

Mr. NEILL: That is not a point of order.

Mr. CRERAR: I just want to say there is no—

Mr. NEILL: I do not wish the minister to say it. He has had his opportunity. The bill has been up for second reading twice. He had all the time in the world. But I will answer him. I was going to answer him anyway if he had kept quiet. If that is not the explanation, I will furnish another. If he does not like the one horn of the dilemma he can take the other. Is it because the government get political hysterics every time the name of Japan is mentioned? We dare not deal with the strictly domestic matter of our own immigration for fear—and fear is an ugly word, Mr. Speaker—that an alien heathen nation, that has no claim whatever to a grievance, might not like it, a nation whose best claim to fame at the present moment is the fact that it is raping and ravaging a friendly nation whose territory it swore a few short years ago to protect and maintain.

Now, this thing is cumulative. Where is it going to stop? If we yield five per cent of our rights to-day for the sake of peace, six months hence we shall be required to surrender ten per cent, and a year afterwards they will want fifty per cent. Other nations will imitate this policy, and we shall lose their respect.

How did we get their respect? We became a nation, not by the Statute of Westminster that we hear so much about, but through the blood and treasure we spent in France to prevent Canada from becoming a German colony. The Statute of Westminster did something. It gave us power to make our own treaties. A lot of good that did us. If we set our feet on the fatal, bitter path I have outlined, soon we shall not be allowed to make our own treaties; we shall not even be allowed to make our own pyjamas, because Japan will discover that she can make them cheaper because of her low standard of living, and they will be sent to Toronto and sold below the cost of the raw material there. If that is to be our policy, we had better tear up the Statute of Westminster and crawl back as a colony under the overburdened protection of the British nation. At least we would be safe there; yes, cheaply safe, would we not? Britain would give it to us, give it to us to the last exhaustion of her strained powers, and she would not worry and fuss because every now and again we debate whether we would be at war when she is at war. But what a humiliation it would be for us as a nation and as individuals!

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. Speaker, it is more than forty-seven years since I came to this country. That is a longer time than the lives of many of the hon. members I see before me. I have married, brought up a family and buried our dead here. I have been a loyal and true Canadian in thought, word and deed. I have taught my children that they must not pay too much attention to the land of their parents, but that they must be true Canadians and bear faithful allegiance to Canada herself. For the first time in nearly half a century I have occasion to be ashamed of my adopted country. To-night we are at the fork of the road. We can say to Japan, "While you have not said you objected to this bill, we have not passed it because we thought you might not like it. We have not exactly cut loose from Britain, but we have indicated that there is no obligation, that there are no commitments if she is in trouble, and to that extent we have weakened her in the eyes of the world; you have our sympathy; we hope you will not be too hard on us." Shall we take that degrading and humiliating position, or shall we say to Japan and to the world, "When Britain is in trouble we are in trouble; when Britain is at war we are at war, and when Britain is in a war, while we cannot bind future parliaments as to the amount of participation, any more than the British parliament is bound, we will do our part; we are solidly behind Great Britain economically, financially and in every other way to the best of our ability." Then, let us say to Japan, "We are determined to run and control our own domestic affairs, of which immigration is one, and another is to decide whether people can be deported or not. That is another privilege and we are going to use it. We are solidly behind the British nation, and the British nation is solidly behind us." That would be the end of it. That would be a policy of courage, a policy of dignity and self-respect, both for us and from the other nations, and one that would make for the preservation of peace, a bold policy which would put us in standing and reputation with all the nations of the world. Whether we take the short vision of the immediate future or the long vision down the vista of time, it would be a policy that would immediately and ultimately work for the benefit of British Columbia, of Canada and of the British empire in which we are all concerned. I think the first step towards the announcement and the initiation of such a policy would be for us to pass this bill which is before us to-night.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Neill) which was negatived on the following division: