

A COMPARISON OF SOME OF THE CENSUS CONCEPTS USED IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES⁽¹⁾

J. T. Marshall, Dominion Bureau of Statistics

The subject of this paper is not only a difficult one from many points of view, but a somewhat hazardous one as well. It presupposes that the author has sufficient intimate knowledge of the conceptual problems of the census of a neighbouring country as well as his own. Anyone familiar with the vast range of subjects covered by the modern-day census will appreciate that there are many fundamental reasons for, and purposes served by, the underlying concepts which govern the census content of a given country. Not the least significant factor, by any means, is the way in which these concepts have evolved over the years in one particular country as compared to another. Thus, it becomes a difficult task to attempt a discourse on this subject for one's own country. To this is added a considerable element of risk when one attempts to make comparisons with one's neighbour. But I am among friends, and I am sure that these risks are worth the taking, if in so doing it enlarges, even in a small way, our perspective of the statistical comparability of census information between the two countries.

One would have to say at the outset, of course, that there are far more similarities than differences in the concepts employed in the United States and Canadian censuses. This produces the happy situation of a large body of census statistics which knows no international boundary line. Differences which do exist vary greatly as to their cause and effect. There are some, for example, which on the surface appear to be at variance, but which on closer examination, indicate a slightly different approach to obtain the same information. Thus, the United States Census may have found that asking "date of birth" is the preferable way of obtaining the age distribution of the United States population, while the Canadian Census may have found that from their experiences to date they have preferred to use "age at last birthday". The arguments for and against, as in most all conceptual problems, are numerous and complex. In this particular instance, for example, they involve such considerations as memory bias on the part of persons answering this question for themselves or for other members of their household, the use and desirability of conversion tables, the methods being used to enumerate, process, and tabulate the data, and so on.

For some concepts, it is doubtful whether it is necessary, or even desirable, that the two countries must be exactly identical in their definitional approach. There are others, however, involving more fundamental differences, where comparability becomes difficult, and in fact misleading if one is not aware of the nature and extent of these differences. It is to some of

these more outstanding cases that attention should possibly be directed, and even if, despite the best intentions of statisticians on both sides of the border, some of them may never be able to be reconciled, it is important that users of census statistics be made aware of them.

The Concept of a "dwelling" or "housing" Unit

Such awareness might prevent the recurrence of what is now, to us, the famous "telephone" incident. Statistics of the 1950 United States Census and the 1951 Canadian Census indicated that a significantly higher percentage of dwellings were equipped with telephones in Canada than in the United States. In the ensuing rush by Canadian statisticians to determine the cause, it was found that the United States showed a higher proportion of "one-and two-person" households than Canada. Seemingly minor differences in the definition of a dwelling unit for marginal cases, relating principally to such factors as the cooking and preparation of meals and the degree of structural separateness, produced a noticeable variance as to whether persons should be classed as lodgers in a boarding-house room or as living in a separate dwelling unit. The installation of a telephone was obviously not a criterion, and the Canadian definition, or at least its interpretation in the field was more restricted than in the United States. Thus, it can be seen that even in one of the most basic concepts of the census, there were elements of non-comparability even though the definitions, from outward appearances, were closely parallel.

Percentage of households by number of persons

<u>Persons</u>	<u>1950 Census of U.S.</u>	<u>1951 Census of Canada</u>
1	9.3	7.5
2	28.1	21.0
3	22.8	20.3
4	18.4	19.0
5	10.4	12.9
6+	11.0	19.3

This difference in dwelling concepts will carry over to comparisons of the results of the 1960 and 1961 Censuses of the United States and Canada. The United States Census defines a "housing unit" as a group of rooms or a single room if it is occupied by or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters, i.e., when the

(1) This paper was prepared jointly with Douglas Ralston; Ray Davy; Alice Wood; Mabel Waddel and Bob Ellis of the Census Division, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

occupants do not live and eat with any other persons in the structure, and when there is either (1) direct access from the outside or through a common hall, or (2) a kitchen or cooking equipment for the exclusive use of the occupants. The Canadian definition for the 1961 Census places more emphasis on structural separateness, and states that to be classed as a "dwelling unit", living quarters must be structurally separate and must have a private entrance either from outside or from a common hall or stairway inside the building. The entrance must be one that can be used without passing through anyone else's living quarters. Instructions to Canadian census enumerators emphasized the fact that rooms on the second or third floor of what was originally a single house, for example, should be classified as a separate dwelling unit, or units, only if there had been some structural change to separate them from other living quarters in the building.

