ber for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), that I did not think that the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition was one which could properly be raised by way of a question of privilege. I say this although on many occasions similar questions have been raised by way of questions of privilege. But are we not faced now with a dispute about certain allegations of fact? If we are faced with that situation, should we not consider citation 192 of Beauchesne, third edition, the last part of which reads as follows:

A dispute arising between two honourable members as to allegations of facts hardly fulfils the conditions of a privilege question, and, if deemed to be a matter to be at once entertained, it is more convenient to postpone other business rather than extend the area of privilege.

I think that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) was quite right in raising the matter but it is one which tends to open a debate. Several rulings are to the effect that a question of privilege is not debatable. It is therefore not fair at this time to postpone any other business for the purpose of allowing a debate as between members of this house on a matter of this kind. The matter could be fully aired whenever the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce come before the house, and no doubt it will be aired at that time. I think that the point has been fully stated and that great latitude has been given. Without any further remarks on my part I should like to ask the house to continue its business.

Questions COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

Fifth report of special committee on estimates.—Mr. Tucker.

FINANCE-FISHERIES

REFERENCE OF CERTAIN ESTIMATES BACK TO COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance) moved:

That items numbered 112 to 127 inclusive and item 529, in the main estimates 1955-56; items 653 to 656 inclusive and item 789 in the supplementary estimates 1955-55, relating to the Department of Finance and item 795 in the further supplementary estimates 1955-56 relating to the Department of Fisheries, approved and reported upon this day by the special committee on estimates, be referred back to the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

TUBERCULOSIS AND PER CAPITA EARNINGS STATISTICS

Mr. Kickham:

1. What is the tuberculosis incidence per capita by provinces in Canada?

2. What are the per capita earnings in Canada by provinces?

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):

1. Rates per 100,000 estimated population of reported cases ⁽¹⁾ of tuberculosis, 1954.

The second second	Canada(²)	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.
Tuberculosis	ana ana	ny sarita Barra				129463	2. Q.M.		terristic	No.	1
all forms	69.1	123.4	93.3	21.7	102.2	95.6	27.0	88.6	63.8	83.1	115.6
(a) pulmonary(b) non-pulmon-	. 56.3	118.6	65 · 7	18.4	99.6	91.8	—	88.6	52.6	78.3	101.8
ary (c) type not	. 3.6	4.8	27.6	3.3	2.0	3.8			9 · 1	4.7	13.8
specified	. 9.2	1-1	-		0.6	4 - <u>211</u> 1	27.0		2.1	0.1	

⁽¹⁾ Reported cases reflect not only the actual incidence but also the effect of case finding programs.

(²) Exclusive of Yukon and Northwest Territories.

2. The average weekly wages and salaries in the major non-agricultural industries as of April 1, 1955, were as follows:

Newfoundland, \$53.26; Prince Edward Island, \$47.53; Nova Scotia, \$51.79; New Brunswick, \$53.89; Quebec, \$58.18; Ontario, \$63.24; Manitoba, \$58.02; Saskatchewan, \$56.82; Alberta, \$61.09; British Columbia, \$64.66.

50433-3621

Personal income per capita in the calendar year 1954 was:

Newfoundland, \$638; Prince Edward Island, \$648; Nova Scotia, \$917; New Brunswick, \$795; Quebec, \$1,052; Ontario, \$1,470; Manitoba, \$1,085; Saskatchewan, \$867; Alberta, \$1,152; British Columbia, \$1,476; Canada, \$1,196.

LETTER CARRIER SERVICE, NORTH SURREY, B.C.

Mr. Hahn:

1. What steps are necessary to be taken by residents of north Surrey to make possible the inauguration of the letter carrier system?