

tion outside the building, in order to find out why the incident he raised in the House had taken place. Discussions were also held with the office of the Solicitor General.

I was given an assurance by these two sources that in future any security measures taken will cause a minimum of inconvenience to members. I might add that these discussions will be ongoing because I understand there are a number of new officers on the Hill who have only recently received their training. Perhaps they are not aware of the identity of members of Parliament. I think they need to be better apprised of who is who in this House and not raise suspicions where obviously there should not be any.

I must tell hon. members that some changes have occurred in the procedures in the interests of both safety and security. Some members will have noticed that the buses no longer park illegally on the wrong side of the street. That important aspect of safety had been overlooked. In an effort to accommodate the members, the bus drivers were dropping them off on whatever side of the street was more convenient. I understand the importance of that when it is raining or snowing, but in the interests of safety I ask hon. members to accept that minor inconvenience.

Standard procedures regarding security have recently been revised. There have been some slight changes. These matters are under constant consideration and periodically new procedures are adopted which the security office feel may be better.

The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) is not in the House. He reported an incident which occurred inside the building, which is clearly within my jurisdiction. I would simply say that corrective measures will be taken in that case. It was an unfortunate incident and I am sure it will not occur again.

\* \* \*

#### POINT OF ORDER

MR. CROSBIE—REFERENCE TO GABON

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order just to make sure there is no misunderstanding about my reference to that wonderful country of Gabon, which is a progressive and developing nation and an oil producer. My reference to swinging from a tree and going back to living in tree houses applied to Canada, not to Gabon where housing conditions and interest rates are likely better than in Canada. My point was that the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen)—

**Madam Speaker:** Order. I am sure that if that is what the hon. member said, it will be obvious to anyone who reads *Hansard* that his reference was not to Gabon but to Canada. Unless the hon. member wants to correct something he said, members usually do not correct after question period what they said during question period.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Madam Speaker, I gave you notice today of a question of privilege regarding the Minister of Employment

#### Privilege—Mr. Nickerson

and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) who is not here. I would like to adjourn that matter because of his absence.

**Madam Speaker:** Order. There are other hon. members who are ahead of the hon. member for St. John's West. It is just a matter of one notice arriving at one hour and another arriving at another hour. I take questions of privilege in the order in which they arrive. The one I received first was from the hon. member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson).

\* \* \*

#### PRIVILEGE

MR. NICKERSON—ALLEGED PARTISAN BEHAVIOUR OF MR. MUNRO (HAMILTON EAST)

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Madam Speaker, this is the first time I have ever pre-empted the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). Unlike the hon. member for St. John's West, it is a very unusual occurrence when I rise on such a matter. In fact, this is the first time I have raised a question of privilege since becoming a member of this House. It is not something I do lightly.

My concern deals with what I consider to be rather improper partisan behaviour on the part of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro). I gave Your Honour notice of this a week ago. I would have preferred to raise the matter when the minister was in the House, but he has not been here for seven days, I have no idea when he will return and under our rules questions of privilege should be raised at the earliest opportunity. Therefore, with no disrespect to the minister, whose presence I would have preferred, I will with your permission proceed today.

It seems that the minister in question finds it difficult to draw a distinction between what might be described as party affairs and public affairs. The House already has the benefit of your ruling, Madam Speaker, with respect to the opening of constituency offices throughout the north. I believe it was handed down on March 26.

My question of privilege today goes back to April 23 when, in reply to a question from myself, the minister said with regard to recent NEB decisions on the pipeline and other matters that "consultations will be held with all those people who feel seriously affected by this decision". He was referring to the people of the north.

I submit that that undertaking to consult with the people is good. However, it is the manner in which the consultations have taken place which cause me concern. Public meetings were held in Yellowknife on May 15 and 16. The meetings were organized, executed and put into effect not by the government, not by the minister's office but by the Liberal party. I wish to read two brief quotations from the literature circulated in connection with these meetings. The first is:

—the Liberal Party of the Northwest Territories has invited the Minister to attend a "Public Meeting" in Yellowknife on May 15th and 16th.