

continuation of postal services. Clause 11 of that particular bill said:

No individual who is convicted of an offence under this Act that was committed while the individual was acting in the capacity of an officer or representative of the union shall be employed in any capacity by, or act as an officer or representative of, the union at any time in the five years immediately after the date of the conviction.

It was stated strongly from time to time in debates that that type of penalty seemed far reaching and was interpreted—as I would interpret it—to be an undue infringement of basic rights. I am pleased that that particular feature is not included in this bill, but I would ask the minister why it is not there. What prompted the minister to leave it out?

Senator MacEachen: We objected to it in the past. We hope that the minister has had a conversion, that his appearances before us have had some effect!

Mr. Cadieux: Permit me to disagree with that in part, senator.

First, I would point out that it is my personal understanding that Bills C-24, C-85 and C-86 were passed and adopted in a democratic society, as I presume Bill C-106 will also be later on in the day.

Bill C-85, which dealt with the railway, included specifically the same penalties as the ones that are included in this particular bill. Bill C-86 contained the same penalties as those included in Bill C-24, which has already been passed.

Clause 11, as it was referred to, was excluded in relation to railway operations, and more particularly in this case because I believe the parties to this particular dispute are good, law-abiding citizens. As a matter of fact, Mr. Kancs has indicated publicly that he would obey the law and go back to work immediately, so I did not feel that in this particular case such a clause was necessary.

Senator Argue: I am glad to have that statement from the minister. However, I do not think that it was necessary in the post office legislation. The minister felt that it might be necessary, but my reading of the dispute and the attitude of Mr. Parrot was that this particular penalty, then, was not required. Since that penalty is not included in this bill, it is a less onerous bill. I think the minister's reading of the attitude of Henry Kancs and the Grain Workers' Union is accurate.

I am confident that when they are back on the job, even though they go back in circumstances that from their point of view were unnecessary and unpleasant—and they probably feel imposed upon—nonetheless, they will go back and do a commendable job.

As I said earlier, they operated last year at 120 per cent of capacity. That is pretty good. If you take the capacity of a terminal and you do 20 per cent better, that is good. In spite of the provocation—and I think there has been provocation—I think that the union will function well. The measure of goodwill that this union has amongst, at least, a substantial section of the grain producers will be maintained, and the confidence

of that particular section of the grain producers will be demonstrated to have been warranted.

Mr. Cadieux: I would like to add a comment particularly on the attitude of the parties and on their attitude once they are back to work.

The honourable senator mentioned in his speech, I believe, an experience that he had in Thunder Bay, when he was the minister responsible for the Wheat Board, where, unfortunately, there was a two-week work stoppage. He stated that when the parties went back to work, they rolled up their sleeves and outdid the capacity that they normally would have produced without missing two weeks.

I must also underline an incident during my term as Minister of Labour when I had to deal with the Thunder Bay situation in October of last year. There was a work stoppage of six weeks in Thunder Bay. Eventually there was a settlement. There again, the parties rolled up their sleeves and exceeded the record of the preceding year, notwithstanding that six-week work stoppage.

I sincerely believe that in this case the grain will again be rolling and the parties—particularly the union—will work so that the damage caused to the farmers in particular will be minimal, and Canada's reputation as an exporter will be reinstated and will be, perhaps, even better.

I do not suggest that this is a solution to get a better record, but I believe that they will do their utmost in order to ensure that the unfortunate work stoppage here will not penalize anyone.

Senator Argue: I agree with the general remarks of the minister. The only difficulty here, of course, is that it is a period longer than two weeks so that the backlog is greater. The effort and good luck will have to be even greater than it has been in the past.

We have an excellent grain marketing system in Canada. I think it is the best in the world by far. The Canadian Wheat Board does a superb job of holding our markets and supplying on time grain of a guaranteed high quality. The Americans have been doing everything they can to capture our share of the grain markets, including giving away wheat. You cannot get it much cheaper than zero, and that is what they have been doing. Even under these circumstances our Canadian Wheat Board system—a board that operates in the interests of the public, but is responsible to a minister; works with all of the various components of the grain industry of this country, the cooperatives and the private grain trade—is an excellent operation.

On previous occasions I have raised in this house the absolute necessity of this government taking extraordinary measures to try to bring about an improvement in the balance of trade between Canada and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is our biggest customer, and we buy little from them. The response to date from the government has not been satisfactory in any way. But there has been an indication—and I believe it is now in the public domain—that the government has recently appointed Mr. Frank Rowan, a senior manager in