

*Income Tax Act*

is estimated that one citizen out of five changes his state of residency every year. This is really fantastic mobility when you think of it—that one out of five should change his state of residence every year.

Even in Canada, where I think we sometimes tend to feel we are a fairly stick-at-home kind of society, where we do not move around very much, the figures, particularly in the last census, show a very, very high degree of mobility. The very fact that only 11 per cent of our labour force is now working full time in agriculture suggests this, and also the fact that in the 1961 census it was shown that 45 per cent of our whole population now lives in the 17 metropolitan areas picked out by that census. It was 40 per cent in 1951, and is 45 per cent today. No doubt it will get higher, and this of course suggests and implies that there has been a very substantial mobility of labour.

Some work has been done with family allowance statistics, estimating that between 400,000 and 500,000 Canadians change their province of residence every year. This is a pretty high level of interprovincial migration for all provinces, for Quebec and Ontario just as much almost as for the maritime and western provinces. It seems to me that these figures shed in their way a new light on Canadian society, and since I am talking about them I might as well mention that in the 17 metropolitan areas of Canada which had 45 per cent of our population in 1961, over 1,700,000 of their residents came from countries outside Canada, and further, almost one million of the residents of those 17 cities came from a province other than the province in which their respective city was located.

All of these figures, and many others I could cite, present a picture of Canada that is quite different from the mythology that has been built up. There may be an occasion later on to say more about this, but in the meantime if any hon. members are interested, there is going to appear in the fall issue of *Queen's Quarterly* an extremely interesting article by Miss Yoshiko Kasahara of the dominion bureau of statistics called "A Profile of Canada's Metropolitan Centres".

Despite this very high degree of mobility from rural to urban centres and from one province to another, to say nothing about the very great intraprovincial migration, the statistics of which are not yet available, we still have in Canada, as has been the case in other western industrial countries, areas of what we call chronic unemployment, areas of slow economic growth, areas where labour does not always move out and where, if it does, it is frequently, of course, the younger

workers. These are areas, therefore, of real social need where there are large numbers of unemployed and where there is not a great deal of opportunity for them.

Countries in western Europe, and indeed Canada too, have tried to find means of encouraging people to move out of these areas. The results of these efforts have been, in many instances, very discouraging. I noticed one particular story in the United Kingdom where there was an attempt to relocate workers. It is told that a party of loom-tuners and their wives were taken by coach to visit another works in the same organization in a different part of the country. They were provided with hotel accommodation and taken to see the works and the surrounding district, in the hope that at least some of them would decide to take up employment there. These were people who were going to be out of jobs in the mill in which they were then working. But not one man accepted the offer, after this great party they had been given to go and see the new mill. Similarly, the French government and the E.C.S.C. made provision for the transfer of 5,000 miners about to be displaced from the Centre-Midi coalfield to Lorraine. When only about one tenth of them moved, the plan was shelved. One tenth were willing to move, but nine tenths were not. The same situation has been found in New England textile communities.

Even though there is very great hardship involved in staying put, geographical mobility has not been sufficient to remove these workers from what seem to be generally called depressed areas. People do not want to move. Sometimes, because of habit, inertia, old ties or whatever may be the cause they would rather stay where they are with only half the wages than move to a new area. Unless we are going to insist that people move out of areas to areas of better potential, we must try to make some provision for a better life in those areas.

We should of course continue to encourage as much mobility of labour as we can. In most European countries it is a two-pronged policy; on the one hand you continue to encourage the mobility of labour, you continue to encourage people to move to areas where the potential for growth is better; but on the other hand, knowing that you cannot always get them to move, you initiate policies which will at least provide a reasonably adequate life for them where they are.

One of these policies is to induce industry to settle in these areas. Inducing industry to settle in these areas has, of course, another purpose. Most countries are reluctant to see only certain centres built up too much; they do not want to see too great a congestion. The United Kingdom, for example, is really