

supply and diverse other facets of community life will undergo changes at both the sending and the receiving ends of migration streams. Migration may also create social problems or stimulate fundamental changes in the social and cultural context of community life.

Until recently, paucity of pertinent data on migration in Canada has deterred the progress of research on this phenomenon. With the exception of information collected in the 1941 Census, in fact, no direct data on movement of Canada's population were in existence. Even the 1941 Census data, moreover, are not sufficiently comprehensive to permit intensive analysis. Estimates derived from a 20-p.c. sample of private households in the 1961 Census thus represent a significant landmark in the study of population mobility in Canada. The data provide detailed information on migration over the 1956-1961 period, including mobility status of Canada's population, the magnitude and direction of migration streams, the types of movement, the types of areas of origin and destination of migrants, and characteristics of both migrant and non-migrant population. Related to other facts during this five-year period, these time-oriented data also permit some appraisal of the social and economic 'determinants and consequences' of migration.

Questions on mobility status were asked of all persons 15 years of age or over in each private household in the sample. Mobility status of persons five to 14 years of age as of the 1961 Census date was assumed to be the same as that of the family head. Persons under five years of age—those born since June 1, 1956—were excluded, since migration in this Census was measured in terms of the place of residence on June 1 in 1956 and 1961. Estimates derived thus represent only the population five years of age or over who resided in private households in Canada in the 1961 Census. Persons in collective-type households, such as institutions, hotels and large lodging houses, are not included.*

Concepts and Definitions

Mobility, as used here, refers to spatial or geographic movement. It is to be distinguished from 'social mobility' which refers to a change in socio-economic status. Spatial mobility often precedes or follows social mobility, but not always.

Movement could take place from one apartment to another in the same house or it could span across the country from Newfoundland to British Columbia. Obviously, not all movements may be considered as migratory. Movement within the same neighbourhood, for example, which introduces no fundamental change into the established order of individual and collective life, is not migratory. Long-distance movement, which is likely to involve significant changes in the life conditions of movers as well as in the context of community life, is generally regarded as migratory. Theoretically, however, it is difficult to draw a clear-cut line between 'migratory' and 'non-migratory' movements. In the first place, distance travelled in spatial mobility is on a continuum; where to place a cutting point for separating migrants from non-migratory movers thus becomes inevitably a matter of more or less arbitrary choice. In the second place, although distance of movement is in general associated with the extent of change to be introduced into the life of the individual mover or of the community, the association does not always hold true. Furthermore, these and other conceptual problems are intertwined with various difficulties involved in the measurement of migration. Migration, therefore, has to be defined on an 'operational' basis by imposing some boundary lines to be crossed and a degree of permanence in a shift in residence to be established before a movement may be counted as a case of migration.

In the 1961 Census, migration was defined as a change in the usual place of residence across the municipal boundaries and was measured on the basis of the reported place of residence on June 1 in 1956 and in 1961. Movers within the same municipality constituted a special category but were not treated as migrants. The municipality was chosen as the smallest unit of area for defining migration primarily for the following two reasons: (1) that respondents could report on their past usual place of residence with a reasonably

* More details about the sampling and estimation procedures adopted are given in the Introduction to the *1961 Census of Canada Report, Vol. IV.*