

Questions

2. To study the cures of perceptive deafness and various testing methods.
3. See answer 1 above.

DO NOT SHIP LIST—CARMEL DEGUIRE

Question No. 1,859—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions acknowledged the presence of the name of Mr. Carmel Deguire on the do not ship list filed with the Norris commission (exhibit O-269)?

2. Did the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions approve of the recommendation of the maritime appeals board that Mr. Deguire's application for reinstatement in the S.I.U. be rejected on the grounds that there was no record with the board of trustees that Mr. Deguire was a member of the S.I.U. and was not on the do not ship list to the knowledge of the S.I.U. and, if so, for what reasons?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour):

1. The board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions acknowledges the presence of the name Camille Deguire on exhibit O-269 filed with the Norris commission, which exhibit bears date of 28 day of August, 1950. This may be the same person referred to as Carmel Deguire.

2. No. The board of trustees does not in any way approve or disapprove of the rulings of the maritime appeals board, which is an independent arbitral tribunal, and it would therefore be improper for the board of trustees to interfere. Upon inquiring, the board of trustees was advised by the maritime appeals board that no person named Deguire had applied to have his case heard before the maritime appeals board.

DO NOT SHIP LIST—KEN LEWIS

Question No. 1,860—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Has the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions acknowledged the presence of the name of Ken Lewis on the do not ship list filed with the Norris commission (exhibit O-269)?

2. Did the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions approve of the recommendation of the maritime appeals board that Mr. Lewis' application for reinstatement in the S.I.U. be rejected on the grounds that there was no record with the board of trustees that Mr. Lewis was a member of the S.I.U. and was not on the do not ship list to the knowledge of the S.I.U. and, if so, for what reasons?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour):

1. The board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions acknowledges the presence of the name Ken Lewis on exhibit O-269 filed with the Norris commission, which exhibit bears date the 28th day of August, 1950.

2. No. The board of trustees does not in any way approve or disapprove of the rulings of the maritime appeals board, which is an independent arbitral tribunal, and it would

therefore be improper for the board of trustees to interfere. Upon inquiring, the board of trustees was advised by the maritime appeals board that no person named Ken Lewis had applied to have his case heard by the maritime appeals board.

EVIDENCE OF MEMBERSHIP IN S.I.U.

Question No. 1,861—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Does the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions consider the do not ship list filed with the Norris commission and attested to as correct by Mr. Hal Banks sufficient evidence of membership of persons mentioned therein in the S.I.U.?

2. Has the board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions accepted the report of the maritime appeals board which appeared in the August 14, 1964 issue of the *Canadian Sailor* which rejects the appeals of Max Anderson, Armand Clermont and John McNeill on the grounds that they could not produce evidence of former membership in the S.I.U. and, if so, for what reason?

3. Which officer or officers of the S.I.U. rule on past membership in the S.I.U. of Canada?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour):

1. The board of trustees does not advise the maritime appeals board on questions of evidence, but the board of trustees is of the opinion that the presence of a specific name on a list described as a do not ship list would probably not by itself be sufficient evidence of past membership in the S.I.U. However, each case must depend on its own facts.

2. The board of trustees of the maritime transportation unions neither accepts nor rejects reports of the maritime appeals board, has no jurisdiction to do so, and has not done so in the cases cited.

3. This is a matter of internal management within the union, subject to appeal to the maritime appeals board and the courts.

MAIL SERVICE, R.R. NO. 2, AMHERST, N.S.

Question No. 1,865—**Mr. Coates:**

Have complaints been received from the patrons of R.R. No. 2, Amherst, N.S., and R.R. No. 1, Tidnish, N.S., with regard to the delays that will be occasioned with outgoing mail as a result of the change in the starting point of R.R. No. 2, Amherst, and, if so, how many?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Postmaster General):

A petition bearing 102 names has been received protesting against a change in Amherst rural route No. 2. There is no record of any complaints from the patrons of Tidnish post office or Tidnish rural route No. 1. However, Tidnish is served as a way office on Amherst R.R. No. 2.

In recent years with the increasing traffic density, the Post Office Department has followed the policy of having rural routes