

could allow someone to come into Canada for up to two years. That was the evidence that was put before our committee.

**Senator Doody:** What is your point of order?

**Senator Stollery:** In my opinion, if the government leader wishes to refute that evidence in the proper fashion, then we should reconstitute the Foreign Affairs Committee and go back and hear the evidence over again. In my opinion the Leader of the Government has made a very weak defence, filled with holes, about the immigration matter, because I am sure he does not personally understand the Immigration Act or the rules of occupational demand. I am sure that there exists an association of Canadian professors from whom we have not heard—nor has anyone said that they were consulted—when, under the Free Trade Agreement, their jobs are put at risk, together with the jobs of the dentists, the nurses and all of the other people on that list—

**Senator Doody:** What is your point of order?

**Senator Stollery:** If the Leader of the Government in the Senate wishes to refute that evidence at the last moment—and, in my opinion, it is a sort of semi-refutation done in a phony manner—then I think he should be honourable enough to move that the entire matter be sent back to the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs in order that we can discuss it with the type of thoroughness that, if the government had had any decency, it would have allowed us to do in the first place.

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, I would never have mentioned the subject of temporary entry—

**Senator Guay:** You are stalling!

**Senator Murray:** —if Senator Stollery had not raised it in the debate on third reading.

**Senator Stollery:** You said two years.

**Senator Murray:** The honourable senator rose on a point of order. Am I to be prevented from dealing with the arguments—or at least trying my best to deal with the arguments—that the honourable senator has advanced in his speech on third reading? If so, what is the purpose of a third reading debate?

**Senator Guay:** Do you want the bill to go through?

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, the bill could have gone through last August.

**Senator Guay:** If you would sit down, it would go through!

**Senator Murray:** If my honourable friend will be patient, I will be sitting down in a very few minutes.

Honourable senators, let me conclude by referring to the fact that it is the intention to have the Foreign Affairs Committee monitor the implementation of this agreement. In particular, the committee has indicated in its terms of reference that it wants particular attention paid to a number of matters. I want to say that I welcome that development. I also want to say that I think if the committee maintains the tradition of seriousness, sophistication and non-partisanship

[Senator Stollery.]

that it earned over many years under the chairmanship of Senator van Roggen then the committee, in monitoring the implementation of this agreement, will perform a very valuable service to Canada. I want to say that the government will cooperate—as we always have and always will—with that committee in its deliberations.

I also want to tell the house that, while the concern of the committee with regard to adjustment assistance to help those who may be displaced is very commendable, in my opinion it is at least equally important to monitor the benefits of the Free Trade Agreement on investment and job creation on the different sectors of the economy and in the different regions of the country to ensure that we are, indeed, in a position to derive the maximum benefit from this Free Trade Agreement. In this respect I think the committee might be guided by the terms of reference that were given to the de Grandpré committee, where the council was asked to examine the possibilities for Canadian businesses and workers to position themselves to benefit from the agreement. I suggest that a good point of departure for the committee will be to examine the effectiveness of the existing programs.

● (1450)

Yesterday, in the committee, the Leader of the Opposition, Senator MacEachen, pointed out that in the past, when government policies led to changes in, for example, the automotive industry and the railway industry, special government programs were brought in to assist those affected by those changes. Of course, that point is well taken, but I think he would recognize that in the years that have elapsed we have brought in dozens of programs to cope with every conceivable adjustment problem or opportunity in the country. Yesterday I mentioned the industrial adjustment service, the Canadian Jobs Strategy with its six components, the various programs that have been available under the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion and the new programs that are being developed in the Department of Industry, Science and Technology. We have the various regional programs under ACOA and the Western Diversification Office. We have the various trade promotion programs and so forth. We have the Older Worker Adjustment Program, the agreements to which have been signed with several provinces in the last little while. Well, I have not heard in this debate, or indeed in the committee when I was able to listen to the evidence, very much reference at all to specific inadequacies in those programs in light of the Free Trade Agreement.

**Senator Frith:** Which programs?

**Senator Murray:** The programs to which I just referred, the DIST programs, the DRIE programs, the regional programs, the Industrial Adjustment Service, the Canadian Jobs Strategy, the Older Worker Adjustment Program, and so forth. I have not heard very much reference to specific inadequacies in those programs in light of the Free Trade Agreement between Canada and the United States. It is no wonder that Mr. de Grandpré, whose committee has clearly studied many of these existing programs, talks of not introducing new programs but of fine-tuning these programs. So I suggest that the committee