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## Symbols

.. figures not available.
... figures not appropriate or not applicable.

- nil or zero.
-     - amount too small to be expressed.

The last data analysed in this report were those available at time of writing.

## Preface

Though demographic trends are not subject to rapid and dramatic fluctuations, it is important to recognize those changes which are likely to have longterm implications. In the three years since the publication of the Demographic Situation in Canada, 1983, some trends have been confirmed, others have changed course, and new patterns have emerged. The present report highlights a number of important demographic developments.

In recent years, the incidence of both marriage and divorce has declined, but that of common-law union formation has increased. Several years of precipitous decline in fertility have given way to stability, but at a level that is insufficient to ensure the renewal of generations. Important changes in internal migration have taken place in recent years: Quebec has returned to a near balance in population exchanges, while Ontario has regained its strong attraction for migrants. Other significant demographic developments include the continuation of the decline in deaths due to motor vehicle accidents, and unexpected progress in male longevity.

Ivan P. Fellegi<br>Chief Statistician of Canada
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## HIGHLIGHTS

The population of Canada, according to the 1986 final census counts, was $25,354,064$ persons, yielding an average annual growth rate since the 1981 Census of $0.84 \%$. This is the lowest growth rate in Canada's modern history. From a high of about $3 \%$ in the 1950s, the average annual rate of increase fell gradually to $2 \%$ in the 1960 s, and to $1.3 \%$ in the 1970 s. One has to go back to the Great Depression of the 1930s to find such a low rate of increase.

Underlying this slowdown is a significant shift in the determinants of population growth. In the 1960s and partly in the 1970s, the deceleration in growth was due primarily to a rapid decline in birth rates - from about 28 births per 1,000 population in the late 1950 s, to about 16 per 1,000 in the late 1970 s. The birth rate subsequently stabilized at about 15 per 1,000 , whereupon the decline in number of immigrants - from 135,000 in 1981-82 to 85,000 in 1985-86 - became the most important factor in the deceleration of growth.

## XXX

The aging of the Canadian population began later than that in Europe, but aging here is proceeding at a more rapid pace. To the low level of fertility, which is the main determinant of aging, is added the increase in life expectancy at retirement age and beyond. The number of persons in Canada aged 75 and over has increased by 140 percent in ten years, and now stands at more than one million.

## XXX

The current pattern of fertility is characterized by stability at the national level. The total fertility rate (TFR), over the first half of the 1980s, has hovered around 1.7 births per woman - below the replacement level of 2.1 required to ensure the renewal of generations. An increasing percentage of women are having their first child after the age of 30 , reflecting the emergence of an older pattern of childbearing. Quebec, with a TFR of 1.4, exhibits the lowest fertility rate of all the provinces. A cohort analysis of childbearing for Canadianborn women reveals that at least some of the youngest birth cohorts of women (those born after 1952) will not yield enough births to replace themselves.

## XxX

Nuptiality (the rate of marriage) continues to decline, and Quebec exhibits the lowest rate among the provinces. In terms of divorce, 14 years of uninterrupted annual increases in both absolute numbers and rates have given way to annual decreases beginning in 1983. In contrast, there has been a significant rise in the incidence of common-law union formation.

The last half of the decade of the seventies saw an unexpected increase in longevity, with the current trend pointing towards a larger relative contribution from mortality reduction at advanced ages. In 1981, newborn females could expect to live for 78.98 years, while males could expect 71.88 years. For the first time ever in Canada, however, the gain in life expectancy over a fiveyear period (1976-1981) was greater for males than for females.

Over a recent 10-year period, the percentage increase for certain smokingrelated cancers was more than three times higher for females than for males. Of all the recent and unexpected changes in mortality patterns, the most striking has been the drop in deaths due to motor vehicle accidents. Mortality from this cause plummeted by more than forty percent over a ten-year period, and is still in decline.

## XXX

Population movements, both into and within Canada, have recently hit very low levels by historical standards. The number of immigrants to Canada in 1985 was among the lowest of any year in the post-war era. The average age of immigrants has increased, and 1984 marked the first time ever that Canada admitted more immigrants at retirement age and over than immigrants under 5 years of age.

Internal migration has returned to more traditional patterns following the slowdown in the oil-boom in Western Canada. Ontario, Canada's most populous province, has regained its strong attraction for migrants. In Alberta, the recent population outflows have given way to a return to near equilibrium in exchanges with other areas of the country. The recent turnaround in the net migration picture in Quebec is noteworthy. After several years of heavy losses, Quebec has almost reached parity between out- and in-migration. As a region, the Atlantic Provinces has returned to a negative net migration scenario. Of special note is the fact that British Columbia, for the first time, recently recorded a period of negative net migration.