Whether the one or the other of these concepts represents the better definition could be argued "ad infinitum". Canadian statisticians might argue that their definition is closer to what one generally considers as a separate dwelling unit in terms of single houses, apartments and suites, etc., as distinct from boarding-house rooms wherein persons may or may not cook their own meals. They would be the first to agree, however, that what they set out as their concept in theory, is not always obtained in practice. In fact, the lack of uniform application by enumerators in the treatment of marginal cases seems a valid criticism of the Canadian concept.

The concept of a "family unit"

Another basic concept which gives rise to misunderstanding when the figures of the United States and Canada are compared, is that concerned with the definition of a "family unit". There is no pretense here at comparability in concept, and each country has been going its separate way for a number of censuses as to the group of individuals within a household which it defines as a "family". For either country now to adopt the other's concept would involve impairment of comparability within its own series. Nor am I sure that there is any strong desire on the part of either country to admit that the other employs a more useful definition.

Basically, the Canadian definition of a family considers only the husband and wife (with or without unmarried sons or daughters), or one parent with one or more unmarried son or daughter, as a family. Thus it can be seen that under the Canadian definition, a family always consists of two or more persons in a parent-child or husband-wife relationship. The United States definition, on the other hand, is broader in its concept, in that a family comprises all persons related by blood, marriage or adoption, within the household, of which there must be two or more such persons. Thus, for example, when a married daughter and her husband live in her parents'

home there would be two families according to the Canadian definition, but only one under the United States concept. Any combination of brothers, sisters or other related persons comprising a household in the United States would constitute a family, but would simply be a group of two or more related persons in Canada.

Thus, we in Canada tend to think of our family definition as using the "immediate family" approach, and the United States as employing an "economic family" approach. Some indication of the comparability of statistics based on these two definitions can be observed from figures derived from the 1956 Census of Canada. A special tabulation was made of "economic families", using the same definition as the United States concept of a family and then compared with statistics based on the "immediate family" concept of the Canadian census. The resulting figures showed a total of 3,640,000 families using the United States definition, and 3,710,000, or 2 per cent more, using the Canadian definition. This small difference of 70,000 more families under the "immediate family" approach, however, does not tell the whole story. Some 16 per cent of all families were affected by the change in definition, while for the remaining 84 per cent, the same group of persons comprised the family under either definition. Further, the average size of the "economic" family was closer to the average size of household than it was to the average size of the "immediate" family.

<u>Item</u>	<u>"Immediate" family concept(1)</u>	<u>"Economic" family concept(2)</u>
1. Number of families	3,711,500	3,642,500
2. Persons in families	14,077,200	14,594,500
3. Persons in families as percentage of population	88.2	91.4
4. Average persons per family	3.8	4.0

- (1) Corresponding to Canadian definition of a family.
(2) Corresponding to United States definition of a family.

Differences in the composition of families under the two definitions were most pronounced, as would be expected, for persons of adult ages. Of the 517,000 persons who were non-family members under the "immediate family" definition but became family members under the "economic family" approach, almost 88 per cent of these were 25 years of age or over. This means that the "economic family" definition has the effect of bringing into family status a relatively large group of adults such as widowed fathers, mothers, mothers-in-law, as well as a fair number of brothers and sisters, and other relatives. While this may sound as though the more extended definition includes, in the words of Gilbert and

Sullivan, "and his sisters and his cousins and his aunts", it has certain definite advantages, one of which I might comment on.

The value of this concept for classifying such census statistics as family income, for example, is undeniable as it relates more closely to the idea of the family spending unit than the "immediate family" definition. The 1961 Census of Canada, recognizing this value, plans to provide a number of such tabulations on the basis of "economic families". However, as in the past, the main tabulations on families and their composition will again be based on the "immediate family" definition. Housing authorities in Canada, for example, have expressed preference for this concept in regard to estimates of housing supply and demand. Some social analysts appear to prefer the more limited and precise concept for certain fields of research. How valid, or how important these reasons are, I am not prepared to say.

