

Mr. HARTT: Oh, yes. If my hon. friend has anything to say I shall listen; I want to learn. The arrangements for an interprovincial conference is a matter of Canadian importance; it is a matter of constitutional rights established and recognized by every court, including the privy council. My former colleague, Mr. Fernand Choquette, gave jurisprudence to the premier of Quebec, and said, "Here is the accusation that I throw at you. You are causing dissension in Canada and a disruption of confederation." You gentlemen were not in the Quebec legislature in 1942 when Britain stood alone, when you talked so British, when you believed so much that the destruction of Britain was a matter of a few moments, when human liberty was about to be destroyed, when that beautiful anthem which everybody sings or talks about but which everybody chooses to forget, was in the air, praising themselves for their part in the greatest moment in human history; it was at that time that the federal government called upon the provinces to relinquish certain fields of taxation, to rent them out, to give a chance to the federal government to carry on the war. The Liberal government at that time in power in Quebec said, "Take it; we will cooperate; we want to do all we can." What did Mr. Duplessis, who was a member of the legislature at that time, say? He was the leader of the opposition at that time. Had hon. members been there they would have heard Mr. Duplessis' speech. They would have heard him say that we were giving away our autonomy. It has nothing to do with autonomy. It is ego-mania; that is what it is. It is a mania for his own aggrandisement, to go down in history as the greatest French-Canadian. That may be possible for Mr. Duplessis, but when I heard the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. Macdonnell) move his amendment and have it supported by people who are so British or Canadian I say it is something that is self-contradictory.

I do not know the premier of Ontario, but he is one of those coy babies who run away and say, "Come hither." You know those coy babies, the young ones. He comes to this town and blames the Canadian government—the government that speaks for the people of Canada, for our interests—for all the troubles. He accuses them of blackmail. If you call that statesmanship; if you call that patriotism, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there has never been a more traitorous act in this country than the two premiers of Ontario and Quebec are practising, who are trying to encroach upon the rights of the federal government. If Mr. Duplessis and Mr. Drew—

[Mr. Timmins.]

Mr. JACKMAN: Shocking language.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Speak up so we can hear.

Mr. JACKMAN: I think he must have heard. I say that it is shocking language to say that two premiers of this country are traitors.

Mr. HACKETT: On a question of privilege or on a question of decency, I suggest that the term "traitorous" used by the hon. gentleman as applied to eminent public men holding positions of the highest trust in Canada should be withdrawn.

Mr. HARTT: Mr. Speaker, there was no question of privilege and there is no question of privilege when an hon. member holds the floor. There may have been a point of order.

Mr. JACKMAN: There is in this house.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HARTT: I will withdraw the word "traitor".

Mr. GREEN: We do not mind all this cheap abuse of ourselves, but the word "traitor" should be withdrawn.

Mr. HARTT: I withdraw the word.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the word has been withdrawn.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): What about "cheap abuse"?

Mr. ABBOTT: Yes; I think that should be withdrawn.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): The pot calling the kettle black.

Mr. HARTT: Seeing where it comes from I do not mind, Mr. Speaker. I withdrew and withdraw the unparliamentary word "traitorous". There is nothing in the rules of parliament which forces me not to think what I like. Hon. members can make their own guess about it. I sat for eight years in the provincial house, and I heard Ottawa being spoken of as if it were the capital of Germany, not the capital of Canada. I resented it at the time and I said so; I repeat it here. If anybody is so touchy that he does not like Mr. Duplessis to be called to account, but would rather see Canada divided to suit his own purposes they can decorate it with any candy they like. It speaks for itself. It will go down in the annals of history. As a Canadian I feel that this man has not contributed anything to Quebec. I cannot speak intimately of the premier of Ontario, but judging him from his statements—I think somebody referred to them as a rhapsody in blue. Let me add one word, tragedy in blue.