

the Leaders of both opposition Parties to offer them a briefing as we enter the crucial last stage of the negotiations. They are both Privy Councillors. We have offered similar briefings to the Premiers and to the 300 members of our sectoral advisory groups. They have always respected the confidentiality of those briefings. We expect no less from the Leaders of the opposition Parties. The Right Hon. Member has rejected that, and it is under consideration by the Hon. Member for Oshawa.

• (1420)

As to the agenda of the talks, I again refer the Hon. Member to the debate we held in this House on Monday, March 16, 1987, when I and other members of this Government set out in great detail the agenda of the talks and the Canadian objectives. I recommend he go back and read the *Hansard* report of that debate.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): I reread the Minister's speech and there is nothing in there to guide Members of this House or the Canadian people generally.

CANADIAN POSITION

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Government and the NDP may believe they can participate in a conspiracy of silence but we believe all Canadians have a right to know what is happening in these negotiations. We admit we know some things. We know the Government has given in to the Americans on foreign investment, lumber, pharmaceutical patents, and book publishing. What we would like to know from the Minister is when we are going to get something in return and what we are going to get?

Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, since the Right Hon. Member is not taking advantage of my offer for private briefings, I suggest he should wait until October 5 to find out the answers to his questions.

May I point out that in my speech of March 16 I said, to quote *Hansard*, "Let me deal with the agenda of the trade talks". I then dealt with it and referred to tariffs. I said non-tariff barriers are on the table, as well as Customs matters, subsidy-related measures, dispute settlement mechanisms, intellectual property and trade-related investment. I spelled it all out. I again suggest the Right Hon. Member read the *Debates* before he continues this frivolous line that we have not debated and discussed in public what we are dealing with in the free trade talks.

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the Minister was not clear at all in her speech, and I read it twice. At least the American Government was open and honest about its claims. It submitted in writing a list of what it expected of the Canadian Government. It was published in an official document that is before the U.S.

Oral Questions

Cabinet. It wants to see our breweries, the Canadian Wheat Board and our drug legislation disappear, it wants changes in the Bank Act, in our procurement policies, our postal rates and our social policies, to name only a few. The Americans are not afraid to reveal their priorities to their people. Why should our Government be different? Why isn't the Canadian Government open and honest with Canadians during these talks?

[English]

Hon. Pat Carney (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Right Hon. Member go back and consider the motion we presented in this House and which we voted in favour of. That motion said:

That this House supports the negotiation of a bilateral trading arrangement with the United States, as part of the government's multilateral trade policy, while protecting our political sovereignty, social programs, agricultural marketing systems, the auto industry, and our unique cultural identity.

We distributed copies of *Hansard* to the Hon. Member. Why does he not read the material presented to him?

* * *

REFUGEES

TERMS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Immigration. For some two and a half years now our Party has been calling on the Government to stop the abusive and profitable scams of smugglers and consultants who continue to traffic in human beings.

Under the new refugee legislation just tabled the Government would have the power to fine or put in prison any individual Canadian, group, or church leader who simply assists refugees. How can the Minister justify making the actions of a priest, nun or layman who genuinely helps individuals in need, an act of civil disobedience? Will he not agree that he has gone far beyond what was required? Will he agree to amend the legislation so that it can target the real abusers and exploiters, not those who give of themselves for the betterment of their fellow human beings?

• (1425)

[Translation]

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time the Hon. Member has spoken to the subject in the House of Commons.

An Hon. Member: Not true!

Mr. Bouchard: I am going to refer to what he said today, but if I look at the statements he has made for the last three weeks with the Leader of the Opposition, I think we are in for some surprises, because there are four, five or six different versions. However, I am not going to quote the Hon. Member but I want to ask him, before all Canadians, exactly where the