The fact, however, that both definitions are capable of being broken down into various sub classifications using such groupings as "primary" and "secondary" families, "sub-families", "related" and "non-related" families, etc., provide the analyst with some means of comparison providing he is fully aware of the meaning and uses of these terms in each country. It would be beyond the scope of this paper to go into these numerous facets of the family definition. Suffice it to say, that anyone making use of the census family statistics of both countries in any sort of comparison must, for the present at any rate, proceed with all due caution in respect to the independent viewpoints of two neighbours on this subject.

Metropolitan and Urbanized Areas

A geographic concept which has assumed ever-increasing importance in more recent years is that defining the "metropolitan area" of a major city. The United States has devoted a great deal of attention to this concept and has developed over the past few decades a standard set of uniform criteria upon which to base the establishment of metropolitan area boundaries. As yet in Canada we do not employ some of the criteria which give more preciseness and uniformity to the United States definition. However, we do make use of some of the more basic criteria such as population densities, proportions of farm population and distances from the central city, to define the metropolitan area limits of a given city.

Possibly the most basic difference in this concept as between the two countries relates to the inclusion in the United States of complete counties in the fringe areas when they satisfy the given criteria, whereas in Canada this is done on the basis of minor civil divisions. The main reason for this in Canada is that the county divisions are generally larger administrative

units than their counterparts in the United States. If we were to adopt the county as the basic unit about 15 out of our 17 metropolitan areas would be unduly exaggerated.

That Canada is gradually moving in the direction of the United States in regard to this concept, however, is evidenced by the fact that for the first time in the 1961 Census, we have tried to define the truly "urbanized areas" based on urban densities, as is done in the United States, within the framework of the metropolitan boundaries. Since the Canadian concept of a metropolitan area, however, is at present somewhat more restricted than in the United States, chiefly through the use of minor civil divisions as building blocks rather than counties, the resulting difference between the "urbanized area" of a given city and the "metropolitan area" of the same city will not be too significant in Canada's 1961 Census. However, we are in a transitional stage for the 1961 Census, and we hope to take a much closer look at the present metropolitan area boundaries on the basis of the 1961 results, with the view to possible enlargement and unification of their boundaries on a less restricted concept of a city's outgrowth.

Thus, for the 1961 Census, the "urbanized area" within the boundaries of Canada's metropolitan areas will be used to give a more precise delineation between rural and urban, but we are planning to issue statistics on population and housing characteristics only on the "metropolitan area" basis, due to the relatively close correspondence which presently exists between the two sets of boundaries. This is evident when it is considered that the Canadian definition of a metropolitan area would naturally include any complete minor civil division in which a significant portion of that civil division would also be part of the "urbanized area". On a more extended definition of a metropolitan area, as in the United States, this would not be the case.

Ethnic or racial groups, and languages

A concept which has been accompanied by much controversy in recent years, in Canadian censuses at any rate, is that concerned with the measurement of population in terms of ethnic or cultural groups. In Canada, a question on this subject has been included in every census, but one, since 1871. It is difficult to comment on the criteria for this inquiry as compared, for example, to the question on "Colour or race" of the United States census. The basic difference, of course, is that in addition to trying to measure the numbers and characteristics of such non-white ethnic groups as "Negro", "North American Indian", etc., the Canadian census attempts to classify the total population into major ethnic categories such as French, German, Italian, Jewish, Ukrainian, and so forth. One of the principal reasons for such an inquiry in Canada is to meet the many requests for this type of information from within the various ethnic groups themselves.

Also, census information is one means of measuring the extent to which various ethnic groups have retained some of their ethnic and cultural identity, as for example, by comparisons of ethnic group statistics with those of mother tongue (which are largely determined on a language criterion). Thus, the Canadian Census defines mother tongue as "the language first learned in childhood and still understood". The United States, on the other hand, asks mother tongue only of persons born outside of the United States using the concept of "language spoken in the home before coming to the United States".

The United States inquiry on "birthplace of parents" provides information on national or geographic origin in the case of the foreign-born and first generation Americans of foreign parentage. However, the United States concept could not deal adequately, in Canada, with the measurement of the French ethnic group, for example, with its long history on the Canadian scene, particularly insofar as measuring its gains or losses.

What the future holds for the Canadian inquiry on ethnic groups is difficult to predict. Despite its numerous imperfections, one wonders what sort of substitute information might be forthcoming in the way of diverse estimates of all sorts from many quarters, were the census not to continue to try to provide for the many interested groups and agencies in Canada at least as factual and uniform estimates as possible on this complicated subject.

