

Moreover, the question was asked by one of her Liberal colleagues, the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi, who, as a courteous man, certainly served notice of his question to the minister. She knew what to expect and she was able to prepare an answer.

• (1505)

A third point is even more serious than this. The minister altered the official report so that today, *Hansard* does not contain the words she used yesterday. According to Beauchesne, and more particularly citation 1117, no member is allowed to alter *Hansard* the way the minister did yesterday after the blues came out.

If you compare the blues and *Hansard*, you will notice that two substantive corrections were made, so that the words which were so injurious to me yesterday as a member of this House in front of the TV cameras and everybody, while the minister scored political points by heaping ridicule on me and making me look like an irresponsible minister, no longer appear in *Hansard* today. Therefore, those injurious remarks made publicly yesterday in this House, in front of the TV cameras, must be corrected today in a immediate public statement including apologies by the minister.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[English]

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, given the gravity of the accusations of the hon. member, I would have thought he would at least have had the courtesy of serving me notice. Had he served me notice, I would have advised him as I did yesterday, as I did several months ago when I actually gave a copy of that particular report to the House. Unfortunately, his caucus I suppose did not advise him of it.

In fact, the Brander-Smith report to which I referred yesterday in the House was initiated by the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was Minister of the Environment. There were several public hearings held while he was Minister of the Environment, including a public hearing that was held in Halifax, another public hearing that was held in Saint John and another public hearing held in Prince Edward Island, which specifically called on the Minister of the Environment in 1989 to act.

In fact, the minister did not act. He did not act; his predecessors did not act; his successors did not act. We acted within 100 days of coming to government.

I would have thought that rather than dragging out the issue—

[Translation]

—rather that resorting to petty politics, the Bloc Quebecois would have done better to recognize the fact that we have made a

Routine Proceedings

decision, a decision that neither the former environment minister, his predecessor, nor his successor made.

I will repeat in French so that he understands clearly. When he was environment minister, in 1989, three public hearings were held at which the refloating of the *Irving Whale* was advocated, and he did not respond. That is what I said in the House yesterday.

[English]

I will put my word on the line against his word any time.

The Speaker: My colleagues, the Chair always takes very, very seriously any question of privilege which is raised by any and all hon. members in this House.

We have heard allegations on one side and a rebuttal on the other. We are getting into debate, perhaps on a question of the interpretation of facts. With your permission, seeing that this has taken place over two days, I wonder if you will give me the time to review the blues as to what was said.

• (1510)

I will come back to the House as soon as I can to give a decision as to whether indeed any hon. member's privileges have been breached in this case. With the time to think about it a bit, I will bring back a decision as soon as possible. For this question of privilege at least at this time, I would like to take the information I have and consider it for a while.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to a number of petitions.

* * *

[English]

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-316, an act to amend the Immigration Act and the Transfer of Offenders Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce my third private members' bill entitled the Immigration Enforcement Improvement Act.

My bill aims to improve the way in which the deportation of violent offenders is carried out. The proposed changes will enable a court in addition to any other sentence to order the