## XxX

Since 1971, the share of anglophones in the country as a whole has increased, whereas that of francophones has diminished. The proportion of the latter, however, has increased in all areas where francophones already constituted a majority of the population.

During the years preceding 1971, as well as in the decade ending in 1981, linguistic transfer favoured the English language - even in the province of Quebec. With few exceptions, however, internal migration gave an advantage to the French language, in relative terms, in the three quinquennial periods between 1966 and 1981.
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## POPULATION GROWTH

## National

The population of Canada, according to the final 1986 Census counts ${ }^{1}$, was $25,354,064$ persons. The average annual growth rate since the 1981 Census, on the basis of these figures, is $0.84 \%$, the lowest rate of growth in recent history (Table 1). As low as the current rate of growth is, it is not entirely without precedent. At the advent of World War I, as well as during the Great Depression of the thirties, growth either dipped below, as in the current period, or was at the threshold of, the $1 \%$ level.

In examining the pattern of population growth in Canada since the beginning of this century it is evident that relatively low growth has been the norm, although two periods with exceptionally high growth rates stand out: the years preceding World War I, and the roughly 15 years of the post-World War II "baby-boom" (Chart 1). Both of these periods displayed the phenomenon of concurrently high fertility and high international immigration, coupled with low rates of emigration.

The annual growth rate peaked at $3.29 \%$ in 1956-57, and remained at a high level until the start of the decade of the 1960's. Growth then declined to low levels in tandem with, and in response to, the decline in fertility. Since then, the small fluctuations in the level of growth have been determined primarily by movements in international migration.

The net effect of declining fertility, when coupled with an increase in the number of women in the reproductive years, is that the number of births has varied little over the last dozen years. On the other hand, progress against mortality has provided a hedge against the rise in the number of deaths which accompanies an aging population. The overall result has been a noticeable stability in natural increase ${ }^{2}$ (varying between the highest value of 202,900 and the lowest value of 176,000 , over the past 12 years).

Further observations include the fact that periods of slow growth in Canada have historically been associated with economic downturns, leading to a feeling of uneasiness about sustained periods of low growth. It also appears that low levels of immigration have frequently coincided, on average, with periods characterized by low birth rates (Chart 2).

[^0]Table 1. Demographic Accounts of Canada, 1951-1986

| Year ${ }^{1}$ | Population at June 1 | Total <br> Annual <br> Increase ${ }^{1}$ | Rate of Total Annual Increase ${ }^{2}$ | Births ${ }^{1}$ | Deaths ${ }^{1}$ | Natural Increase ${ }^{1}$ | Net <br> Migration ${ }^{1,3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1951 | 14,009,4004 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | 21,568,3004 | 377,9005 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1972 | 21,801 3006 | 233,000 | 1.07 | 353,500 | 159,100 | 194,400 | 38,600 |
| 1973 | 22,043 0006 | 241,700 | 1.10 | 345,400 | 162,300 | 183,100 | 58,600 |
| 1974 | 22,363,9006 | 320,900 | 1.45 | 342,000 | 166,000 | 176,000 | 144,900 |
| 1975 | 22,697,1006 | 333,200 | 1.48 | 354,200 | 169,200 | 185,000 | 148,200 |
| 1976 | 22,992,6004 | 295,500 | 1.29 | 363,000 | 166,600 | 196,400 | 99,100 |
| 1977 | 23,272,800 ${ }^{6}$ | 280,200 | 1.21 | 358,500 | 166,000 | 192,500 | 87,700 |
| 1978 | 23,517,0006 | 244,200 | 1.04 | 358,500 | 168,500 | 190,000 | 54,200 |
| 1979 | 23,747,3006 | 230,300 | 0.97 | 364,600 | 165,900 | 198,700 | 31,600 |
| 1980 | 24,042,5006 | 295,200 | 1.24 | 367,200 | 171,300 | 195,900 | 99,300 |
| 1981 | 24,343,2004 | 300,700 | 1.24 | 371,500 | 170,300 | 201,200 | 99,500 |
| 1982 | $24,631,800^{7}$ | 288,600 | 1.18 | 372,500 | 172,500 | 200,000 | 88,600 |
| 1983 | $24,884,500^{7}$ | 252,700 | 1.02 | 373,100 | 175,800 | 197,300 | 55,400 |
| 1984 | $25,124,200^{7}$ | 239,600 | 0.96 | 374,700 | 174,200 | 200,500 | 39,100 |
| 1985 | 25,359,8007 | 235,700 | 0.93 | 380,900 | 178,000 | 202,900 | 32,800 |
| 1986 | $\mathbf{2 5 , 5 9 1 , 1 0 0}{ }^{7}$ | 231,300 | 0.91 | 376,600 | 182,800 | 193,800 | 37,500 |

${ }^{1}$ From June 1 of the preceding year to May 31 of the year indicated.
${ }^{2}$ Percent.
${ }^{3}$ Difference between total increase and natural increase.
${ }^{4}$ Census data.
${ }^{5}$ Average annual growth, June 1, 1951 to May 31, 1971.
${ }^{6}$ Intercensal estimate.
7 Preliminary postcensal estimate.
Sources: Statistics Canada, Censuses of Canada.
Statistics Canada, Catalogues 91-201 and 91-210 (annual).

