

INTERNAL MIGRATION IN CANADA  
Demographic Analyses

M. V. GEORGE

Ottawa, Queen's Printer for Canada  
1970, 251 pp. \$2.00

This book is a companion in the 1961 Census Monograph series to *MIGRATION IN CANADA: REGIONAL ASPECTS* by Leroy O. Stone. Stone's volume contains more material on historical trends, on concentration in urban and metropolitan areas and on economic aspects. For the most part, George's analysis begins with 1931. It is based mainly on statistics of province of birth and of change of residence between 1956 and 1961. The eight chapters deal, respectively, with introductory matters; definitions and evaluation of basic data; estimation of internal migration; population growth and redistribution; levels and trends in migration; migration streams; migration differentials by age, sex and marital status; and summary and conclusions. The two appendices are devoted to reference tables and to exposition of the place-of-birth survival-ratio method for estimation of intercensal net migration.

Canada is fortunate in that it has tabulated data on province of birth since 1931 by age and sex. (The item on the questionnaire goes back to the census of 1901.) Thus George can and does use the relatively powerful methods for analyzing such data that allow for intercensal mortality and treat separately the interprovincial migration of the "in-born" and of the "out-born." These methods were developed at the University of Pennsylvania by Hope T. Eldridge and Yun Kim. The results

are estimates of "net" migration between each pair of provinces during the decades 1931-41, 1941-51 and 1951-61 by age and sex. (The several degrees of "netness" in these migration measures become confusing. Actually, the estimates are of gross streams as reduced by return migration and progressive migration.) I should have liked somewhat more attention paid to the extent of response errors in reporting province of birth inasmuch as the author regards the migration estimates based on them as superior to those made by the census survival rate, which he also presents. Many of the text tables in this book are derived from detailed tabulations that have not been published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Most of the analysis relates to interprovincial migration; but, from the 1961 question on residence five years earlier, George presents statistics on local mobility and intraprovincial migration. This question related to persons 15 years old and over living in households. These limitations of coverage remain a possible source of bias although the mobility status of children 5 to 14 years old was imputed from that of their family or household head. Some types of nonresponse were fairly high. Certain types were prorated.

Noteworthy similarities are found to migration patterns and trends in the United States during the same general period. Over a 60-year period, a positive relation was seen between the rate of internal population redistribution and the national growth rate. The migration of the Canadian born was more important than that of the foreign born in redistributing population from 1931 to 1951, but the reverse was true for 1951-1961. The lower death rates of the foreign born are attributed to selective immigration. (Nativity tends to play the important role in this analysis of Canadian migration statistics that is customarily played by color in the United States.) The interprovincial migration rate tends to be lower than the interstate rate in the United States, partly because of the larger average land area of the Canadian provinces. Age-specific migration rates have profiles similar to those in the United States and

increased from 1936–1941 to 1956–1961. Sex differentials in migration have tended to converge over time.

The heavy flows between Canada and the United States complicated the estimation process but received special attention. In some cases, however, estimates of interprovincial migration *include* the migration to and from the United States.

The analysis is deftly performed, and the exposition is lucid given the technical complexity of the material. This reviewer has few criticisms to offer and spotted relatively few errors or contradictions. It seems odd to prorate the six per cent of persons with mobility status not reported, but to show separately the 0.4 per cent of the movers with origin not reported. Instead of making tabulations from which sampling errors could be estimated, the author consulted corresponding errors for 1960 United States migration statistics. Why obtain natural increase by subtraction instead of directly from registration statistics? There appear to be errors on pages 32, 82 and 90 vs. 91. Table 6.9 is not clearly labeled. The percentages as described in the text seem to be in the reverse direction from those presented in Table 7.1. The absence of an index is regrettable.

HENRY S. SHRYOCK