

rounding the Open Skies Conference. Secretary of State Baker and foreign minister Genscher debriefed the NATO caucus on their recent visits to Moscow, where these issues were addressed.

Canada, in hosting the Open Skies Conference, stimulated greater dialogue and confidence-building on this and other important issues concerning the future of Europe.

In this process, consultations among all interested parties, including Canada, will be important. We welcome recognition of this fact by Soviet, American and German leaders in their recent talks in Moscow.

Hon. Jeremiah S. Grafstein: I appreciate the prompt response to my question of yesterday. I wonder if, in addition to that information, the Government of Canada might give the Senate the benefit of its views with respect to its position respecting the borders of Germany.

Senator Doody: We will certainly try to get any information that is available.

Senator MacEachen: Could the Leader or the Deputy Leader of the Government, at some point, expand on the expression used in the answer that "security concerns of the Soviet Union must be addressed"?

The deputy leader and I visited Leningrad, together with the Speaker, and we saw the results of World War II aggression against Soviet people. In one single grave 600,000 residents of Leningrad were put to their rest as a result of the attempted destruction of Leningrad by the German army.

One can understand the apprehensions of the Soviet Union. I hear it said that the West will, in a sense, attempt to allay its concerns by having the new united Germany within NATO, but what about the Soviet Union? They have asked that it be a neutral country, and that has been rejected by the West.

Are there any thoughts about how the interests of the Soviet Union will be addressed? In fact, I would appreciate, as Senator Grafstein would, any further information on this point.

Senator Doody: I shall certainly do what I can to obtain the information for the honourable senator.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT AND COMMISSION ACT

BILL TO AMEND—AMENDED REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ADOPTED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Hébert, seconded by the Honourable Senator Thériault, for the adoption of the Third and Final Report (as amended) of the Special Committee of the Senate on Bill C-21, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Employment and Immigration Department

[Senator Doody.]

and Commission Act (with eight amendments).—(*Honourable Senator Gigantès*).

Hon. Philippe Deane Gigantès: Honourable senators, yesterday there seemed to be considerable confusion—which goes back in history, because Socrates tried to solve it—when Senator Simard did not seem to be able to distinguish between the verb "to listen", in the sense of being there and having sound arrive at one's ear, and the verb "to listen", in the sense of actually paying attention and accepting what somebody is saying. Certainly, Tories have had to listen to the people who are being savaged by Bill C-21 in the sense that their complaints have reached Tory ears; but have they listened in the sense of realizing that there was some merit in the complaints of these people? I am afraid the answer to that question is no. I am not talking now about bad Tories, because I like bad Tories; the Tories I find difficult are good Tories, just as I find bad Liberals difficult and good Liberals all right. A bad Liberal is a good Tory, more or less, and a bad Tory may be a crypto-Liberal. Moreover, if you do not like that kind of interpretation, and you want to take a more ordinary view of the words, then "bad Tory" is a tautology and should not be used.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard: Honourable senators, would Senator Gigantès allow me to ask a question?

Senator Gigantès: This is not the time for questions. I am making a speech.

Senator Simard: May I ask you a question?

Senator Gigantès: Absolutely.

Senator Simard: Yesterday, I allowed you to ask me one.

[*English*]

My honourable friend uses the phrases "bad Tories" and "good Tories", but I suppose there could be different interpretations for Liberals.

Senator Frith: One is a redundancy and the other is a contradiction in terms.

Senator Simard: I wonder if the gentleman had the same problem of comprehension in understanding "yes" and "no" at the last referendum. We know that "yes" meant something different to Liberals from what it meant to the rest of Canada, including Quebecers. Perhaps the honourable gentleman could expand on that.

Senator Gigantès: Honourable senators, I will launch an inquiry and try to explain the situation to Senator Simard. People out West say that they need Mr. Vander Zalm to help explain things to Mr. Getty; so perhaps I will acquire a new role here in the Senate.

Honourable senators, I was a little puzzled by some of the remarks made by Senator Tremblay, who seemed to be thinking that the absolute veto the Senate has is less than the power of amendment which this bill seems to be suggesting. To block a bill appears to be, from some of his remarks, a lesser injury to inflict on a bill than to make some reasonable and kindly