

Mr. BREWIN: Yes.

Mr. DRYER: There was a specific implementation of one detail and that was postponed with the agreement of Mr. Hall. It was contemplated at the time the agreement was made that within a short time Mr. Turner would be removed as president and the constitution would then operate with Mr. McLaughlin in. But the release of that information, which became current at the time, cause some public discussion, and it was felt by both Mr. Hall and ourselves that that would be injurious to the union and the job we had to do and Mr. Hall agreed to postpone it, and we did. We postponed it first of all until the middle of July. Then we had another discussion with Mr. Hall and it was decided to leave it until after the election.

Mr. NIELSEN: I want to stick to this line for a moment. Did the arrangement not go one step further, in that after Mr. Turner was removed and Mr. McLaughlin stepped into the position of the presidency, was there not also included in the arrangement with Mr. Hall that Mr. McLaughlin would have to have a spot on that executive?

Mr. DRYER: What executive?

Mr. NIELSEN: On your new slate of officers?

Mr. DRYER: No.

Mr. NIELSEN: Were any members of the S.I.U. led to believe that?

Mr. DRYER: Not to my knowledge, but certainly not by me.

Mr. NIELSEN: Were any members of the S.I.U. led to believe that there was no arrangement whatsoever made with Mr. Hall?

Mr. DRYER: Not to my knowledge and not by me. I do not see how they could when this was all out in the papers.

Mr. BREWIN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would like to have that memo to see what the agreement was.

The CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will bring it down, Mr. Brewin.

*(Translation)*

Mr. ÉMARD: Mr. Chairman, does . . .

The CHAIRMAN: One moment, please?

Mr. ÉMARD: Did the S.I.U. constitution in Canada contain certain clauses which gave more extensive powers to Mr. Banks than those which are normally given to presidents of other unions?

*(Text)*

Mr. DRYER: I do not think that is a question that can be answered with a yes or a no. Most union constitutions give a great deal of power to the president. I have seen union constitutions—and I think an analysis was done on this—which did not show any. I might say this, that we have an expert working on this coming up with recommendations. It is not something of which you can pick some little thing and deal with it. I think the constitution of the S.I.U. is not everything it should be, but then I have never seen a union constitution that was. It is not much different to other union constitutions, making allowance for the problem that they have, that people were away. You have a special problem in the case of sailor constitutions. When you compare it with the English sailor unions or the Swedish sailor unions, there is a great deal more democracy in the Canadian S.I.U. perhaps than you find there. They have specific problems. At first one could say you should do this and you should do that, but when you look into the matter, there are other things to consider. It is a mistake to jump to conclusions too quickly.

*(Translation)*

Mr. ÉMARD: Do you believe that Mr. Banks overstepped his authority?