

ent sort of organization altogether than the S.I.U. of Canada. The S.I.U. of North America, if I may borrow a term from corporate structures, is really a sort of holding company to which various other unions belong. The relationship is not the same in most international unions. The constitution is markedly different because they perform two entirely different functions. But, you would have to take the two of them and read them in order to get the full effect of them. I might say that I have never made a study of them. Mr. Hope made a study and reported to me. I looked at that study. But, Mr. Hope did the work on it.

The CHAIRMAN: Has any member on this side of the room any questions to put on this part?

Mr. BASFORD: Judge Dryer, so far as the trustees are concerned, what is Mr. Bank's role in the S.I.U. of North America?

Mr. DRYER: So far as I have been able to find out, I would say nothing except as a former member of the family. I think some of them feel they have some sort of personal obligation to him. I think they would wish he would disappear.

Mr. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if Judge Dryer would identify Mr. Sheppard about whom questions have been put by members of the committee.

Mr. DRYER: He is a vice-president of the S.I.U. of North America.

Mr. WOOLLIAMS: Judge Dryer, you have described the S.I.U. of Canada as being really like to a holding company of the S.I.U. of the United States.

Mr. DRYER: No, the S.I.U. of North America; there are a number of unions that tie into it.

Mr. WOOLLIAMS: What degree of control does the S.I.U. of Canada exercise over the United States S.I.U. or vice-versa.

Mr. DRYER: Are you referring to direct legal control?

Mr. WOOLLIAMS: Yes.

Mr. DRYER: I would say none except in so far as some control may arise from the fact that the S.I.U. of Canada has a charter. Now, you are getting into a very difficult field of trade union law when you try to determine what control a parent body has over an organization which is chartered by it. But, on the face of it, I would say that it has no legal control. The S.I.U. of Canada could do what it wants legally. But, I say that subject to the proviso that there might be something which stems from the fact they have taken a charter. That is, it may be that if the matter came before the courts the courts would hold that having taken a charter you have subjected yourself to certain obligations and you cannot rid yourself of these when you see fit. But, that is a matter to be determined.

Mr. WOOLLIAMS: What I had in mind was that with your knowledge of corporate law and corporate companies, if one is a holding company or something like that, then I think you would go along with me and say that there would be some influence and some exercise of authority of one company over another company, and that the same would hold in the case of one association over another, in respect of the election of officers.

Mr. DRYER: I think that could happen to individuals.

Mr. WOOLLIAMS: That may be true and it may not.

Mr. DRYER: I think any such control would arise as a result of personal conduct rather than anything inherent in the legal structure. We are guessing at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Could I interrupt at the moment, Mr. Woolliams because you were not in attendance for a few minutes between 9 and 9.20. After a very pleasant exchange of views, the Chair ruled that all questions pertaining to