinion favourable to trading as far as possible within the British empire rather than with foreign countries. I believe that geographically the natural channels of trade and transportation on the north Ameri-

can continent are north and south. I came to a realization of that fact many, many years ago, but at the same time I concluded that the national cost of directing a large proportion of that trade and transportation east and west was part of the price we pay for the privilege, for the many privileges, of being part and parcel of the British empire. I for one am willing to continue to pay that price. Now, do not misunderstand me. I do not say that this trade agreement will give the United States economic domination in this country, but when I see that during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1929, we purchased 68.6 per cent of all our imports from the United States, in 1930, 67.9 per cent, in 1931, 61.5 per cent, and so on, the percentage decreasing each year, and then when I see this trade agreement which is bound to increase again the imports of this country from the United States, I say that this trade agreement is making a serious contribution to the economic domination of this country by the United States.

I want to make a further statement, one that is frequently laughed at, but one which I think must be regarded in all seriousness. If this country ever comes under the economic domination of the United States it will be a question of only a very short time until we are one or more of the states of the American union.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LAWSON: I thought that would cause comment, but I still say it and I still believe it.

Mr. DUNNING: My hon. friend is harking back to 1911.

Mr. DUPUIS: No truck or trade with the Yankees.

Mr. LAWSON: This is a very different agreement from the one that was proposed in 1911.

Mr. DUPUIS: Where were you in 1911?

Mr. LAWSON: I was right here in Canada, where I have always been. The statement which I made, I made in all seriousness. As individuals I like the people of the United States, but I do not want to come under their laws and under the administration of their laws.

Mr. HOWARD: Get the flag out.

Mr. LAWSON: I do not need to get the flag out, as the hon. member suggests. I am taking up the point of an argument of the hon. member for Selkirk, who wants to end