The economically-active population

In the complex subject-matter area of measuring the economically-active population, where seemingly arbitrary rules have to be set up to define what we mean by such terms as "labour force", "unemployment", "class of worker", and numerous others, one might expect serious problems of diversity in the conceptual approach adopted by Canada and the United States in their current censuses. However, such is not the case, and differences for the most part are concerned more with the amount of detail and supplementary information obtained by each country. Possibly the most serious element of non-comparability in the basic labour data is not conceptual in nature at all, but rather stems from the fact that the measurement of labour force characteristics in the United States census relates to a week in April, while in Canada it is a week in June. The intervening period is a season of change, as for example, in the primary industries from forestry operations, trapping, and the like, to farming and construction activities. It is a period of improvement in unemployment rates, of new workers such as students entering the labour force on a part-time or full-time basis, so that Canada's Census in this respect at least should be on a more optimistic note than that of the United States.

A few other differences might be mentioned briefly in this general area. The United States, in addition to obtaining information on the number of persons currently at work, unemployed or with a job but not at work, also included in the 1960 Census a question on the most recent year in which persons who were not currently working did any work. The 1961 Census of Canada obtained data on the number of persons with a current job, or were unemployed or who had a job anytime during the preceding 12 months. Thus, the Canadian Census will not have a corresponding count to that of the United States of persons not in the current labour force who did any work prior to the 12 months preceding the census. A further enlargement of the scope of the United States criteria as compared to Canada provided for questions to obtain the job description of all persons who had worked anytime during the past 10 years. In Canada, we did not obtain the job description of persons unless they had been economically active at some time during the 12 months preceding the Census.

In the field of income statistics, Canada has followed the lead of the United States, not without some trepidation on our part, in attempting to obtain for the first time statistics on personal income from all sources, rather than income from salaries and wages only, as in previous censuses of Canada. In the 1960 United States Census, the basis of inquiry for collecting income data was the calendar year (1959) whereas in the recent Canadian census it was the census year (June 1960-May 1961), although the amount for the calendar year (1960) was accepted if the exact amount for the past 12 months was not known or could not be estimated. In this instance, as in several others I could mention, the April 1st United States census date was clearly superior to Canada's reference date in June.

Housing concepts

Turning for a moment to the Census of Housing, one finds again a high degree of correspondence in the concepts of Canada and the United States. Such differences as there are, for the most part are due to differences in terminology and the amount of detail obtained. Thus, for example, the United States provides very precise criteria by which to determine condition of dwellings. Although the terms describing condition differ, both countries will produce results for three degrees of housing quality, viz., in the United States "sound, deteriorating and dilapidated"; in Canada, "good condition, in need of minor repair and in need of major repair". Much greater detail is obtained with regard to vacant dwellings in the United States than in Canada. Again, while the concept of toilet and bath facilities, including exclusive and shared use, is essentially the same in both countries, the United States goes farther than Canada and counts the number of bathrooms and partial bathrooms in each housing unit.

Certain variations occur in questions regarding household accessories. Thus, while both countries inquire as to homes equipped with home freezers, television sets, and passenger automobiles, Canada includes also a question on refrigerators, while the United States includes questions regarding radios, telephones, air conditioning units, clothes dryers and washing machines. The Canadian Housing Committee decided that radios and telephones were no longer as indicative of standards of living in Canada as certain other criteria. Data on clothes dryers and washing machines are obtained from Special Surveys. However, air conditioning units are not yet sufficiently prevalent in Canadian homes to warrant their inclusion.

Concepts regarding tenure, value, and rents are basically alike. As in the United States, we in Canada have attempted to obtain a figure representing gross rent. The items and basis of payment for additional services included in the gross rent are the same in both countries. In addition to the amounts paid for these services (water, gas, electricity and fuel), Canada included a question to ascertain whether or not cash rent included a refrigerator, cooking stove, furniture or garage.

