

unusually hard hit by economic circumstances, and thus are not able to find money quickly, or as easily as other Provinces, there should be a federal contribution higher than 50 per cent for those provinces. That was the recommendation of Liberal Members of the House of Commons and, indeed, the unanimous recommendation of a committee of this House. In the spirit of leadership, in solving the problems this Government created, will the Minister of Health and Welfare accept that unanimous recommendation?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I think that to play games like that is very easy for someone who is not in Government. Does the Hon. Member want me to cut into my other programs or increase the deficit? He does not tell us. There is one thing that he keeps forgetting. The Program exists and functions very well, and, of course, there is an increase in times of hardship. There is a very important part of the transfer payments to, for example, the Atlantic Provinces, which covers exactly the problem identified by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition, namely, that they have less front-end money to advance.

I have just completed a study of the request from these provinces for more money for medicare. I have news for the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition. They have done better under medicare, with all our transfer payments, than the other Provinces.

* * *

[Translation]

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the Table reports of the Clerk of Petitions stating that he has examined the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Thursday October 28, 1982, and finds that they meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[English]

PRIVILEGE

MR. YURKO—QUESTIONING OF MR. LALONDE—REQUIREMENT FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Madam Speaker: I have a notice of a question of privilege from the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko).

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which I feel severely affects the rights and privileges of every Member of this House, and certainly my rights and privileges. I raise this matter as a question of privilege because I think the rules of the House have been breached in such a manner as to reflect on the reputation, character and good name of the House itself.

Privilege—Mr. Yurko

The incident I am referring to occurred yesterday when I rose after the question period to deny unanimous consent to allow further questioning of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) on his Wednesday statement. The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), the House Leader for the Official Opposition, quickly jumped up and said as reported at page 20120 of *Hansard*:

—when the Government House Leader made his submission with respect to the results of the meetings between House Leaders at the opening of the House, he disclosed the fact that there was unanimous consent.

I want to repeat that last phrase, Madam Speaker, so that everyone in this House understands it very clearly. The Hon. Member for Yukon said the House Leader disclosed the fact that there was unanimous consent. He then changed his story slightly. He said:

Madam Speaker will recall that I rose afterwards and I believe the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) did likewise. I submit that it was at that point that unanimous consent was sought and achieved, and it is too late now for the Hon. Member to rise in an attempt to refuse unanimous consent.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Rather than reading these quotations, I would like the Hon. Member to tell me forthwith what his question of privilege is. I do caution him that he may not comment on my ruling of yesterday, which I maintain. I would like to know immediately what his question of privilege is, and he can elaborate on it once he has enunciated what it is.

Mr. Yurko: I do not intend to be too long, Madam Speaker, but I must take a few minutes to set the scene. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), the House Leader for the NDP, took quite a different tack in responding to my objections. He said that based on the previous consultations that had taken place, perhaps unanimous consent was not required.

Madam Speaker: I am afraid I have to be very strict with the Hon. Member because he is probably referring to a ruling, and he has to make it quite clear to me now that he is not. I therefore ask him to state what his question of privilege is and he may then remind me of the statements made in the House by other Hon. Members. I want him to tell me, please, what is the basis of his question of privilege.

Mr. Yurko: I have never seen, Madam Speaker, anyone have as much difficulty with the Chair as I have in terms of trying to put forth a matter of privilege. This is my basic point. As far as my understanding of the rules of the House are concerned, any changes in the routine daily order of business have to be sanctioned each day the Routine Proceedings are superseded, and unanimous consent of the House must be sought and obtained. In this particular case it was not.

I would like now to refer to your statement yesterday, when you said, as reported at page 20120 of *Hansard*:

Statements by Ministers. I understand that by unanimous consent we will continue for a period of 20 minutes with questioning which follows the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde).

Your statement indicated that we had unanimous consent for a period of 20 minutes to question the Minister, and I find nowhere in *Hansard* that such a question was even put to the