

interprovincial in-migration rate was highest in Alberta, with British Columbia following close behind. These two western provinces appear to have been the major centres of attraction to relatively long-distance migrants during this period. In absolute terms, the total interprovincial migrants to Alberta amounted to approximately 80,000 and those to British Columbia nearly 90,000. Surprisingly, the share of interprovincial migration for Ontario was smaller than its degree of industrial urbanization or its strategic location suggested, although the total number of migrants in this category for the province exceeded 150,000—the largest in the country. Quebec, which has traditionally demonstrated a unique pattern of development in many of its demographic features, scored the lowest interprovincial in-migration rate—lower even than that of Newfoundland.

II.—MOBILITY RATES<sup>1</sup> OF POPULATION FIVE YEARS OF AGE OR OVER,  
FOR THE PROVINCES AND CANADA, 1956-1961

Province	Intra-municipal Movers	Intra-provincial Movers	Inter-provincial Movers	Total Movers within Canada <sup>2</sup>
Newfoundland.....	17.9	7.4	1.6	27.1
Prince Edward Island.....	13.7	8.5	5.6	28.0
Nova Scotia.....	18.3	10.5	4.1	33.0
New Brunswick.....	17.6	9.9	4.9	32.6
Quebec.....	27.5	13.3	1.5	42.5
Ontario.....	26.0	14.1	2.8	43.2
Manitoba.....	24.7	10.8	5.4	41.2
Saskatchewan.....	20.6	13.4	4.2	38.5
Alberta.....	26.1	15.1	7.3	48.8
British Columbia.....	25.9	16.6	6.4	48.8
<b>Canada<sup>3</sup>.....</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>42.3</b>

<sup>1</sup> Per cent of movers of a given type to total population.

<sup>2</sup> Includes those who did not state their place

of residence in 1956.

<sup>3</sup> Includes the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

**Urban-Rural Differences in Gross and Net Migration.**—The mobility rate examined above reveals the extent of intramunicipal mobility and in-migration to a given type of community. The effect of out-migration, however, is not evident in this measure; it is only indirectly reflected in the size of the base population. In order to assess the total impact of mobility on a given population, therefore, the two opposing streams of migration as well as their net balance must be examined.

The urban centres during the 1956-1961 period were exposed to strong cross-currents of migration. In every size group of urban areas a high in-migration rate was matched by a correspondingly high out-migration rate. In the absolute volume of in- and out-migration, the largest urban centres with 100,000 or more population overshadowed the others, absorbing over 1,100,000 migrants and sending out almost as many.\* The intensity of both streams of migration, however, was greatest among the smallest centres under 10,000 population, while the urban areas between 30,000 and 100,000 population proved to be somewhat more stable than others. If the largest urban communities representing most of the census metropolitan centres are excluded, the migration rate or the impact of migration on a given local population appears to have been inversely correlated with its size.

Contrary to expectations, the effect of the two counteracting streams of migration on the urban population as a whole was a slight net loss.† Although the larger urban centres with 30,000 or more population gained some population through migration (intra- and interprovincial migration combined), the gain for this group was too small to cancel

\* These figures include the migrants from one urban centre of 100,000 or over to another in the same size group.  
† Exclusion of the residents in collective-type households from the sample universe may well have resulted in an understatement of in-migration to urban centres, since this group with the majority living in urban centres is likely to have contained a larger proportion of highly mobile population than the residents in private households. Even after an allowance is made for the possible understatement of urban in-migration, however, the general pattern remains unchanged.