The Census of Agriculture

The United States and Canadian Censuses of Agriculture are very similar with respect to concepts, questionnaire content, and types of tabulations, although there are a few notable differences. The United States Agriculture Census, for example, was taken in the fall of 1959, as a separate census operation, while in Canada it was taken in June, 1961, in conjunction with the Population and Housing Censuses. With the heavy work-loads of decennial censuses, it will be a matter of prime consideration in the planning of future censuses of Canada as to whether the present arrangement will continue, although there are a number of advantages to the combined operation which we would not like to forfeit. A further difference is that a substantial section of the 1959 United States questionnaire was enumerated on a 20 per cent sample, whereas in the 1961 Census of Canada sampling techniques for agriculture were abandoned as a result of the persistent demand that all information be tabulated for small areas.

A change in the concept of a "farm" was made for both the 1959 United States Census and the 1961 Canadian Census. Briefly, this change introduced sales of agricultural products as a criterion in place of production alone. Consequently, some holdings which produced only for home use are no longer classified as farms for census purposes. The United States definition specifies as farms those places of less than 10 acres with agricultural sales of \$250 or more for the year, or places of 10 acres or over with agricultural sales of \$50 or more. The 1961 Census of Canada defines a farm as a holding of one acre or over

with agricultural sales of \$50 or more. From this it can be observed that the main difference in the "farm" concept is that the United States would include a holding of less than one acre as a farm if sales were at least \$250, whereas Canada did not include as farms any holdings of less than one acre. On the other hand, Canada would include holdings of one to 10 acres if agricultural sales amounted to \$50, rather than \$250 as in the United States.

One other related concept which might be mentioned briefly in the field of Agriculture relates to the "commercial farm" definition, for which important agricultural data are provided in both countries. The definition of a "commercial farm" for the 1961 Census of Canada is simply a farm with sales of agricultural products for the year of \$1,200 or more. A more involved concept was used in the 1959 Census of Agriculture in the United States, as follows:

- (a) Farms with sales of agricultural products for the year of \$2,500 or more;
- (b) Farms with sales of agricultural products for the year of \$50 to \$2,499 provided the farm operator was under 65 years of age, and (1) he did not work off the farm 100 or more days, (2) the income that he and members of his household received from non-farm sources was less than the total value of farm products sold.

The farm definition proper should not contain too great an element of non-comparability, since in Canada only 5 per cent of farms in 1956 were 10 acres or less in size at the point where the sales criteria differ. However, the difference in the "commercial farm" concept between the two countries could be of greater significance, although the extent of this would be difficult to estimate at this time.

The problems of reconciliation

Since it is not possible, of course, to compare in this paper the full range of census concepts, I have attached a summary statement which attempts to outline in a very brief way the main differences in some of the more significant definitional areas. There is some danger to this, of course, in that such a summarization may tend to over-simplify and minimize these differences. In certain cases too, they give the illusory appearance that it would be extremely easy to bring the concept of one country or the other into line in order to obtain complete comparability.

One has only to observe the first item on the list, however, to see that this is not so. The first item has to do with the concepts which

underlie the counting of population at their usual place of residence. Both the United States and Canada basically take a "de jure" census and their residence rules appear to show a difference only in respect to the counting of university students. Since one country counts such persons basically where they are attending university, and the other where their "home" addresses are, it would seem a simple matter for one or the other country to change its rule in this regard. On looking closer, one wonders how many university students might be missed in the United States Census if on April 1 they tried to enumerate these at their usual homes or how much fun the Canadian Census would have in enumerating them at their University on a June 1 census date.

One might say that the solution is first to make the census dates coincide and then decide on a uniform rule. We in Canada are envious of the April 1 date used in the United States being farther removed from the vacation season than June 1, but our enumerators in the more rural types of areas report enough difficulties as it is from late spring weather problems which can be encountered in our country even in early June.

Each question has its own set of problems, and one can readily see the difficulties which the Statistical Commission of the United Nations is up against when it tries to encourage uniformity in census concepts among many vastly dissimilar countries, instead of only two whose general characteristics, geography, and so on, are in many ways so much alike. I feel sure that in the case of the United States and Canada a number of the present differences in our census concepts will disappear over the years. As census experience builds up in regard to given sets of criteria, the better ones gradually become apparent and replace the less useful ones.

We hope in Canada that we will be sufficiently intelligent to take advantage of the great pioneering work that has been done in these fields by our neighbour to the south. In fact, I am sure that you can tell from the many similarities in our fundamental approaches to most census concepts that it has been achieved through the meetings of the joint committees where a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation has existed between the two census organizations for the past 10 years. We feel there is every assurance that this will continue in the future.

