

*The Address*

**Mr. Leroux (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I think we must be serious in this House, and even if my honourable colleague from Sherbrooke rose to speak to this House, as he has the right to do, his speech reminded me of the death of a swan or, should I say, the agony of a swan. As far as we are concerned, in Quebec we had a choice and the majority prevailed.

**Mr. Charest:** Mr. Speaker, it is always comforting to see that in our democracy people have choices to make and that they can make them freely, albeit for different reasons. There are some in the hon. members ranks who claim that he was elected to achieve the independence of Quebec. Others will say that maybe his mandate was a bit wider and that many people who voted for the member from Shefford also wanted a change of government. It is hard to judge after the fact, but time will tell.

I want to say to the member from Shefford, while thanking him for his advice, which is always useful, that he has just arrived here. I too know what it is to be elected with the wind at my back and on a wave. When you arrive here in those circumstances, you are always full of confidence and very happy. Here is what I have to say to the member from Shefford for what it is worth, since I do not seem to have the benefit of his vast experience. If he is forecasting our demise, the swan's song, he surely knows things that I do not. I do not know him very well, but he must have a lot of parliamentary experience to be able to say that.

In any case, I can say to the member from Shefford in all humility that like him the member from Sherbrooke was once elected with the wind at his back and that the member from Sherbrooke has also been elected with the wave running in the opposite direction. When he has lived both experiences, maybe he will share with us his thoughts and his great wisdom.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** There is a short time left and I would ask for the co-operation of members.

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very quick indeed. As the member knows, I have deep affection for the member for Sherbrooke.

When he was going through the litany of policy initiatives he agreed to in terms of supporting the government, I wondered if it was some type of early olive branch and that he might like to consider coming over here and joining us.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Just as short an answer from the hon. member for Sherbrooke.

**Mr. Charest:** Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised by the comment. I have a lot of friendship for my friend from Broadview—Greenwood, but I think it would be the reverse. We could form the government pretty fast and continue the agenda. I look forward to sitting with the member for Broadview—Greenwood and forming a new Progressive Conservative government who knows?

I know the member for Broadview—Greenwood will acknowledge that I sat on that side of the House for a period of time. I would be curious to know whether he shares the view that things are a little different, the perspective on fund raisers and other things.

I heard the Prime Minister yesterday make a very good explanation on using government aircraft. Why did he not give that explanation when he was on this side of House? I look forward to working with him in this Parliament.

\* \* \*

• (1115)

**POINT OF ORDER**

## RECOGNITION OF MEMBERS

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was extremely disappointed a short while ago when you did not recognize me after the Minister of Canadian Heritage spoke. It has been my experience in the House and my observation of years before that when someone spoke in the House the Speaker would recognize people from different parties.

I understand full well that if someone from the government makes a speech, especially a minister, it would be good parliamentary manners to accept comments or questions immediately from opposition members of Parliament.

However, when members of the government wanted to make a comment or question to the minister I believe in the past they have always been recognized. A member may agree or disagree with his own minister. A member like myself may want to make a comment. I may want to make a comment about something that affects my riding. I may want to question the minister.

Are we changing the way we have been operating in the House whereby after someone's speech there is an alternance between parties so that backbenchers, members of Parliament, can have their say in the highest court of the land?

I beg you, Mr. Speaker, not to change that good practice. There should be an alternance among the five parties. We on the government side should not be muzzled as ordinary members of Parliament because of possibly a new practice of which I have not been made aware to date.

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I thank the hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester for raising his point of order, particularly at this early stage in this 35th Parliament. I will quote for him two precedents that will enlighten us all, certainly including myself in the chair at this moment.

In the first instance I will refer to the *Annotated Standing Orders of the House* at page 144:

—preference in this period is to be given to Members of parties other than that of the original speaker, but not to the exclusion of Members of other parties—amendments to a bill cannot be moved—