

The Address—Mr. Mullally

Island was \$2,187, while the Canadian average was \$3,131, which is \$1,000 or 50 per cent more than the average income for Prince Edward Island. This surely points out the dire need for additional consideration.

Second, during 1962, as I have mentioned, the average realized net income per farm in Prince Edward Island was \$980. This is the lowest in Canada and is less than one third of the national average. Third, since we have a small population, slightly over 100,000 people, the cost of government administration, in fact of all services, is of necessity higher than in other provinces. Fourth, our unemployment rate in the maritime provinces is the highest in the country.

Fifth, during the decade between 1951 and 1961, over 11,000 people left our province to take up residence in other parts of Canada. These were young people in the prime of life who had been reared and educated in our province, but because of the limited opportunities at home they moved to other parts of Canada where their education and productive capacity will contribute to the province of their adoption. This continual outflowing of our educated youth reduced our productive capacity and at the same time placed more strain on our educational finances and other similar programs. We speak of equal opportunity to all Canadians. Certainly, the young people in my province cannot possibly have equal educational opportunity, compared with the opportunity available to young people in the wealthier parts of the country.

Finally, with low income and higher unemployment, and the attendant problems which those conditions create, the need for social services is much greater than in those areas where these problems are not so prevalent. This is all summarized by the fact that our ability to pay is less while the demands on our resources are greater. For these several reasons, and for others which I could present, I believe we are deserving of special consideration. Formulae which give a reasonable and fair share to other provinces do not benefit a small province such as ours to any extent consistent with our needs. As I have mentioned before, our needs are much greater than other provinces, and our ability to meet these needs from provincial sources is less. I am therefore suggesting that special consideration be given to this request, which I believe is consistent with sound reasoning and fair play.

I realize we are now receiving fairly substantial amounts, but I point out that these do not enable us at present to provide the services required, especially in the fields of education and social services.

Transportation, Mr. Speaker, is of vital concern in every part of the country, but for those Canadians who live on an island it is the very lifeblood of their economic survival. This may explain why all islanders are watching so anxiously the studies under way to determine the best method of building the Northumberland causeway.

Mention of this major, national undertaking is sometimes viewed with scepticism by people in other parts of the nation. This is certainly not the case in Prince Edward Island. We are seriously concerned, and we are anxiously awaiting the report of the engineering surveys conducted during the past summer. Everything revealed to this date has given us cause for optimism on this most essential and important undertaking. I urge the Department of Public Works to proceed with all possible speed to the completion of its studies, and I suggest that the Minister of Public Works, as soon as the report is studied, give us a full and detailed review of the present status of this project and the plans for the future. We islanders are hopeful and confident that this great national enterprise will be in full swing of construction as one of the great centennial projects undertaken by our country.

We have been alarmed, especially during the past year, at the rapid and rather drastic curtailment of railway services, especially in the eastern and western portions of Prince Edward Island, I know this concern is shared by hon. members in every part of the house, who represent ridings where railway curtailment and abandonment is under review. Passenger service, at least in the eastern and western sections to which I have referred, has been completely removed, and freight services have been reduced by as much as 50 per cent or more. We realize that railway companies, like any other enterprise, must follow sound economic practices, and with the dwindling passenger traffic offering we could not seriously criticize the elimination of passenger service. However, we are deeply concerned with the cut-back in freight service, especially because it seriously affects our primary producers, our farmers and fishermen.

It seems inevitable, despite our strong and most persistent objections, and despite the objections and arguments presented by boards of trade, organizations, business people and citizens generally, that railway service is going to be continually curtailed. If this is the direction in which the railway company is moving and if ultimately, even against the strongest protests, the service is removed entirely, then I point out to the government and especially the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill)—in fact I am advising them