

been taken care of, and I think the program did something along that line. Now that we do not have unemployment—and I think it is generally conceded in Canada that there is no great problem in any area of Canada concerning unemployment—what would happen to Northern Ontario in general if we changed the criteria from unemployment to lack of employment growth?

Mr. KILGOUR: Well, Mr. Peters, this has been suggested as an alternate criteria that might be used. If we were to take—and I think these figures are available—the national rate of growth and possibly the desired national rate of growth—it might be better according to your Economic Council figures—and look at any area that is growing at a lesser rate than this and term it a slow growth area, this might be a solution to your problem. I think with the present mobility of labour that you are not going to keep pockets of unemployment in any one place, and I think this is what has happened in Northern Ontario. You do not keep unemployed people where there is no employment, so they disappear. If you look at the figures you will see that you do not have registered unemployment because they are busy registering and getting jobs in the borderlands.

Mr. MARTIN (*Timmins*): A hardrock miner does not stay unemployed, he strikes out for B.C. or some other place.

Mr. KILGOUR: I think the mobility of labor is so much greater now than it used to be. As a matter of fact, your manpower legislation and the practice of the manpower department is to aid people to move, they will pay them to move out of unemployment areas, so how can you establish an unemployment area and get the advantages of designation by having unemployed? Perhaps an idea would be to bring in a couple of train loads of people, register then, get your designation and then they can move out if they feel like it.

This is not a proper method of reaching an estimate of slow growth. What we are concerned about is all of northern Canada—I prefer to keep away from northeastern Ontario, particularly although that is the part that we are directly concerned with—and I think all of northern Canada has to grow and it has to grow in a hurry just for the sake of our own self preservation.

Mr. DELVILLANO: Mr. Chairman, in answer to Mr. Peters, and before we leave that portion of it, I do not think any of us suggested that it should be changed, but it should be added to because of these people that are moving. We can talk about all the assistance they give to people who move, but I know of one individual case—maybe the machinery has not been put into operation in this instance—where a man is starving in Toronto because he has to look after his family in Timmins, and he was moved under this plan of assistance in education. You can talk all you want about changing your place of employment, but these municipalities have invested a great amount of the taxpayers' money in order to build themselves up and now we are losing people.

I would say the greatest example of this in Canada is Kirkland Lake. You know that because it is in your area. These are the ills that should be corrected. We are not suggesting that the criteria change but that it be added to, because the solution can come from that. I think it is solving the problem.

Mr. PETERS: Could I ask Mr. Kilgour a question. In doing this I think governments are always going to give some attention to the anomalies that are created by it. Do you see an extension of the designated programs into areas of slow growth, causing a detrimental situation anywhere?