

EMPLOYMENT SUMMARY

	In labour surplus Category % of 48 summer months. Years 1955-1962	Employment Change. Years 1955-62	In labour surplus Category % of 18 summer months. Years 1959-1962	Employment Change. Years 1959-62	Employment changes by year during years 1959-1962		
					1959-60	1960-61	1961-62
BRANTFORD....	87	+ 2.2%	89	- 7.4%	- 7.0%	- 1.6%	+1.2%
Guelph.....	21	+19.7%	39	+ 2.4%	- 4.3%	+ 2.2%	+4.7%
Galt.....	21	+22%	28	+ 6.2%	+ 6.1%	- 6.0%	+6.5%
Kitchener.....	4	+30.4%	11	+ 9.8%	+18.6%	-14.0%	+7.7%
Woodstock.....	15	+35%	17	+ 1.1%	- 0.8%	- 3.8%	+5.8%
Stratford.....	2	+31%	0	+12.6%	+ 4.8%	+ 0.6%	+6.8%
		National Average 15%		National Average 4%			

Mr. Fisher: What is this statistic of economic growth? Is the hon. member suggesting it is the rate of employment? Is it the rate of unemployment? Is it the number of people in the labour force or the number of jobs created? I cannot follow her.

Miss Jewett: It is based primarily on the rate of employment growth.

Mr. Fisher: I disagree.

Miss Jewett: There are other and more discretionary ways of determining whether an area is capable of future self-sustained growth. I am not sure the bare figures of employment growth are enough to enable one to say that an area is capable of future development and, particularly, of self-sustained development. I would agree with the hon. member as to this. However, I think this method gives a good general picture of the growth of one area as compared with another over a period of time.

The point I wish to make is that with regard to these areas we are using figures and statistics from the past which are, after all, the only ones relevant if it is intended to use objective criteria. But in order to be able to choose areas which have a real potential for expansion on a self-sustaining basis, other factors must be taken into consideration, as is done in most European countries. This involves the use of a great deal more discretion, and the possibilities in this direction will increase when we are mature enough to allow this discretion to be exercised, and not to complain, for example, that a certain area has been designated or excluded for purely political reasons. In Sweden, this selection is done entirely on an ad hoc basis.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

I think there is a lot to be said for this method, especially when one is thinking in terms of future potential. But, for the time being it seems to me that the criteria which have been used in this case, namely, employment and unemployment figures over the past eight years, are perhaps the best which could be used in the circumstances, and that the size of the areas designated is also the best which could have been arrived at.

I do not think that the rules governing designation are immutable, as were the laws of the Medes and the Persians. Changes can be made as we see how they work out in the course of time.

It has been suggested by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam that not nearly enough people in our labour force are affected by these tax incentives. Actually, 10 per cent of our labour force will be aided by this measure. This is somewhat below the percentage in Europe where between 12 and 15 per cent of the labour force is affected by relocation measures. Perhaps we should bring the percentage affected in Canada to a higher level in future, as we see how the legislation works out.

Having said this, let me add that it is important, in trying to provide for a more equitable rate of growth and a higher level of employment in certain areas in Canada, that we should work as closely as possible with the provincial governments. My impression is that many of the provinces have not yet got their teeth into this problem. I know the province of Quebec has for a long time wished to encourage industry to move away from the Montreal area, but as far as I know they have not used any of the tools at their disposal to bring about this result. I think the