

when I say this, but hope he will comment on the point I have made. I have raised that question in correspondence for I do not know how long. I have raised it in many committee meetings considering the estimates of the minister and of his predecessor. I know officials say, "Here we go again." Mr. Speaker, I raise it for this purpose: I insist that there shall be eradicated from our immigration regulations any and all vestiges of prejudice related to age, and that there shall be removed from the points system as it may be set up any provision whereby any person, by reason of age, shall lose points.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** It's fun to be forty.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I would extend this provision to a person who is the parent of an applicant, provided such person is in good health; in other words, standing up, able to see and to breathe, and not subversive.

**Mr. O'Connell:** Would that not be discrimination by reason of marital status?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** No; I spoke of a parent. If one applies the rule to a parent, will that be discriminatory? I do not think so. It is a matter of relationship. I am sure the hon. member opposite made his intervention with tongue in both cheeks, as it were.

I say there should be removed from the immigration regulations references to admissibility based on age. I hope the Minister of Manpower and Immigration will intervene on this point because, with all due respect, the House will rise some time in June, all our committees are occupied and I see no prospect of the immigration bill coming back before the end of this month. We hear reports of a new session to be called when the House resumes. Therefore, the immigration bill as presently constituted will die. The minister shakes his head. He must believe in miracles. I do not. I know many people in Canada are exercised about certain provisions of the present immigration bill.

I hope the minister will intervene this afternoon, since there is no way the bill can be reported back, debated, passed on third reading and considered in the other place by the end of the month. We know that members of the other place view with mixed feelings certain provisions of the bill. Consequently, I would advise the minister not to bet on the future viability of that legislation unless we sit all summer. On that unhappy note I will conclude. I ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to say how his department hopes to prohibit discrimination by reason of age as presently applied under the points system, and to tell us the proposals concerning a new points system.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity offered by the study of this bill at the report stage to state very clearly the fact that discrimination exists and that you do not have to go very far to find cases of discrimination based on prejudices since we live in an era of

### *Canadian Human Rights*

prevailing prejudices and witness a kind of discrimination that effects the very nature of Canada. If there are people who know what discrimination means in this country, these are French Canadians who, for centuries, have had to suffer all sorts of injustices for various reasons which should never have existed in the first place. And just to show you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not speaking through my hat, I will mention a particular case where a casual worker at the employ of the federal government is dismissed while other fellow workers doing very similar work are eventually hired on a permanent basis. This case has been submitted to the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer). It has also been submitted to a few hon. members opposite. It has even been submitted by myself to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who has not found a solution to it. Why? Because they take into account only the opinions of those who are precisely the cause of the discriminatory practices suffered by this employee.

● (1620)

Being quite informed about one side of the story, I would not want to seem to have prejudices of my own, however, as it is our duty here in this House to raise issues involving cases of discrimination toward individuals whose rights must be respected. To illustrate my opinion on the matter, I will take the liberty of reading to you large extracts from the grievances written to me by that Quebecer who lives at 38 Sylvain St. in Gatineau, Quebec, whose name is Gaëtan Pelletier and who has tried for several months to seek justice. He eventually met me and has written to me this letter that explains his case.

Mr. Speaker, if the facts mentioned in that letter are grounded, and I do not see why I should have doubts regarding the circumstances and the facts related to me by this individual, then, it would seem to demonstrate that it is high time for the law to protect the rights of individuals. Here is the quotation:

Gatineau, April 14, 1977

Mr. René Matte,  
Member for Champlain,  
House of Commons, Ottawa  
Dear Sir:

You will find enclosed a copy of my grievance and the answer I received from the department. You will notice that this answer deals only with the first request.

My union informed me today, April 12, 1977, that they cannot pursue the case further because under the law they cannot defend an individual who left government service. Any how, because of the provisions of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, all cases concerning temporary employees have always been lost.

I believe it would be appropriate to amend sections 90 and 91 of the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

After complaining that the union did not defend his grievance, he continues and I quote:

The minister, Jean-Pierre Goyer, did not make any research, he only asked the reasons to those who are against me. If Parliament can order a royal investigation into the CBC, why could it not do the same to compensate for injustice perpetrated against me?

What does the minister mean by colleagues? If he means the same opportunities as my French-speaking colleagues, it is questionable. But if he means the same opportunities as my English-speaking colleagues, then I say the minister is not well informed.