## An International Perspective

Even though the growth rate in Canada is considered to be low, it is actually near the top among industrialized countries, and for the period 1980-1984, only Australia had a higher growth rate. Among these countries, seven had zero or negative growth, and the United States, over the same period, experienced lower growth than Canada (Table 2).

Chart 1
Annual Rate of Growth, Canada, 1867-1984


[^1]The list of countries with higher growth rates than Canada's doesn't stop at Australia, however. A number of countries in the less developed areas of the world have much higher rates of natural increase and higher overall growth rates than does Canada. This accounts for the change between 1950 and 1984 in the comparative ranking of Canada with other countries in terms of the size of their populations (Table 3). Canada fell back only slightly in its relative rank over the 34 year period, having surpassed the low-fertility, low-growth European countries of Yugoslavia and Romania in size, while having been

Chart 2
Immigration Rate and Total Fertility Rate, Canada(1), 1901-1983

(1) In calculating the total fertility rate for Canada, Newfoundland has been excluded. Source: table A2.
surpassed by the high-fertility, high-growth countries of South Africa, Zaire and Columbia (Bangladesh, currently ranked $8^{\text {th }}$, was not a separate state in 1950). For Canada, this surprising relative stability in rank, especially when considering the very high fertility of the world's underdeveloped nations, is due to the high concentration of the Third World in a few populous nations.

## Provincial Patterns

As for the country as a whole, provincial growth depends on the levels of natural increase and net migration. As the pattern of fertility and mortality become increasingly uniform across the country, regional differences in growth

Table 2. Average Annual Growth Rate for the 1980-1984 Period Among the World's Largest Industrialized Countries

| Country | Growth (in\%) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Canada | $\mathbf{1 . 1}$ |
| Australia | 1.4 |
| Austria | 0.0 |
| Belgium | 0.1 |
| Bulgaria | 0.3 |
| Czechoslovakia | 0.2 |
| Denmark | -0.1 |
| Federal Republic of Germany | -0.2 |
| France | 0.6 |
| German Democratic Republic | -0.1 |
| Greece | 0.7 |
| Hungary | -0.1 |
| Ireland | 1.0 |
| Japan | 0.7 |
| Luxembourg | -0.1 |
| Netherlands | 0.5 |
| New Zealand | 0.9 |
| Norway | 0.3 |
| Poland | 0.9 |
| Portugal | 0.7 |
| Romania | 0.8 |
| Spain | 0.8 |
| Sweden | 0.1 |
| Switzerland | 0.2 |
| United Kingdom | -0.1 |
| United States | 1.0 |
| U.S.S.R. | 0.9 |
| Yugoslavia | 0.7 |

become, generally, the product of regional variations in international and internal migration. The 1983 report described the changes between 1977 and 1981, and the current report considers the most recent developments in this domain. (Detailed data can be found in Appendix Table A3.)

In 1985-86, the Atlantic Provinces experienced a rate of population increase well below the national level. This was primarily the result of losses through migration, but a decline in natural increase also played a part.

Table 3. World Population, Canada and Countries with
Larger Populations, 1950 and 1984

