

mont (Mr. Rinfret). I want to pay a special tribute to him for the arduous and painstaking work he has done in an effort to give justice to everybody.

It is not my desire to embark upon a discussion of the report of the redistribution committee in connection with other constituencies. All I am dealing with now is the report of the committee on standing orders, to which committee has been referred the petitions which I have tabled. After they were tabled they were examined by the clerk of the committee, and he said that the petitions were not drawn in proper form and therefore should not be received. Then I argued that some of the forms were antiquated, and I thank the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) for the support that he gave me on that occasion. He spoke as a great parliamentarian, as he always does; what he said has been appreciated by my electors on whose behalf I speak today, and I convey their thanks to him. I cannot thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Beauchesne, but I can express to you the deep appreciation of my electors of the spirit of fairness that you showed on that occasion. When the matter was brought before the committee another one of my colleagues, the hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Knight), spoke very well, and expressed in the committee views similar to those which have been expressed in the house by the hon. member for Peel. To him also I convey the thanks of my electors.

I shall not take up much of the time of the house but I have here some very fine articles which have been published in different papers, *Montreal Matin* of May 5, the *Ottawa Journal* of May 6, the *Toronto Daily Star* of May 9 and the *Ottawa Journal* of May 14; and if I am allowed to do so I shall table them in order to save time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member the unanimous consent of the house to place on the record these reports from newspapers?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you.

*Montreal Matin*, Lundi, 5 mai, 1947

Evitons les "chinoiseries"

Nos grammairiens se sont montrés très injustes à l'égard des Orientaux quand ils ont permis que le mot "chinoiserie" servît à désigner toute démarche, manifestation ou règlement inutile.

Mais nous n'y pouvons rien et, à maintes reprises, l'occasion nous est fournie de nous plaindre de "chinoiseries" particulièrement de "chinoiseries administratives". Celles-là sont abondantes: jamais, probablement, n'y en a-t-il eu autant.

La plus récente, c'est M. Jean-François Pouliot, député de Témiscouata, qui l'a signalée alors que deux pétitions présentées par un groupe de ses commettants risquaient d'être

[Mr. Pouliot.]

mises de côtés, parce qu'elles n'étaient pas rédigées dans les termes précis exigés par les règlements.

Les électeurs de Témiscouata, en personnes intelligentes, ont abrégé. Comme l'expliquait M. Pouliot, "ils ont exposé ce qu'ils voulaient en langage simple et très clair". Or, selon les règlements de la Chambre, c'était trop clair, trop simple, trop abrégé surtout, d'où l'intervention du député de Témiscouata pour empêcher que la requête aille tout droit au panier.

Rien d'étonnant que certaines lois et ordonnances soient tellement emberlificotées, si l'on songe qu'elles sont l'œuvre de législateurs ne prisant guère un langage simple et clair et préférant, au contraire, les formalités surabondantes qui compliquent et... embêtent.

*The Ottawa Journal*

Tuesday, May 6, 1947

The Form or the Substance

Mr. Jean-François Pouliot, member for Temiscouata, brought an extraordinary ruling to the attention of the House of Commons the other day. Two petitions signed by hundreds of electors in that riding and addressed to the House were refused consideration, he said, because they did not use the prescribed "sacramental words".

The petitions, Mr. Pouliot explained, had to do with redistribution, and were tabled in the ordinary way, but were not turned over to the Redistribution Committee because they did not conform to ceremonial practice. "They were addressed", said the Member for Temiscouata, "to Mr. Speaker and to members of the House of Commons instead of to the Honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled". That was the first offence. But worse was to come. The prescribed words "The petition of the undersigned humbly sheweth" were missing, the argument was not divided into paragraphs each beginning with the word "That", and the conclusion omitted the prescribed formality, "And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray". His electors, said Mr. Pouliot, were not strong on red tape, but they had made their meaning clear and plain.

Mr. Graydon supported Mr. Pouliot's request that the petitions be sent on to their intended destination, and the Speaker promised to look into the matter. Mr. Graydon's words were very sensible. "We should not be governed so much by the form as by the substance of a petition such as this", he said. "When the common people of Canada decide that they want to petition the House of Commons we should place as few obstacles as possible in the way."

With that doctrine we thoroughly agree. Parliament is the servant of the people, not its master, and nothing is less important than the form a petition to Parliament takes. If it is the honest expression of a group of electors on a matter of public concern, expressed in decent and intelligible language, obviously it should be received and considered, and if the rules interfere then the rules should be changed.

*Toronto Daily Star*

Friday, May 9, 1947

Jean-Francois Scored That Time

That genial man and Independent Liberal, Jean-Francois Pouliot of Temiscouata, gets sometimes upon the nerves of parliament. But