

I also said that by accepting the appointment the hon. member was bound to apply rules made by others. If that is interpreted as inferring that decisions made by the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans were not impartial, that certainly is not what I meant. I meant that by accepting this appointment, he put himself in a position where he had to apply rules against the recognition of the Bloc Québécois, which are not his to change.

As the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said earlier, he has become a servant of the members of this House. Instead of using the word servant, I used the words *un instrument*. I do not want that to be interpreted as being partial. When he makes decisions in the House, he cannot do otherwise but apply the non-recognition rule.

My point was that he had the choice to either accept or refuse this position. It is quite clear that he is a servant of the House. I referred to *un instrument* and I am quite prepared to withdraw the word collusion, if you prefer, and to talk about a coalition, which is common knowledge.

It seems to me my interpretation is quite clear, and people know, as the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said earlier, that the Speaker is a servant of the House.

• (1025)

Mr. Speaker: First of all, I want to thank the hon. member for his comments and his explanation, but there still is a problem. Although the hon. member for Rosemont has put forward certain arguments which are not altogether impossible to understand, especially in politics, I still think we are faced with a difficult situation for the House.

[English]

Consequently, having found there is a *prima facie* case I am going to put the motion of the hon. member for Beauce to the House. Then it will be for the committee and the House to decide. The hon. member for Rosemont will of course have a chance to discuss the matter with his colleagues in the House and in the committee.

It may well be that out of that discussion may come something useful in terms of the general amity of

members among themselves. I do think it is a matter for the House to decide.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is there agreement?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[Translation]

Mr. Tremblay (Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, you said that you had some difficulty. I am trying to understand what that difficulty is because I think I clearly explained that what I said was not a reflection on the decisions of the Speaker. I explained that I would substitute the word coalition, a decision by all the members of this House, for the word collusion. I am trying to understand your reasons for this decision, Mr. Speaker, and I must say, quite honestly, that I am somewhat at a loss.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rosemont will understand it is not appropriate for the Chair to give an explanation after making its decision. However, I suggested he withdraw his remarks as reported in the newspaper. The hon. member may not agree with the Chair's suggestion, but lacking a specific statement by the hon. member in which he withdraws his words I believe it is appropriate to give the House and the committee an opportunity to consider this matter. The hon. member has every right to state his case, and he will have ample opportunity to do so in committee. After this brief explanation I think the case is closed. Once the committee has tabled its report the House may have a chance to consider the matter again. However, for the time being the case is closed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1030)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to several petitions.