

*Starred Questions*

reports of this house I move that the budget white paper be published as an appendix to today's *Votes and Proceedings* and also as an appendix to tomorrow's *Hansard*.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does that meet with the wish of hon. members?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD ACT****AMENDMENTS RESPECTING GAS TOLLS AND EXPIRY DATES OF LICENCES**

**Hon. Gordon Churchill (Minister of Trade and Commerce)** moved the first reading of Bill No. S-26 (from the Senate) to amend the National Energy Board Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

**STARRED QUESTIONS****MAIL CONTRACT, DEER LAKE-NORRIS POINT, NFLD.**

*Question No. 90—Mr. Batten:*

1. To what person, or persons, were the latest contracts awarded to carry mail from Deer lake to Norris Point, Newfoundland?
2. What is the amount of each contract?
3. Were these contracts awarded as a result of tenders being called?
4. Who was the previous mail courier and what was the amount of his contract?

**Hon. W. M. Hamilton (Postmaster General):** Mr. Speaker, the answers to the four parts of this question are as follows:

1. Charles Theodore Burden and Selby Martin, Bonne Bay.
2. Charles Theodore Burden, \$4,000 per year; Selby Martin, \$3.75 per trip, four trips per week.
3. Charles Theodore Burden, yes; Selby Martin, no.
4. Stewart Blanchard, Bonne Bay, under temporary arrangements without tenders called, August 17, 1956 to October 1, 1959 at \$4,800 per year.

**ANNA BADMAN, VANCOUVER—BAIL REFUND**

*Question No. 91—Mr. McIlraith:*

1. Did the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General or any other member of the government receive any representation either written or oral urging the government to refund estreated bail to Mrs. Anna Badman of Vancouver?
2. If so, what persons made such representation and in what form?
3. Was any member of parliament directly or indirectly instrumental in presenting any such representation and, if so, what member or members?
4. Was the refund in question recommended by the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or any other member of the force and, if so, by whom?
5. Was the refund in question recommended by any other police officer or any court official?

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

**Hon. Leon Balcer (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, this question stands as an order for return, as there is more than one department involved.

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Bonavista-Twillin-gate):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the rights of parliament are being seriously abridged by this practice that is growing up. When starred questions are put on the order paper that is done because hon. members want the answers in the house. By waiting a week these answers could be collected, as they were by the previous government, and given in the house in the spirit of the rules.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Perhaps hon. members will permit me a minute while I find the rule. Standing order 39 (5) reads as follows:

(5) If a question is of such a nature that, in the opinion of the minister who is to furnish the reply, such reply should be in the form of a return, and, during the question period on Wednesday, the minister states that he has no objection to laying such return upon the table of the house, his statement shall, unless otherwise ordered by the house, be deemed an order of the house to that effect and the same shall be entered in the *Votes and Proceedings* as such.

Is it the pleasure of the house that this question 91 should be made an order for return?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** On division.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, with respect may I suggest that this should not be put to a vote of the house. When the hon. gentleman said that another course was followed by the previous government, I think that is just what one might call legislative license. The rule provides, as Your Honour stated, that it is not a matter to be submitted to the house.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Speaker, on a question of personal privilege, the Prime Minister chose to make a personal attack on me—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** —and to question my veracity about a matter on which he did not take the trouble to produce any evidence whatsoever. I would say, sir, that from the time these starred questions were provided for under the new rules in 1955, this practice was not followed by the previous administration.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has raised this as a question of privilege, and perhaps in so doing has accomplished his intention of making an explanation. I think what was said did not really impute anything improper to the hon. member.