

How are you going to impose a penalty, and what is the penalty going to be? It seems to me you must have police and courts in order to impose a penalty. I have never had any desire at any time to join the police force, but I think it necessary to have a police force, and a well-equipped one, and I do not think that having a well-equipped police force is an incentive to crime. If you have armaments I do not believe they are an incentive to war. I hate war just as much as does any hon. member. I have a great deal to lose if war came. As far as I am concerned I would probably not be considered fit for a soldier at my time of life, but I have three sons. I would not want to see those boys conscripted and taken to war, or taken in any other way. It seems to me that we have confused the issue a great deal. We have been talking about whether we should go to war and all that, but that is not the issue. In my opinion the issue is whether we should have national defence, and if we should, whether these estimates are in order. That is what we should be considering.

Many hon. members have made the suggestion that we should rely upon the United States for protection. A good many hon. members on this side of the house have referred to the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation as the representative of labour. I cannot agree with that, although I have no quarrel with any of the hon. gentlemen who sit in the ranks of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. But I do not wish hon. members who are not well acquainted with labour affairs to refer to the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation as the representatives of labour. I grant that they represent some classes of labour, but they do not represent all the labour people in this dominion. Organized labour men despise people who will take the privileges that are gained by organized labour but will not help to maintain the organization which gets them those privileges. The action of such people is on a par with the suggestion that we should depend upon the United States to protect us and pay nothing for that protection. There are many labour men in this country—and my friends of the cooperative commonwealth federation know it—who will take all the privileges that the labour organizations secure for them, but will not pay any dues. The argument they put up is: Why should I pay dues? The other fellow has to protect me when he is protecting himself. And they ride on the coat-tails of the others. As a Canadian I do not want to be riding on the

[Mr. O'Neill.]

coat-tails of Uncle Sam. They are good and long but I do not want to ride on them.

This afternoon the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), replying to a remark by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie), in reference to the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. MacNeil), that it was double-barrelled, said that if it were double-barrelled it was for the purpose of dealing with a two-faced government. That is what the hon. member said if I heard him correctly. I wished to interject a question at that time, but the hon. member sat on me and sat on me pretty hard. That was his privilege, and I am not holding anything against him for it, but in saying he would not permit a question I take it he included all hon. members on the government side of the house. Being one of those members I naturally resent that. I have been working in the interests of organized labour for thirty-five years, and I have never at any time done anything that was not in the interest of organized labour as I saw it. I may be wrong, but that is the way I see it. The hon. member is altogether too vulnerable to make a statement of that kind. I should like to refer to a couple of instances in the last session. I was not here very much during that session on account of sickness, but I read from the record in Hansard which I assume is correct. This is a motion moved last year by the hon. member for Vancouver East:

Whereas it is detrimental to the best interests of Canada that there should be in the country groups to whom, because of race or religious beliefs, we do not extend all the right of citizenship;

Therefore be it resolved, that, in the opinion of this house, the government should take the necessary measures to exclude from the country all persons belonging to those groups to whom we do not grant the full rights and privileges of citizenship.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I was a young member of this house, in experience if not in years, and I was very new to parliamentary procedure. I did not fully realize what my position would be if I did not speak on a question of that kind. In British Columbia we naturally have a greater percentage of orientals than in any other province, and I should have been among those who spoke to that motion. I did not say anything because I was not in a position to vote for the resolution. It was not that I wanted to see more orientals in British Columbia, but there are many more important things to be considered than the few orientals who may be allowed into this country. At the time I was objecting most strenuously to the importation of