SOME PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THE PLANNING AND TAKING OF THE 1961 CENSUS OF CANADA

O.A. Lemieux, Dominion Bureau of Statistics

The organization which it is necessary to put in motion for the planning and taking of a census is always a large one. A large number of operations must be undertaken which may appear unimportant to persons who have had no experience in this kind of work, but which are very important if we are to be ready to start enumeration on the day set by law for it. In the preparation of the 1961 Canadian Census the situation was complicated by a series of circumstances which were unprecedented in our experience and which had to be met as we went along.

The date set by law for the taking of the Canadian Decennial Census is June 1 of the year ending in "one". In this case the date was June 1, 1961.

Shortly after the compilations of the 1956 Quinquennial Census were under way, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics began to study the possibility of acquiring an Electronic Computer to compile the 1961 Census. The 1951 and 1956 Censuses had been done with the use of mark-sensing equipment; i.e., the enumerators made their marks on a card which was put through the conventional mark-sense punching machine. This system had proven very satisfactory and time saving in both censuses. In conjunction with an Electronic Computer, it was important to devise a reader which would be able to use the documents mark-sensed by enumerators and transfer the information directly on to a magnetic tape which then could be fed into the computer. The return to the slow and bothersome process of punching cards would have seemed to be a retrograde step.

We talked to the representatives of firms which manufacture various types of computers always with the idea that a reader was necessary which would transfer the information directly from the document to the tape so as to do our job as efficiently as possible. Finally, the International Business Machines Company undertook to develop such a reader. Thus, a reader was eventually developed and put in operation sometime in 1960. In 1958 it was decided that we would acquire an I.B.M. 705 to which a 1401 was added sometime later. These were installed ready for use during the second half of 1960.

Programming. - The next very important problem was the acquisition of programmers to start writing the various programmes for the runs required for the census. At that time, programmers were not very plentiful in Canada and it became quite a task to acquire the necessary staff to programme the various runs and test the programmes in time to be ready when the returns of the census began arriving from the field. It was necessary to employ a large number of young persons who had had no previous experience and to train them. Some of them, after they had obtained some knowledge and experience, left us for more lucrative positions in business and industry, and the turn-over in programmers was quite high.

Another very important fact was that not one of the subject-matter people in the Census Division, from the Director down to the most junior statistician, knew anything about a computer. The majority of them had never even seen one. None of us knew what a computer could do, what it could not do, how it functioned, etc., etc. We had heard stories of the marvelous things it could do and, I fear, some of these were a trifle exaggerated. It was, therefore, necessary to give our subject-matter specialists some knowledge of the computer so that they would have an idea of what the machine could do. This training had to be done at a time when our statisticians should have been exceedingly busy doing something else.

Questionnaires. - Now that we had a reader, it was necessary to plan a questionnaire that would fit it. Of course, the size of questionnaire to be used had been decided before building the reader, but the arrangement of questions on this questionnaire had to be settled. This had to be arranged in such a way that a very ordinary enumerator would be able to mark it successfully under field enumeration conditions.

Such a questionnaire was devised and then had to be tested under field conditions.

Determination of questions. - After the physical shape of the questionnaire had been settled, it became necessary to determine what questions would be asked. There, we had been told of the huge capacity of the machine and people started to overwork their brains to find out new questions that should be asked in the census. As you know, some census questions are essential and must be asked at every census. These are questions like sex, age, marital status, relationship to head of household, occupation, etc. Then the Dominion Bureau of Statistics works in co-operation with the Statistical and Population Commissions of the United Nations, with the Food and Agriculture Organization, with UNESCO and the Inter-American Statistical Institute. A number of questions have to be asked to meet the requirements of these organizations for purposes of inter-continental and world-wide comparability.

Then there is the question of making an effort to meet the requirements of our users in business, trade, social work, etc., etc., both in Canada and the United States, because, as you may know, a large proportion of our clients are from the United States. A large sample of our users was queried by mail as to what questions would be most useful in the census. We, of course, reserved the right to refuse to accept questions after it was felt that the questionnaire had reached a size beyond which we could not go.

