

Point of Order

tion of their concern about their individual rights being protected by the Speaker.

We as members of this House have for as long as I can remember paid great respect to the committees of this House. We feel they are an absolutely fundamental part of our process. We are all particularly proud of our membership on those committees and very proud of the work that those committees do.

On several occasions the Bloc has insisted upon its use of obstruction to prevent committees from doing their work.

I would ask that in the deliberations the Speaker is already considering on the matter of committees and expenditures by members on those committees while they travel that the Speaker would consider one other thing. That is that the hon. members who have been doing this represent one of 295 members of this House.

It would seem to me therefore to be logical that they should receive about every 295th speech, every 295th question, and every 295th statement. I would ask that the Speaker look at this issue at the same time as he is considering these other matters.

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order on the same point.

I think that the parliamentary secretary is not serious when he makes a statement like that, especially because he tries to take measures against us, since from time to time, the parliamentary secretary, who is a little—has decided that he runs the House his way and that as soon as he asks for leave, all members should give unanimous consent, with apologies.

Mr. Speaker, you know that as members of this House, we do not have many privileges. You know that so far, we have not been allowed to attend parliamentary committees, even those we wanted to be on full time. Mr. Speaker, I think that the suggestion made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the House Leader is frivolous and contrary to the spirit of parliamentary reform.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not think we should carry on the debate any further.

* * *

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52**NUCLEAR VESSELS**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I am in receipt of a notice of motion under Standing Orders 52 from the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 52 to request the adjournment of the House because I believe the House has the responsibility to debate thoroughly and to look into exactly what happened in terms of the three Orders in Council that were passed today, one in relation to U.S. and British propelled vessels passing through Canadian waters and to visit Canadian ports, the second the consent for U.S. and British vessels capable of carrying nuclear weapons to pass through Canadian waters and to visit Canadian ports, and the third is a consent Order in Council for U.S. nuclear propelled submarines, in particular the Trident nuclear submarines, to pass through Canadian waters in Dixon Entrance on their way to the new U.S. nuclear submarine base in southeast Alaska.

The reason that I very firmly believe that this is an issue that is deserving of an emergency debate is that the Order in Council technique that was used for these three Orders in Council was found on May 14 by the Federal Court of Canada, trial division, before Mr. Justice Allison Walsh to be illegal, and he struck down the use of that technique in terms of Alcan's Kemano project.

I think because the Minister of National Defence will be leaving Canada for the next two weeks, apparently shortly, it is important that this be—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Speaker has had a chance to look at the hon. member's application and at this time he does not quite feel that it is necessary for us to have an emergency debate. But that does not necessarily mean that at a future date the hon. member could not have an emergency debate in regard to his application.