Summary statement of some of the more significant differences in
census concepts employed in the United States and Canada

Concept	Canada	United States	Remarks
POPULATION			
1. The "de jure" population	Basically similar to U.S. residence rules, except that university students are counted at their "home" address.	University students are counted as residents of the communities in which they are residing while attending college.	Differences likely grew out of use of April 1 census date in U.S. as compared to June 1 in Canada.
2. Rural and urban	Urban defined as all centres of 1,000 and over, plus the "urbanized" fringes of cities of 10,000 and over.	Urban defined as all centres of 2,500 and over, plus "urbanized" fringes, as well as certain localities included by special rules.	Main difference is in the use of the 1,000 or 2,500 minimum. The 1,000-2,500 range amounted to 8 p.c. of the total urban in the 1956 Census of Canada.
3. Metropolitan Areas	Consist mainly of complete minor civil divisions below the county level based on urban densities, proportions of farm population, etc.	Consist mainly of complete counties on the basis of a standard set of criteria to ensure uniformity among cities.	Criteria not as refined in Canada as in the U.S., and present boundaries closer to "urbanized area" concept.
4. Farm population	All persons living on a farm as defined by Census of Agriculture, (i.e., one acre in size and \$50 sales, minimum).	Same except that "farm" defined as follows: Under 10 acres: Sales of \$250 or more 10 acres or over: Sales of \$50 or more.	In the 1956 Census of Canada, 5 p.c. of Canadian farms were of 10 acres or less.
5. Dwelling (or housing) Unit (See also Items 16-26 re Housing Concepts)	To be classed as a dwelling, living quarters must be structurally separate and must have a private entrance either from outside or from a common hall, lobby, or stairway inside the building. Such entrance must be one that can be used without passing through anyone else's living quarters.	A room or group of rooms occupied as separate living quarters, i.e., when occupants do not live and eat with other persons in the structure, and when there is either (1) direct access from the outside or through a common hall, or (2) a kitchen or cooking equipment for the exclusive use of the occupants.	Greater emphasis on structural separateness in the Canadian definition, which in practice leads to some lack of uniformity in the treatment of marginal cases. U.S. housing unit definition is based more on living arrangements rather than structural separateness.
6. Family Unit	Consists of a husband and wife (with or without children who have never married) or one parent with one or more children never married, living together in same household.	Consists of two or more persons living in the same household who are related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption; all persons living in one household who are related to each other are regarded as one family.	Both definitions employ several sub-group classifications. Average size of Canadian family using U.S. definition was 4.0 in the 1956 Census, compared to 3.8 using Canadian definition of "immediate family".
7. Age distribution	Age in completed years at last birthday prior to the census date.	Same except that question asked in terms of "month and year of birth".	Different method of asking question should not affect materially the comparability of age statistics between the two countries.

Concept	Canada	United States	Remarks
8. Marital Status	Four categories (viz., single, married, widowed, and divorced). The "married" category includes persons separated for any reason unless a divorce has been obtained.	Five categories asked for (viz., single, married, married but separated, widowed, and divorced).	Previous attempt in 1941 Census of Canada to obtain a count of "separated" not successful. Alternative use made of family data on "married" (both present)", and "married (spouse absent)".
9. Ethnic or racial groups	Origin question asked as: "To what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestor (on the male side) belong on coming to this continent? Instructions to enumerators provided certain rules for determination, principal among which was the language spoken at time of arrival.	U.S. question on "Colour or race" somewhat comparable for non-white groups. Some ethnic data for other groups on first-generation basis obtained from questions on country of birth of parents.	Questions appear to be designed for different purposes to meet specific internal needs for information of the type collected by each country.
10. Mother Tongue	Defined as "the language first learned in childhood and still understood".	Question restricted to foreign-born population, and defined as "the language spoken in the person's home before coming to the United States".	Uses of this question in each country related to previous item on ethnic or racial groups, and account for different approach.
11. Education	Two questions asked: (1) Highest grade or year of schooling ever attended? (2) Attended school or university since last September?	Basically similar concepts, except that two additional questions asked: (1) Completed the highest grade attended? (2) If attending school, whether a public or private school?	Enrolments by type of school obtained in Canada by Education Division, D.B.S. Also Canada did not attempt the more difficult question on grade completions, particularly in view of census date.
12. Employment Status	Concepts basically similar to those of U.S. regarding persons with a job, unemployed, etc. Labour force questions asked of persons 15 years of age and over to tie in with standard age groupings, rather than 14 and over as in the U.S. Change-over in Canada also influenced by relatively small numbers in labour force at this age level.	U.S. questions provided for separate category of persons "With a job but not at work". Also, year last worked will be available for persons not in current labour force who worked at any previous period. Job descriptions obtained for all persons who worked within past 10 years, as compared to past 12 months for Canada.	Comparability of basic data on the economically active population likely affected more by difference in census reference date (viz., April in U.S., and June in Canada) than by any conceptual differences.
13. Hours worked per week	Based on the <u>usual</u> number of hours worked each week.	Based on the <u>actual</u> number of hours worked in the given census week.	Canada used "usual hours" in the expectation that it will be more representative when related to weeks worked during the year.
14. Weeks worked per year	Refers to weeks worked for wages or salary only, for all persons who were economically active anytime in the 12 months preceding the census date.	Refers to weeks worked in the preceding calendar year for all persons who did any work in that period.	Weeks worked is used in Canada mainly to relate to hours of work and incomes from wages and salary.