A very large number of questions were suggested by users of questions which had a great deal of merit. There are three things to remember, however, and these may be summarized as follows:

1. It is of the utmost importance to determine what is the maximum number of questions that can be asked without jeopardizing the reliability of the statistics obtained. Past experience has proven that there is a definite limit to the number of questions that we can expect the enumerators to ask and the people to answer. We were of the opinion that the questionnaire for the 1961 Census should not be more complicated nor much longer than the one used for the 1951 Census. It should be noted that the prolongation of the interview time may bring it to a point where fatigue and annoyance on the part of the respondent affect the quality of the answers.

   Another serious consideration, and one not so generally recognized, is the deterioration in the quality of all census results arising when an unduly heavy load is imposed upon an army of quickly recruited and often inadequately trained enumerators. Each question added to the schedule contributes its share to the volume of instructions which need to be assimilated in advance of enumeration and the cumulative effect of a large number of additional questions may be to spread the training time over so many subjects that the enumerator is not properly equipped to get reliable information on any one of them.

2. The questions asked must be such that they will produce statistics which are of general interest. We cannot afford to ask a question on the census just to serve the purposes of one individual or one organization.

3. There is no point in asking questions that, we know in advance, a large proportion of respondents (largely housewives) cannot answer.

Test Census. - On June 1, 1959, a Test Census was held in two areas; one English-speaking area in Ontario and a French-speaking one in Quebec. In Canada, both English and French are official and questionnaires must be provided in both languages. The purpose of the test was to try out the new type of document to see whether or not enumerators could make marks, under enumeration conditions, that would be recognized by the reader; to test the questions to find out whether or not they were readily understood by respondents; to discover whether all questions asked were apt to produce usable statistics; to test the proposed tabulation on the computer; and, finally, to assist in determining rates of pay to enumerators.

The test questionnaire contained 22 questions to be answered on a 100-per cent basis. These questions covered personal characteristics, occupations, employment and salaries and wages. In addition, there were 15 questions asked of a 20-per cent sample of the population. Five of those referred to family size, one to migration and nine to income from all sources.

Analysis of the Test Census. - The results of the test showed that the reader could very well read the markings of an ordinary enumerator. It also showed that a few questions which had been urged upon us would not produce usable statistics and that others would have to be rephrased in order to be understood by both the enumerators and the respondents.

Publicity around the Test Census. - The questionnaires used in the Test Census were given to the press and this started a campaign, which at one time was violent enough, against a number of proposed questions from the census. The questions which were objected to were those on family size, on income and on ethnic origin.

Family size - One newspaper started the news that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics proposed to ask of every woman the number of illegitimate children she had borne. This started a string of letters of protest and the subject was even mentioned on the floor of the House of Commons. Of course, this was not true, the Bureau had never proposed such a question.

Income - In this case the newspaper protests were that the Government was getting too nosey, that this information was private and none of the business of the Government and that the information had already been supplied under oath to the Income Tax Department. Then there were protestations about the fact that people would have to give this information to an enumerator living next door or just a small distance down the street.

Ethnic origin - This question in the Canadian Census has been a source of worry to a large proportion of the population for some time. In order to appreciate the problem it is necessary to go into some preliminary details. Now, what do we mean by the ethnic origin of the Canadian population? How is it determined? The concept is at least indefinite if not to say nebulous. However, whatever the statistical value of the question may be, a large proportion of the population feels that it has considerable administrative use in our country which is officially bi-cultural.

Because of adverse publicity in previous censuses, certain groups, namely, the Canadians of French, Jewish and Ukrainian origins were concerned lest this question be dropped from the 1961 Census. Representatives of some of these groups waited upon the Government and were assured that the question on ethnic origin would be asked in the 1961 Census in the same way as it had been asked in 1951.

On the basis of this assurance the question was included in the Test Census with exactly the same instructions as had been given in 1951.

Preparation of the final population questionnaires. - The criticisms levelled at the size of family and income questions, in particular, caused us to prepare two questionnaires, one for the questions which were asked on a 100-per cent basis and the other for the questions asked on a sample basis. These questions were on migration, size of family and income. This questionnaire was made in the form of an envelope. It was left by the enumerator to the respondent for him to fill, seal and return to the enumerator at a later date, and this envelope would be opened only in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics thus ensuring confidentiality in so far as the enumerator was concerned.

The questionnaires were finalized but in doing so it was decided, on the question of ethnic origin to add the words "Canadian" and "American" as acceptable ethnic origins. It is obvious that from the very beginning this question referred to non-North American origins and whatever the value of the question may be this addition tended to destroy the purpose of the question.

