

Centre had been treated more fairly by the Union government during and after the war, he would not despise some laws as he does now and confound abuses of the law with the law itself.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Although the hon. member may be defending me for the moment, I think he has inadvertently suggested that I am guilty of something of which I am not guilty. I am not confounding any abuses with the law itself nor am I disregarding the law at all in my amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it is not a question of order but a question of privilege, and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is entitled to make his statement. I do not think the hon. member for Témiscouata is allowed to impute motives to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Mr. POULIOT: I have never imputed motives to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, Mr. Speaker. I have much respect for him, as much respect, in fact, as I have for the Prime Minister himself. Both are respectable citizens and law-abiding people, and both can be put in the same category as good members of parliament. I do not see why anyone should impute motives to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. We may differ from him at times.

Mr. COWAN (Long Lake): The hon member—

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, is it the loon from Long Lake? Mr. Chairman, the loon from Long Lake has answered.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must be aware that the expression he is using is not parliamentary. Further, he must bear in mind that the House of Commons is a gentlemen's club.

Mr. POULIOT: I was speaking of birds. As I have been interrupted I shall have to begin the sentence again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. member should withdraw, because his language was not parliamentary and should not be used in the House of Commons.

Mr. POULIOT: I will withdraw, and say that the hon. member for Long Lake is not any more an angel than a bird, because he has no wings. Now, beginning my sentence for the third time, may I repeat that I was not imputing any motives to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, because I respect him. I was trying to explain to the house

the way I understood his views in the matter, and if I have been mistaken I must be pardoned. I have endeavoured to tell the house my personal views concerning the whole matter.

Let us now go back to past history. Hon. members who live in the province of Quebec cannot have forgotten what has been done by Tinoir Desjardins when another gentleman was Minister of Justice under the Union government. I do not place the blame upon the present Minister of Justice, but upon one of his predecessors. Hon. members must recall that the man Tinoir Desjardins was paid by the Department of Justice for a conspiracy against French-Canadians during and after the war, and that that same man was paid by the Department of Justice to blow up the house of Lord Atholstan in Cartierville. That is what the Union government did. Those people because they were afraid of the retaliation passed the legislation. Why? Was it directed against the hon. gentleman who is now member for Winnipeg North Centre? Was it directed towards any one who is now a member of this House of Commons? It was directed towards any one who at that time was frightening them. They were acting through fear; fear was their inspiration. Would that be a good way to deal with communists?

No one should be crushed under the iron heel of ruthlessness. The Prime Minister should wear moccasins; if he wore moccasins instead of an iron heel I would not be afraid of the way he would deal with that legislation. However, I am strongly against the iron heel of ruthlessness. There was enough legislation in the criminal code, before the enactment of the legislation now in question, to see to it that order be maintained in Canada. You, Mr. Speaker, are a lawyer, and you know the criminal code as well as any lawyer knows it. You know the meaning of seditious conspiracy. You know that in accordance with section 133 of Chapter 36—the Criminal Code—seditious conspiracy is "an agreement between two or more persons to carry into execution a seditious intention." Seditious intention has several times been defined by the courts. Every hon. member familiar with the law knows the meaning of the term. It is not necessary for him to be a king's counsel; any justice of the peace knows it. They know the interpretation which has been given by Canadian courts.

What is the punishment for sedition? Section 134 states:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than twenty years who speaks any seditious words or publishes any seditious libel or is a party to any seditious conspiracy.