Concept	Canada	United States	Remarks
15. Income from all sources	Wages and salaries obtained from population universe. Earnings of persons in non-farm households from self-employment and other forms of income obtained from 20 p.c. sample basis. All questions based on 12 months preceding the June 1 census date.	Income inquiries on 25 p.c. sample basis, referring to calendar year 1959. Income from sources other than earnings obtained through one question, as compared to seven separate questions on Canadian questionnaire.	Calendar-year figures in Canada would relate to a period commencing some 18 months prior to the census enumeration. Provision made for 1960 calendar-year figure if person could not estimate income for immediately preceding 12-month period.
<u>HOUSING</u>			
16. Collective dwelling or group quarters	Institutions, camps, hotels, and lodging houses of 10 or more persons.	Living arrangements for institutional inmates and for groups of 5 or more persons unrelated to the head of the household.	Main difference is that the U.S. classifies all dwellings with 5 or more unrelated persons as "group quarters".
17. Vacant dwelling	A vacant dwelling is one suitable for occupancy but unoccupied at Census date (unless occupants only temporarily absent).	A housing unit is <u>vacant</u> if no persons are living in it at the time and occupants are not just temporarily absent.	No difference in the basic concept but U.S. categorizes types of vacancy as "vacant, under construction", "being converted", "used for non-residential purposes", "unfit for human habitation", "abandoned", etc. Canada distinguishes only as to whether vacant dwellings were occupied before, and their type.
18. Dwellings under construction	A dwelling is considered <u>under construction</u> from the time the foundation is begun until ready for occupancy.	Included only as part of "vacant" count if all exterior windows and doors are installed and usable floors are in place, but not occupied; otherwise not enumerated.	See Item 17, above.
19. Structure	Not defined.	A structure is a separate building that either has open space on all four sides or is separated from other structures by dividing walls that extend from ground to roof.	By emphasizing the "structural separateness" of dwellings, it was hoped, in Canada, to avoid the need for defining "structure" in 1961. (See concept below for "type of dwelling")
20. Type of dwelling	<p><u>single detached</u> - one dwelling unit completely separated on all sides from any other dwelling or structure.</p> <p><u>single attached</u> (double house) - two dwellings separated by a common wall extending from ground to roof.</p> <p><u>Single attached</u> (other) - all other dwellings separated by a common wall from ground to roof.</p>	<u>House, apt., flat</u> - every dwelling other than trailers.	The chief difference here lies in the fact that while Canada attempts to distinguish single-unit, double-unit and multi-unit structures by type of dwelling, this is done in the U.S. by means of the "structure" concept mentioned above. Thus the U.S. may have detached and attached structures of one unit only or of more than one unit, which more or less ties in with the Canadian concept of "type of dwelling".