Printing. - The printing of the questionnaire presented another problem. The printing demanded a very high degree of precision so that the various positions could be read by the reader. It was a slow process. Documents had to be checked at very close intervals to ensure that they did not exceed the permissible tolerance which is of the order of one one-hundredth of an inch between dots. The printing took several months and all necessary materials were packed in 32,000 boxes ready to be shipped to individual enumerators across the country.

Protests of various organizations. - When the questionnaires became available, it was seen that a change had been made in the questionnaire by the addition of "Canadian" and "American" as acceptable ethnic origins, and, as has already been said, this failed to recognize the purpose of the question and threatened to render it useless. A certain number of organizations and a sizeable portion of the press began a series of protests, claiming that the intent of the question had been changed in spite of the statement of the Government, and that the question was no longer asked as it had been asked in the 1951 Census. Another section of the press and other organizations and individuals favoured the addition of these two terms and a long and protracted polemic followed. The Members of Parliament were assailed from all sides.

Finally, it was decided to revert to the original question and remove these two terms. This meant the reprinting of some 11,000,000 questionnaires and a change in the instructions to enumerators. The decision for reprinting was not taken till sometime in March, - 32,000 boxes had to be unpacked and repacked with the new documents. There was great pressure for time and this created confusion and errors which did not come to light until the enumerators were in the field.

This paper is not for the purpose of discussing the pros and cons of a question on ethnic origin in the census but since this turned out to be one of our leading problems in the 1961 Census it seems advisable, in order to understand the question, to say a few words about it.

What is ethnic origin and how did it get included in the Canadian Census in the first place? At best it is a vague concept which is exceedingly difficult to define in terms that will be understood by ordinary enumerators and by respondents who have been in Canada for many generations.

The Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Macmillan, 1931, has six pages of definitions and explanations and after reading them carefully one remains with the idea that while ethnic groups exist they are exceedingly difficult to define in terms that an ordinary person will understand.

In essence, the Encyclopaedia defines ethnic communities or groups as groups bound together by common ties of race, nationality or culture, living together within an alien civilization and remaining culturally distinct. They may occupy a position of self-sufficient isolation or they may have extensive dealings with the surrounding population while retaining a separate identity. In its strict meaning the word "ethnic" denotes race; but when applied to communities in the above sense it is loosely used, in the absence of any other comprehensive term, to cover the more general concept of culture.

Then it goes on to explain how these communities and groups have developed and it gives examples such as the Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Jews, etc.; of the Canadians of French origin it says: "In Canada the presence of an established French population which antedated the English induced a tendency of tolerance toward other groups, their cultural autonomy being in a measure acknowledged through permission to retain their language for some official and educational purposes."

Then the Encyclopaedia goes on to explain that "the chief basis for cohesiveness is race. Physical differences which cannot be changed or concealed set one group apart from another and mark any man who seeks to leave his community (or group) and become part of the surrounding culture."

"Where no marked racial differences exist, cultural difference forms the basic cohesive bond and appearance merely supports cultural barriers."

"Supplementary to race and nationality the strongest reinforcing factors are language and religion, both of which are apt to be essential parts of the national culture complex. The retention of the national tongue is often the principal aim of those who seek to prevent an ethnic group from losing its identity while the loss of that language is taken as a measure of amalgamation."

Origin of the question in the Canadian Census. - As far as I was able to ascertain, this question appeared for the first time in a census of Nova Scotia taken in 1767. In this census the population was divided into English, Irish, Scotch, Americans, Germans and Acadians. More than half of the population was reported as "American", a term which has not been acceptable as an ethnic origin between 1871 and 1951.

In 1842, in Upper Canada, and in 1844, in Lower Canada, the birthplace table separates the Canadian-born into "French Canadians" and "English Canadians". In 1848, and in 1851 and 1861, again the Canadian-born were divided into "French origin" and "not French origin" in both Upper and Lower Canada. It is of interest to note that at that time the population was composed as follows: of the Canadian-born, 35 per cent were of French origin and 65 per cent of British and other origins; 23 per cent of the population was foreign-born and of this number only 16 per cent were born outside of British possessions.

Naturally enough the ethnic origin question in the census started by being for the purpose of counting the Canadian of French origin separately from the others.

In 1871, there was a change and two tables were produced, one on the birthplace of the population and the other on origin. In the introduction to the published volume, the then director of the census wrote as follows: "The subject matter of Table III (ethnic origin) is a new feature of our census statistics. None of the former censuses of the various provinces had it, except in so far as the French origin was concerned, in the former Province of Canada. What is given in previous returns under the head of "origin" was simply the enumeration of the people by their place of birth. But a moment's reflection shows at once that these two subjects are as different as they are important."

Now, how different were they? By racial origin, in the 1871 Census the British origins were 60.5 per cent of the total population, the French 31.0 per cent and the others were 8.4 per cent. By birthplace the percentages are British 62.1, French 31.0 and others 6.9 per cent. So, as it turns out, the difference in this census was not great.

The instructions given to the enumerators on this question were as follows: "Origin is to be scrupulously entered as given by the person questioned in the manner shown in the specimen schedule by the words English, Irish, Scotch, African, Indian, German, etc."

The enumerators and respondents must have understood what it meant since the question was answered and only 0.2 per cent reported "not stated". It could be that we could get better answers nowadays if we wrote less instructions.

Of course in 1871, as the previously quoted figures indicate, the problem was rather simple.

The question was repeated at every census since 1871, with the exception of 1891 when only Canadians of French origin were counted.

Since 1871, the instructions to enumerators have been amplified but I am not too sure that we have improved them very greatly.

The 1961 instructions to enumerators read as follows: "It is important to distinguish carefully between "citizenship" or "nationality" on the one hand and "ethnic" or "cultural" group on the other. "Ethnic" or "cultural" group refers to the group from which the person is descended; citizenship (nationality) refers to the country to which the person owes allegiance. Canadian citizens belong to many ethnic or cultural groups - English, French, Irish, Jewish, Scottish, Ukrainian, etc.

For census purposes a person's ethnic or cultural group is traced through his father. For example, if a person's father is German and his mother Norwegian, the entry will be "German".

If the respondent does not understand the question as worded on the questionnaire you will ask the language spoken by him on arrival if he is an immigrant, or by his ancestor on the male side on first coming to this continent. For example, if the person replies that his ancestor on the male side spoke French when he came to this continent, you will record "French". However, if the respondent should reply "English" or "Gaelic" to this question, you must make further inquiries to determine whether the person is English, Irish, Scottish, or Welsh." (Parenthesis: This seems to establish language as the only determinant of one's ethnic origin.)

Then the instructions continue: "If the respondent does not understand the question as worded on the questionnaire or you cannot establish the ethnic or cultural group through the language of the ancestors", you will ask: "Is your ethnic or cultural group on the male side English, French, Jewish, Negro, North American Indian, Norwegian, Scottish, Ukrainian, etc.?"

Then starting in 1951 an innovation was made as follows: "Since the question refers to the time when the person or his ancestors came to this continent, the answer should refer to the

ethnic groups or cultures of the Old World. However, if, in spite of this explanation, the person insists that his ethnic or cultural group is "Canadian" or "U.S.A.", enter his reply in the write-in space."

This, in 1951, was the thin edge of the wedge which led to our problems in 1961.

As you see, many words were added to instructions to enumerators but I doubt very much if the concept was made any clearer.

Through the years, particularly after the first World War, a body of opinion has been formed opposing the question on the grounds that it was no longer meaningful because of intermarriage between groups and because of the fact that some people claim that after several generations in Canada they did not know to what cultural group their ancestors belonged on first coming to Canada and besides, they did not care, and wished to call themselves plain "Canadians".

Reasons for asking this question in Canada. - There are many reasons for asking this question in the Canadian Census. These may be summarized somewhat as follows:

1. As we have already mentioned, the original purpose of the question was to count Canadians of French origin separately from the others. Under the Canadian Constitution they have special rights. In order to preserve and exercise these rights, they should be able to count themselves periodically, assess their own position in order to determine where they stand. For example, if in a certain area a fairly substantial percentage of Canadians of French origin no longer speak French, the knowledge of this fact allows the French community to try to do something about it.

2. Among all groups, this is a measure of the degree of assimilation into one or the other of the two official cultures of Canada. Since the beginning of the century, Canada has received a very large number of immigrants from a very large number of countries. Some of these groups integrate themselves more readily than others with the Canadian community.

3. In the future, when Canada has fully developed, sociologists and anthropologists will have a better measure of what went into the building up of the Canadian nation than any other country which was formed before statistics were available.

4. For groups other than the French and the Anglo-Saxon, it allows them to assess their contribution to the building up of the Canadian nation. Canada, unlike her neighbour to the south, has not adopted the concept of the "melting pot". On the contrary, immigrants from foreign lands have been encouraged to cherish the traditions which they brought from their homeland and to use them to add to the Canadian culture.

This has been an unduly long parenthesis but I thought it advisable to give these details because it is with this question of ethnic origin that our most serious problems in the 1961 Census have arisen.

Field organization for the 1961 Census. - In 1951 and 1956, the field organization of the census was, in many ways, similar to that of the United States. We had one Commissioner (called Supervisor in the United States) for each Electoral District. Under his direction were a number of Field Supervisors (called Crew Leaders in the United States). The number of Field Supervisors in each Electoral District varied with the area and population of the District. Thus in 1951, we had 263 Commissioners and somewhat in excess of 1,000 Field Supervisors.

In order to remove one level of supervision in 1961, the Electoral Districts were divided into Census Districts; the number of Census Districts in an Electoral District again varying with the area and the population. Each Census District was headed by a Commissioner who had under his supervision from 25 to 30 enumerators in urban districts and some 15 to 20 in rural areas. Each Commissioner was responsible for the census in his Census District independently of other Commissioners in the Electoral District. Each one dealt directly with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics or with the Regional Office of the area where he was located. This made it possible for him to receive his instructions directly from headquarters and permitted to have a much more intimate contact with his enumerators. We ended with 1,350 Commissioners for the 265 Electoral Districts.

In addition, a group of employees (50 in number) were added to strengthen the Regional Office staff so that they would be in a position to give more attention to individual Commissioners than had been possible in previous censuses.

Enumeration areas. - In past censuses, enumeration areas had been delineated to contain from 1,500 to 2,000 population in urban areas and 800 to 1,200 in rural areas. In the hope of speeding up enumeration and because it was felt that Commissioners would have more time to devote to individual enumerators, it was decided to make enumeration areas that would average somewhere around 120 households. It was hoped that such an enumeration area would be covered in two weeks in urban areas and three weeks in rural ones. It has to be kept in mind that a Census of Agriculture was taken in conjunction with the Censuses of Population and Housing. Our census is taken as of June 1, and it is important that enumeration be completed before it gets complicated by the holiday season when families go away to summer cottages, extended vacations in the United States, or Europe, etc.

Appointment of Commissioners. - As in the United States, Commissioners are not appointed by the Civil Service Commission but are recommended to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, under whose jurisdiction the Dominion Bureau of Statistics comes, by the Members of Parliament. When these nominations are made, the candidates are interviewed by members of the staff of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and accepted if satisfactory.

As early as June 30, 1960, the Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote a letter to each Member of Parliament asking for recommendations. These recommendations were to be in the hands of the Minister by October 1, 1960. The intention was that between the 1st of October and the end of February, the representatives of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics would have time to interview and select the best candidates so that all appointments would be made by March 1st. This would give adequate time to explain their assignments to them and give them the necessary time to do the preliminary work before enumeration began on June 1.

Unfortunately, for many reasons, the most important of which have already been mentioned, some of the acceptable nominations did not come to hand until sometime in May. This created problems which caused confusion all through enumeration.

Because of the planning and in spite of these delays, over 52 per cent of the enumeration areas had been returned to the Regional Offices by the end of June as compared to 12.2 per cent in 1951. In all our enthusiasm, we had not anticipated such rapid returns and consequently we had not asked the Civil Service Commission to supply us with processing staff in the Regional Offices soon enough. As a result, our Regional Offices were literally swamped with returns long before they could have trained staff to handle them. This created a considerable amount of confusion in our Regional Offices and delayed the returns to Ottawa to be processed.

In spite of all this, the first preliminary reports of population were published on July 28, 1961, giving the preliminary population figures for about 1,000 municipalities. This was some weeks in advance of 1951. The last preliminary report giving the population of municipalities was published on October 6, again earlier than in 1951.

Postal check. - Prior to their 1960 Census, the U.S. Bureau of the Census had experimented with a postal check to assure the completeness of the census in areas covered by house-to-house mail delivery. They did not follow through with it. Like good neighbours we took over the idea and carried out the experiment for them.

Each enumerator after having enumerated a household made a card with the address of the household. These cards were turned over to the postal authorities, they sorted them and then gave us a list of the addresses that they had on their records and for which no card had been given to them. These addresses were checked and when they had been missed they were enumerated and added to the records. The result was that a population of over 38,000 was added to the census at a cost of about $30,000. It also gives the census authorities the satisfaction of knowing that all addresses in urban areas are accounted for and this provides an excellent argument when city authorities begin to argue that we have missed a large number of people in their municipality.

Processing in Regional Offices. - As in 1951, acceptability checks, coding, payment of enumerators, was carried on in our eight Regional Offices scattered across the country. This work was done in record time, the whole process being completed by the end of October.

When the returns were sent to Ottawa they were, in theory at least, ready to be forwarded to the reader for transfer to tape.

When we were preparing the census, we were not certain that all enumerators' markings would be of good enough quality to be picked up by the reader. Consequently, we had provided for a fair percentage of rejects caused by the failure of the machine to pick up the marks made by the enumerators. The results were way beyond our expectations. The machine read the marks and instead of the anticipated percentage reject, the actual was much lower.

Preliminary counts of population. - As already stated, a preliminary bulletin published on October 5 completed the publication of the preliminary population counts of all organized municipalities in Canada.

From these figures it is possible to get a glimpse of how the population has grown and distributed itself during the last five and ten years.

First, if we look at our two cities of more than 500,000 population, namely, Montreal and Toronto, during the period 1956-1961, the population of the city of Montreal proper increased by 4.1 per cent. During the preceding five years the increase had been 8.6 per cent and for the ten-year period the increase was 13.0 per cent.

In the city of Toronto proper, on the other hand, the population decreased 1.6 per cent between 1956 and 1961, 1.2 per cent during 1951-1956 and a decrease of 2.7 per cent during the decade 1951-1961.

Now, if we look at the Metropolitan Area of Montreal, apart from the city proper, we find that the population increased 42.2 per cent during 1956-61, 41 per cent during 1951-56 and 100.5 per cent during the decade.

The Metropolitan Area of Toronto increased 36.7 per cent during 1956-61, 57.3 per cent during 1951-56 and 115.1 per cent during the decade.

Between 1951 and 1961, these two cities and their Metropolitan Areas have accounted for 28.2 per cent of the anticipated increase in the Canadian population.

Now, if we take a look at the cities of a population between 100,000 and 499,999 which are not situated within the Metropolitan Areas of the two preceding cities we have a picture which is not dissimilar to the preceding one.

The cities themselves, there are ten of them, increased 14.8 per cent between 1951-56, 10.4 per cent between 1956-61 and 26.8 per cent between 1951 and 1961. The rate of increase has slowed down considerably between 1956 and 1961.

Now, when we take them with their Metropolitan Areas, the situation is pretty much the same as in the case of Montreal and Toronto.

Between 1951 and 1956, the Metropolitan Areas (other than Montreal and Toronto) increased 20.9 per cent, between 1956 and 1961, 18 per cent and between 1951 and 1961, 42.6 per cent. Between 1951 and 1961, these ten Metropolitan Areas accounted for 30 per cent of the total population increase of Canada. If to this we add the 28.2 per cent accounted for by Montreal and Toronto, the 12 municipalities and their Metropolitan Areas accounted for 53.2 per cent of the population increase of Canada.

Now, a look at the cities of 30,000 to 99,999 which are not located within the above-mentioned Metropolitan Areas. There are thirty of them. Between 1951 and 1956, they increased 18.6 per cent, between 1956 and 1961, 20.7 per cent and between 1951 and 1961, 43 per cent. These cities accounted for 11 per cent of the population increase since 1951. The percentage increase will be greater when account is taken of the urbanized areas which have developed on their periphery. Were these taken into account as they will be when the compilations are more advanced, their contribution would be somewhere around 15 per cent or more, 42 municipalities then are responsible for about 75 per cent of the total population increase between 1951 and 1961.

This leaves only about 25 per cent of the increase to be distributed among the remaining 4,800 odd municipalities.

From these preliminary counts, a few obvious observations can be made:

1. The large cities are becoming larger.

2. The intermediate size cities are also becoming larger.

3. The smaller cities and villages are remaining fairly stationary.

4. The rural areas have decreased considerably.

5. The movement from central cities to the periphery has continued between 1956 and 1961.

To sum up, I think I can say, without fear of being called too boastful, that the 1961 Census operation has been quite successful in spite of the difficulties which arose at the outset. There now remains to be seen what sort of a job our computer will do in producing tabulations.