

sent here not to request anything, not to make a remonstrance to the House of Commons, but just to express their opinion to the House of Commons, as they have a right to do. If I insist again on this matter it is because I thought that documents that bore the signatures of the independent electors of Temiscouata should find their way to the right place, to the redistribution committee.

Something happened which was a precedent. I was unavoidably absent from Ottawa on the morning when the matter was referred to the standing orders committee, and who came to my defence? It was editorials which appeared in the press supporting what had been said by my friends the hon. member for Peel and the hon. member for Saskatoon City, who took the same view before the committee as the former did in the house.

I express the high appreciation of my electors to these great papers, *Montreal Matin*, *Toronto Star* and the *Ottawa Journal*. Those who wrote these editorials have shown their readers that they are true to the very best traditions of the British parliamentary system. If I have had some difficulty, it was due to some opportunists outside my county—there are no opportunists in my constituency. There were three or four outside. One apparently was kidnapped during my first election. He was no more kidnapped than anyone here, but he disappeared like the prophet Elijah, although he was not in a chariot of fire. He is considered as one of his own class. The other was a young man who had no military record and who during the war was writing very hard letters to a N.R.M.A. man from the registrar's office in Quebec, and I complained bitterly about him at the time. He is just a little intriguer who wants to find a political nest for himself. But I know very well that these people who went to my electors and the electors of Rimouski telling them that my colleague, the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Belzile) and myself were for change, were liars; and strangely enough they were supported by the parrot of the cream separators of the Quebec reform club, the legitimate heirs of the unforgettable Quebec Nipple club. I do not care about that. I thank the house, and I thank my colleagues who have supported me. I thank all my colleagues, and especially thank the committee on standing orders. I also thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. O. BERTRAND (Prescott): It would appear that in this matter, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) is complaining about the action taken by the standing orders committee, although he did it in an indirect manner. In

order to keep the record straight, to protect the procedure of the house and give a certain amount of explanation it would probably be well if a word or two were said about what has really taken place, in order to complete the record.

Under date of May 5, your committee received from the house the following reference:

That the petitions presented by the electors of the parishes of Ste. Rita, St. Cyprien, St. Paul de la Croix, St. Emile d'Auclair, Notre Dame de Sept Douleurs and St. Jean Baptiste de l'Isle-Verte be referred to the standing committee on standing orders.

These petitions had been presented to the house by the hon. member for Temiscouata. In his report thereon, under date of April 30 and May 1, the clerk of petitions stated that the petitions were not drawn in proper form and therefore could not be received.

I have listened with great care to what was said by the hon. member for Temiscouata, and although he claims that he wants the committee's report to be supported by the house, he is making all sorts of complaints with regard to it, claiming apparently that red tape is being used and that the voice of the people at large is not being heard by the house. This is not at all the case.

Having regard to the report made by the clerk of petitions it would appear that the question to be decided by the committee was whether or not in this case the rules of the house and the forms sanctioned by practice with regard to the wording of a public petition had been observed. Without taking too much of the time of the house, and referring to the documents under consideration, may I say first of all that Your Honour, the Speaker, had stated in the house on May 5 that the house is not seized of a petition addressed to the members unless mention is made of the words "in parliament assembled", which statement the hon. member for Temiscouata criticized severely. It was pointed out that the petitions were not properly addressed and the clerk of petitions reported that they could not be received. This decision given by the clerk and by Your Honour is only the practice confirmed by the rules which have been enforced by this house in the past, and following precedent. The practice was enforced by Hon. Mr. Rhodes, a former Speaker. It was enforced by the rules and regulations in days gone by.

Naturally we should like that report of the standing committee on standing orders to be accepted as such, but not with the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Temiscouata. After all, we claim that we as the committee on standing orders are the