

did not condemn it and who was strictly neutral was the representative from the airlines who came only to protect their financial interests. In answer to questions he stated that he had no comment on the Bill. The only witnesses who supported the Bill were the former Ministers and the officials who had drafted it.

● (1540)

The Canadian Council of Churches, the Canadian Jewish Congress, the Catholic Bishops, the Canadian Bar Association representing 35,000 lawyers in private practice—this Government is busy privatizing says that private enterprise is the engine of recovery yet this bureaucrat absolutely rejected the advice of the representative of 35,000 lawyers in private practice. The Canadian Labour Congress, *La Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux*, the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, and dozens of smaller groups wrote, petitioned, and in many ways urged the Government not to adopt the Bill without amendment.

Since the Government absolutely refused to consider the amendments that they asked for, and insisted on the screening system and on the refusal of a review or appeal in the Bill, the public opposition has remained so strong that when the other place recently conducted hearings from coast to coast it found the same thing—every witness that appeared opposed the Bill as it stands.

It is unfortunate that it is the Government which has demonstrated a lack of respect for the rule of law, and specifically a lack of respect for the Immigration Act and for the need of making amendment to it. I think it is very unfortunate that up until this point the Government has declined to listen to the Canadian public who have expressed themselves through well respected public institutions, including those who have given their own time and money to feed, clothe, house, and otherwise help refugees because they believe those people were in need.

That Bill and the other Bill C-84 will not work as they stand. Every lawyer who is not paid by the Government has said that they will not work. The lawyers who are paid by the Government are the ones who led the Government into the debacle of the Singh decision three years ago in the Justice Department.

Therefore, I urge the Hon. Minister to consider that it is monstrous for her to assume that she is only deporting 30 or 40 Turks, and perhaps a few more. According to the Government's estimate there is a big majority of 48,000 more people to whom she will have to give consideration.

The public support for the Turks in Quebec, where most of them live, has reversed the previous public alarm at their entry. In every community I know of across Canada the public who have met refugees and even met those who have been brought on a scam like that, or met those who came not narrowly as refugees but because they feared for their lives in

### *Eldorado Nuclear Limited*

Iran, Beirut, the Soviet Union, El Salvador, or Chile, prefer to give them the benefit of the doubt and to help them rather than take the chance on sending them back.

Turkey has a record of human rights violations. It even has some opposition Members of Parliament in jail. I know that there are Members on the government side who take a dim view of that, since they remember that they were in opposition once. That is not a country to which we should be forcing people to return, especially given Bill 140 in Turkey which can be used by the Government there as an excuse to punish any of those Turks who have spoken in criticism, even in justifiable criticism, of his or her Government while outside the country.

I would urge the Minister to reconsider the decision she has given us today and to consider the honourable course of revising her approach in the manner that I have suggested.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. David Berger (Laurier):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the unanimous consent of the House. I would have some brief comments on this question, and if I am not mistaken, occasionally Members are allowed to comment on Ministers' statements.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Hon. Member for Laurier (Mr. Berger) is asking for unanimous consent of the House to make a statement following the statement of the Minister and the Member of his own Party. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** The Hon. Member does not have unanimous consent.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### ELDORADO NUCLEAR LIMITED REORGANIZATION AND DIVESTITURE ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mrs. McDougall that Bill C-121, an Act to authorize the reorganization and divestiture of Eldorado Nuclear Limited and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the amendment of Mr. Benjamin (p. 14369).

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** When the House rose, the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) had completed his remarks. Are there any questions or comments following his speech?