

*Labour Conditions**(Translation):***LABOUR CONDITIONS****EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS OVER 45 IN FEDERAL UNDERTAKINGS****Mr. Guy Rouleau (Dollard)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give consideration to the advisability of introducing, during the current session of parliament, legislation that would facilitate the employment, in federal works, undertakings, or businesses, as defined in section 2 of chapter 38 of the Statutes of Canada, 1956, or in any corporation, set up to perform some function or duty on behalf of the government of Canada, of male or female persons over 45 years of age who, on account of their age, find it difficult to secure employment at the present time.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this year, at last, this notice of motion, which has been on the order paper every year since 1956, has reached the stage where it can be discussed. Like every member of this house, since my election to this parliament, I have realized in my encounters with the voters of my constituency, the workers of my riding, heads of families who tell us of their problems, that unfortunately there is in this country a discrimination against workers of 45 years of age and over.

In my opinion, that discrimination against workers 45 years of age and over is as reprehensible as racial and other discriminations.

Since I had the opportunity to become aware of the problem facing workers 45 years of age and over, I decided to consider the question with a view to know if the government could not do something to stop that discrimination in our country. That situation is caused by factors fairly numerous, but I shall mention only two.

Our industrialists—perhaps for want of leadership from the government, perhaps because of automation or other related problems—prefer to hire young people rather than persons of a certain age, feeling that young employees will adapt themselves more easily than older ones.

Another factor also causes this discrimination. It is the question of portable old age pensions. That question was discussed many times in this house, and I have no intention of bringing it back tonight. I merely wished to recall it to the attention of the house.

I was saying a while ago that, faced with this problem, I had wanted to go more deeply into it. I therefore studied what was done to stop this discrimination in other countries and especially in the American states.

In February the government announced a substantial increase in expenditures for 1962-63, and in the following weeks an impressive list of projects which had not been included in the main estimates. Those of us who sat on this side of the house remember too well how, prior to the election minister after minister rose in the House of Commons to announce projects from one end of the country to the other. However, what is the position today? Most of those projects have been abandoned, although they were used on behalf of the Conservative government to obtain votes in the last election campaign. Moreover, after the election even the main estimates tabled in the house in the month of February are being cut by about \$200 million.

But this is only part of the story. Before the election, according to the Prime Minister the Canadian economy had never been in better condition; the Canadian economy was progressing by leaps and bounds. After the election, however, the story was entirely different. We had the dollar crisis and the import surcharges, representing not only a substantial increase in the cost of living—as the housewife can now see every day—but also an increase in taxation, which has not been approved by parliament, let alone the austerity measures which should have been submitted to parliament and about which we know little or nothing. Before the election we had talk of easy money and low rates of interest. Now, after the election, we have tight money with a vengeance.

After all this, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat that the Canadian people have been the victims of a gigantic political fraud, and whether the government likes it or not, it is a fact that the government has established a fantastic record of deceit and it has shown a complete lack in integrity.

Mr. Churchill: That is quite false.

Mr. Chevrier: I want to submit proof—

Some hon. Members: Five o'clock.

The Chairman: Order. It being five o'clock, it is my duty to leave the chair in order that the house may proceed with private members' business, pursuant to section 3 of standing order 15.

Progress reported.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock, the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions.