

out the net out-migration from the smaller centres. For the urban centres with less than 30,000 population the total out-migration rate amounted to 25 p.c., while the total in-migration rate was approximately 20 p.c.* The resulting net out-migration thus came to one loss for every 20 residents of these smaller urban centres in 1961.

III.—GROSS AND NET MIGRATION RATES¹ OF POPULATION FIVE YEARS OF AGE OR OVER,
BY TYPE OF MIGRATION AND TYPE OF AREA, 1956-1961

Type of Area	Intraprovincial Migration			Interprovincial Migration		
	In	Out	Net	In	Out	Net
Urban	14.4	14.9	-0.5	4.1	4.2	-0.1
100,000 or over.....	13.8	13.6	0.2	4.4	2.7	0.7
30,000-99,999.....	12.7	11.4	1.4	3.0	3.7	-0.7
10,000-29,999.....	15.0	18.5	-3.5	4.4	5.9	-1.5
Under 10,000.....	17.8	21.2	-3.4	3.8	5.8	-2.0
Rural	14.0	12.9	1.2	2.6	2.4	0.2
Non-farm.....	18.5	8.4	10.1	2.6	1.1	2.5
Farm.....	7.2	19.6	-12.4	1.0	4.3	-3.3

¹ The base population excludes those movers who did not report their place of residence in 1956. The migrants from rural areas who did not state the type of rural residence in 1956 are distributed into rural non-farm and farm categories according to the reported distribution.

As will be discussed below, the majority of urban migrants were interurban movers, generating population shifts among individual urban centres alone. It should be noted, however, that the net interchange of population between urban and rural non-farm communities during this period was invariably in favour of the latter, regardless of the size of the urban areas involved. Some net migration gain witnessed among the larger urban centres, in fact, represented a balance between a net gain from smaller urban centres and rural farms on one hand and a net loss to rural non-farm communities on the other. The smaller urban centres suffered a net loss due to out-migration to rural non-farm communities as well as a drain toward larger urban centres, despite a sizable in-migration of rural farm population.

The counterpart of this picture is revealed in the migration rates for the rural non-farm population. The total in-migration rate here, heavily weighted by a very high intraprovincial in-migration, was higher than in any other type of area in the country. Coupled with the lowest total out-migration rate, this yielded the highest net migration rate for the rural non-farm population; the ratio of net gain to the total resident population in 1961 was almost as high as 13 p.c. Furthermore, approximately two thirds of its total gain represented the net in-migration from urban centres and the remaining one third the net in-migration from farms.

The rural farm population, on the other hand, indicated a pattern almost diametrically opposite to that of the rural non-farm population, combining the lowest in-migration rate and nearly as high an out-migration rate as the smaller urban centres. If judged from the intramunicipal mobility and in-migration rates, the rural farm population appeared to be the most stable. In the light of the out-migration rate, it was among the most mobile. The consequent net out-migration rate proved to be by far the highest in the country; for every 100 rural farm residents in 1961 there was a net loss of nearly 16 due to migration. About 60 p.c. of the exodus from rural farms was toward urban centres. For the urban centres, however, this farm-to-city stream was a relatively small portion of their over-all mobility; it constituted less than 12 p.c. of the total migrants residing in urban centres in 1961.

* The total in-migration (or out-migration) rate refers to the sum of intraprovincial and interprovincial in-migrants (or out-migrants) per 100 resident population in 1961.