

has asked for such forms from the Income Tax Collector at Prince Albert who told him that there were none and that unless he filled out the English form sent to him proceedings would be taken.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the hon. gentleman let me have the letter, the name and the address and I will be pleased to have it rectified.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS AND REPATRIATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the right hon. the acting leader of the Government (Sir George Foster) to an article that appeared in the Ottawa papers this morning purporting to give a report of a meeting of the committee of this House on Pensions and Repatriation in which it was stated that one of the members of the committee, the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Lang), having expressed himself in opposition to the matters that were referred to the committee asked to be excused from serving on it and that the chairman, the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) prevailed on him to remain on the committee. I cannot understand how that can be in view of Rule 11 as contained in the Book of Rules and I wish to know what the opinion of the Acting Prime Minister is in reference to that question. The book of rules says clearly that no man who has expressed a view on a question can be appointed to a committee.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend (Mr. Currie) has asked rather an involved—

Mr. CURRIE: No, it is not involved; it is a straight question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:—and important question. I had not noticed what my hon. friend has referred to in the paper and therefore I cannot give a reply to what is involved in it. If my hon. friend will repeat his question at the next sitting of the House a reply will be ready for him. He will see that it is quite impossible to give an answer if attention has not been directed to it beforehand.

Mr. CURRIE: It is an old rule of the House that has been violated.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If it is a rule of the House, why, of course, it stands.

EAST ELGIN ELECTION WRIT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. KING: Has the Government reached any decision as to when it intends to issue the writ for the election to fill the vacancy existing in East Elgin so as to give the electors of that constituency the right of representation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I must answer my hon. friend by saying that the Government has not yet come to any conclusion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is high time.

Mr. FIELDING: What is the trouble in East Elgin?

AGRICULTURAL GAZETTE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like to inquire if the Agricultural Gazette is now being printed in the English language as the numbers I have received recently has been printed in French.

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE: It is still printed in English, as far as I am aware.

DOMINION FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed, from April 8, consideration in committee of Bill No. 12 respecting the election of members of the House of Commons and the electoral franchise—Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 39—disqualifications of candidates.

Mr. DEVLIN: In order to make things perfectly clear I would like to know from the Acting Solicitor General what his understanding is of the words "county crown attorney" found in paragraph (e) of subsection 1. In the province of Quebec, county crown attorneys are called crown prosecutors. In the cities they are appointed for a certain term of years, and in the rural districts for the sitting of the court. Would they be included under this designation of "county crown attorney" and thus rendered ineligible as candidates at an election?

Mr. GUTHRIE Paragraph (e) is intended to apply to officers holding permanent appointments under local governments. I do not know what the situation in the province of Quebec is upon this point but I think that in all the other provinces—it certainly is so in the province of Ontario—they are permanent appointees of the