Concept	Canada	United States	Remarks
20. Type of dwelling - Concluded	<p><u>apt., flat, etc. (duplex)</u> - 2 dwelling units one above the other and adjoining no other structure.</p> <p><u>apt., flat, etc. (Other)</u></p> <p><u>Mobile</u> - any dwelling designed for movement and actually moveable, such as trailer, boat, quarters in a railway car, or house permanently on skids.</p>	<p><u>Trailer</u> - each occupied house trailer whether mobile or on permanent foundation.</p>	<p>Since trailer-living is not so widespread in Canada as the U.S. it was felt that the broader category of "mobile" would be more suitable for the purposes of this Census. Trailers on permanent foundations were classed as ordinary single-detached dwellings.</p>
21. Condition of dwelling	<p>Three categories, as follows:</p> <p>In good condition.</p> <p>In need of minor repair.</p> <p>In need of major repair.</p>	<p>Two categories, as follows:</p> <p>Not dilapidated: (a) Sound (b) Deteriorating</p> <p>Dilapidated.</p>	<p>Although the terminology to describe condition varies between the two countries, and the U.S. goes into greater detail in defining each category, the concepts are basically similar.</p>
22. Rooms	Both countries advise enumerators to accept the respondent's count of rooms.		<p>The U.S. includes "rooms used for offices by a person living in the housing unit", while Canada excludes "rooms used solely for business purposes". The U.S. gives instructions re partially divided rooms, also, while Canada does not.</p>
23. Source of water supply	<p>Two categories, as follows:</p> <p>(a) Private source on property.</p> <p>(b) Other (municipal mains, etc.).</p>	<p>Three categories, as follows:</p> <p>(a) Public system or private company.</p> <p>(b) Individual well.</p> <p>(c) Other.</p>	<p>Main difference here is in the concept of "private source". In Canada this means a well, spring, or other source located on the property. In the U.S. the "individual well" may be on a neighbouring property serving 5 or fewer houses, while water from springs, creeks, etc. are placed in "other".</p>
24. Fuel	Canada asked specifically for heating fuel only.	The U.S. distinguishes fuels used for heating the housing unit, for cooking and for heating water.	The additional information provided by U.S. should be of considerable value to users.
25. Monthly rent	Rent for month of May, 1961.	Monthly rent for unit.	U.S. includes rent for vacant dwellings. Canada does not.

Concept	Canada	United States	Remarks
26. Value of dwelling or housing unit	Amount expected if sold to a willing buyer.	Amount expected if sold on today's market.	About same concept in both countries with slightly different value intervals. U.S. includes value of vacant dwellings. Canada does not.

AGRICULTURE

27. Farm	Holdings of one acre or more with agricultural sales of \$50 or more for the year.	(a) Places of less than 10 acres with agricultural sales of \$250 or more; (b) Places of 10 acres or more with agricultural sales of \$50 or more.	In Canada, holdings of less than one acre, and others not satisfying farm criterion, are enumerated on special questionnaire to obtain data on any agricultural operations, (e.g., numbers of livestock). In United States, criteria applied during office processing and farms selected according to definition.
28. Commercial farm	Farms with sales of agricultural products for the year of \$1,200 or more.	(a) Farms with sales of agricultural products for the year of \$2,500 or more; (b) Farms with sales of agricultural products of \$50 to \$2,499 provided the farm operator was under 65 years of age, and (i) he did not work off the farm 100 or more days, (ii) the household income from non-farm sources was less than the total value of farm products sold.	While the "farm" definition does not contain too great an element of non-comparability, (since only 5 p.c. of farms in Canada were 10 acres or less in 1956), the difference in the "commercial farm" concept between the two countries could be of greater significance.

<u>Percentage of households by number of persons(1)</u>			<u>Comparisons of family size, Census of Canada, 1956</u>		
<u>Persons</u>	<u>1950 Census of United States</u>	<u>1951 Census of Canada</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>"Immediate" family concept(1)</u>	<u>"Economic" family concept(2)</u>
1	9.3	7.5	1. Number of families	3,711,500	3,642,500
2	28.1	21.0	2. Persons in families	14,077,200	14,594,500
3	22.8	20.3	3. Persons in families as percentage of population	88.2	91.4
4	18.4	19.0	4. Average number of persons per family	3.8	4.0
5	10.4	12.9			
6 +	11.0	19.3			
Average	3.5	4.0(2)			
(1) A household is defined as all persons occupying a dwelling unit.			(1) Corresponding to Canadian definition of a family.		
(2) Average persons per household in 1956 Census of Canada was 3.9.			(2) Corresponding to United States definition of a family.		