

movers to another as we go down the list given in Table I, regardless of the type of area involved. The impact of mobility on local communities, however, varied significantly among different types of area.

The urban centres contained a much higher proportion of mobile population than the remainder of the country, indicating the ratio of one mover to every two residents. As expected from housing developments, rapid changes in land use and other primarily urban conditions favouring internal mobility, the intramunicipal mobility of the urban population was significantly higher than that of the rural population. Almost one out of every three urban residents in 1961 had moved within the same municipality during the preceding five years. This was nearly double the corresponding rate for the rural non-farm population and four times as high as that for the rural farm population. The urban inter-provincial in-migration rate was also highest, although its difference from the corresponding rural non-farm rate was only slight. The impact of intraprovincial migration, on the other hand, was strongest on the rural non-farm population, over 45 p.c. of the total internal movers falling in this category. Mobility among the urban population thus represented primarily intramunicipal movement and only secondarily in-migration from different municipalities, while mobility among the rural non-farm population was mainly a function of in-migration. Judged from the mobility status of the residents in 1961, the rural farm population was the most stable; more than 80 p.c. reported the same place of residence for 1956 and 1961.

I.—MOBILITY STATUS OF URBAN, RURAL NON-FARM, RURAL FARM AND TOTAL POPULATION, FIVE YEARS OF AGE OR OVER, BY TYPE OF MOVEMENT, 1961

Type of Movement	Urban		Rural Non-farm		Rural Farm		Total Population	
	No.	p.c.	No.	p.c.	No.	p.c.	No.	p.c.
Non-movers.....	5,153,278	48.3	1,692,422	60.0	1,503,006	82.9	8,348,706	54.6
Movers within Canada...	5,096,512	47.8	1,087,788	38.6	299,700	16.5	6,484,000	42.3
Intramunicipal.....	3,219,442	30.2	490,160	17.4	154,177	8.5	3,863,779	25.2
Intraprovincial.....	1,444,795	13.5	494,256	17.5	126,444	6.9	2,064,475	13.5
Interprovincial.....	411,961	3.9	96,663	3.4	17,266	1.0	586,790	3.4
Moved, but place of residence in 1956 not stated	19,314	0.2	6,829	0.2	2,813	0.2	23,956	0.2
Migrants from abroad.....	421,349	3.9	38,708	1.4	9,858	0.5	469,915	3.1
<b>Totals.....</b>	<b>10,671,139</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2,818,915</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,812,564</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>15,302,621</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Provincial Differences in Mobility Status.**—The over-all mobility status of provincial populations differed significantly by their geographic location. In general, the total mobility rate becomes higher moving across the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coast—from 27 p.c. in Newfoundland to almost 49 p.c. in Alberta and British Columbia. The rates for these two western provinces were, in fact, appreciably higher than the rate for Ontario—the most urbanized province in the country. The only significant deviation from this general pattern of increasing mobility from east to west was Saskatchewan. The mobility rates by type of movement, however, did not show such a consistent pattern. The intramunicipal mobility rate was highest in Quebec, followed by Alberta, Ontario and British Columbia in that order. In general, however, the lower rates prevailed in the more rural provinces, while the more urbanized provinces tended to evince intensive intramunicipal mobility. The intraprovincial mobility rate also indicated a more or less direct correlation with the degree of urbanization, with British Columbia leading the other provinces and Newfoundland standing at the bottom of the scale. The