

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I will tell the hon. member why we bring them up. Then we had the padlock law, a vicious restraint of our civil rights. Now the Minister of Justice is to add his name to this catalogue of wrongs and injustices. I say to the minister he will be remembered in Canadian history as the man who in this critical hour did more to destroy the civil liberties of the people of this country than has ever been done before in peacetime. It is not enough in normal times for the minister to go to seminars and teach-ins.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member although his time has not quite expired. Some hon. members have brought to the attention of the Chair that it is ten o'clock. I will not put the motion now because I have a slight reservation about it. It may not be too important, but it seems to me that the hon. member has proposed an amendment which may be doubtful in that it refers to clause 12. It may be clause 14 the hon. member should attempt to amend. Perhaps it is the Bill of Rights that the hon. member is attempting to amend. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) seems to agree with my suspicion. If it is the Bill of Rights the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) wishes to amend, he cannot do it by an amendment to clause 12 of the bill.

In any event, it is such an important matter that I would want to consider it, and I will not declare the amendment out of order without hearing argument. The hon. member might consider in the meantime whether it would not be easier to move an amendment to the effect that Bill C-181 be sent back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of reconsidering clause 14, rather than clause 12.

In any event, it being ten o'clock, a motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been made.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—NON-PAYMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE—RETIRED EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS— GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, on November 4 I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) a question regarding the payment of less than the minimum federal wage to employees of the Chateau Laurier Hotel in Ottawa. The minister replied:

I expressed this opinion two weeks ago and gave my department the authority to proceed in the matter in the usual manner. I refer to the application of the rules and regulations under which the Department of Labour normally proceeds in

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

such cases. I presume that advice is now being sought from the appropriate department in regard to proceeding further.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question dealt with the Canadian National pension plan. But speaking first to the original question put to the Minister of Labour, it appears at this time, which is more than two weeks after November 4, that the situation at the Chateau Laurier Hotel has not been clarified. It is my information that there is hesitation on the part of some departments of government to take any action to find out whether the Chateau Laurier Hotel falls within federal or provincial jurisdiction. It is very ironic, to say the least, that at one time the CNR Chateau Laurier Hotel was quite prepared to be within federal jurisdiction so far as the payment of wages and other conditions were concerned, but now that the federal minimum wage is more than the provincial minimum wage they have the audacity to suggest that they are under provincial jurisdiction.

Even though there may be a case in Canada—I understand there is one in Alberta in respect of Jasper Lodge—regarding whether or not a certificate of collective bargaining can be granted under provincial or federal legislation, I cannot understand why the appropriate department of government will not move in respect of the Chateau Laurier Hotel and decide that it should be governed by federal legislation.

A supplementary question was asked of the minister in respect of the CNR pension plan. In view of the CNR labour-management question which is before the country, and the fact that labour is asking that pensions be put on the bargaining table, I think it is only right that we be assured that the CNR will consider putting its pension plan on the bargaining table.

We are aware that the unanimous report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, which in effect took no position concerning collective bargaining, suggested that persons already on pension should be given the same consideration that pensioners received some time ago. At the same time it was suggested that there should be an escalator clause. This suggestion received the unanimous agreement of the House of Commons. It would seem appropriate therefore, that a minister should answer to the House in respect of whether Canadian National plans to do something similar about its pension plan. I am given to understand that Canadian National has communicated with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), but neither the Minister of Labour nor the Parliamentary Secretary would be in a position to answer for the Minister of Transport so I shall defer that question until another time. The most important questions at this time are why the Chateau Laurier is not paying the federal minimum wage, and why no action is being taken on the part of the Canadian National management to act at least in part on the recommendations of the committee which were adopted unanimously so far as pension plan is concerned.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, within its jurisdiction, this