| Rank | 1950 |  | Rank | 1984 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Country | Population (in thousands) |  | Country | Population (in thousands) |
|  | WORLD | 2,504,000 |  | WORLD | 4,763,000 |
| 1 | China | 463,500 | 1 | China | 1,051,550 |
| 2 | India | 358,000 | 2 | India | 746,740 |
| 3 | U.S.S.R. | 193,000 | 3 | U.S.S.R. | 275,000 |
| 4 | United States | 151,689 | 4 | United States | 236,680 |
| 5 | Japan | 82,900 | 5 | Indonesia | 159,900 |
| 6 | Pakistan | 75,040 | 6 | Brazil | 132,580 |
| 7 | Indonesia | 73,500 | 7 | Japan | 120,020 |
| 8 | Brazil | 52,124 | 8 | Bangladesh | 96,730 |
| 9 | United Kingdom | 50,616 | 9 | Pakistan | 93,290 |
| 10 | G.D.R. | 47,607 | 10 | Nigeria | 92,040 |
| 11 | Italy | 46,272 | 11 | Mexico | 76,790 |
| 12 | France | 41,934 | 12 | West Germany | 61,180 |
| 13 | Rep. of Korea | 29,500 | 13 | Vietnam | 58,300 |
| 14 | Spain | 28,287 | 14 | Italy | 56,980 |
| 15 | Mexico | 25,368 | 15 | United Kingdom | 56,490 |
| 16 | Vietnam | 25,000 | 16 | France | 54,940 |
| 17 | Poland | 24,977 | 17 | Philippines | 53,350 |
| 18 | Nigeria | 24,000 | 18 | Thailand | 50,400 |
| 19 | Turkey | 20,935 | 19 | Turkey | 48,260 |
| 20 | Egypt | 20,439 | 20 | Egypt | 45,660 |
| 21 | Philippines | 19,557 | 21 | Iran | 43,410 |
| 22 | Iran | 18,772 | 22 | Rep. of Korea | 40,580 |
| 23 | Burma | 18,489 | 23 | Spain | 38,720 |
| 24 | Thailand | 18,313 | 24 | Burma | 37,610 |
| 25 | Argentina | 17,196 | 25 | Poland | 36,910 |
| 26 | Yugoslavia | 16,250 | 26 | Ethiopia | 35,420 |
| 27 | Romania | 16,094 | 27 | Zaire | 32,080 |
| 28 | Ethiopia | 15,000 | 28 | South Africa | 31,590 |
| 29 | Canada | 13,845 | 29 | Argentina | 30,100 |
|  |  |  | 30 | Columbia | 28,220 |
|  |  |  | 31 | Canada | 25,150 |

Source: United Nations, Demographic Yearbook.

In Quebec, a turnaround in migration flows has meant a larger population increase than has been seen in any of the previous five annual periods, despite a persistent decline in natural increase. The net loss through migration of 13,900 persons in 1982 became progressively smaller in succeeding years, and finally turned positive in 1985-86 with a net gain of 3,900 persons.

Ontario, on the other hand, continued the strong growth trend exhibited during recent periods, due primarily to substantial gains through migration (53,100 in 1985-86). Ontario continues to exert a powerful attraction on migrants and remains the leader in growth.

In the West, population growth in every province and territory, with the exception of Alberta, was lower in 1985-86 than in either 1983-84 or 1984-85. In Saskatchewan, growth dipped to one-third of its 1984-85 level following several years of substantial gains. While still positive, this reduced growth can be attributed to a turnaround in net migration, as a loss in excess of 6,000 persons was recorded in the 1985-86 period. The swing in absolute numbers was not as great in Manitoba, but the year 1985-86 saw a small net loss to migration and a slight drop in natural increase. British Columbia, for the first time, recorded negative net migration ( $-1,700$ in 1985-86). Its rate of total increase for $1985-86$ stood at $0.78 \%$, down from $1.14 \%$ for the year before.

In contrast, growth in Alberta rebounded to its earlier levels. The recent and short-lived slowdown in growth, which began in the 1982-83 period, can largely be attributed to migration. After having made large net gains through population exchanges in previous years, Alberta suffered unprecedented net losses for three years in a row during 1982-83, 1983-84 and 1984-85. With a migration balance of almost zero in 1985-86, the full weight of growth in Alberta's population was borne by natural increase. Its 1985-86 rate of increase stands at $1.3 \%$, which, with that of Ontario, is the highest rate recorded in Canada for that year.

Small population declines were recorded in both the Yukon and Northwest Territories in 1985-86, but because of the small numbers involved, these trends should be interpreted with caution.

Table 4 gives a synoptic presentation of the principal demographic indicators for the provinces and territories, as well as for Canada overall.

## POPULATION STRUCTURE

## Age

The aging of a population is a slow process, but one that has tremendous momentum. The Canadian population began to age some time ago, and the

Table 4. Rates ${ }^{1}$ and Summary Demographic Indicators, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1981-1985

|  | Year | New-foundland | Prince Edward Island | Nova Scotia | New Brunswick | Quebec | Ontario |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Birth Rate (per 1,000) | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \\ & 1983 \\ & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.8 \\ & 16.1 \\ & 15.4 \\ & 14.8 \\ & 14.6 \end{aligned}$ | 15.5 <br> 15.7 <br> 15.4 <br> 15.6 <br> 15.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.3 \\ & 14.5 \\ & 14.4 \\ & 14.2 \\ & 14.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.1 \\ & 15.0 \\ & 14.9 \\ & 14.5 \\ & 14.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.8 \\ & 14.0 \\ & 13.5 \\ & 13.4 \\ & 13.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.2 \\ & 14.3 \\ & 14.4 \\ & 14.7 \\ & 14.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Fertility Rate | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \\ & 1983 \\ & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | - - - | $\begin{aligned} & 1.91 \\ & 1.93 \\ & 1.89 \\ & 1.89 \\ & 1.90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.64 \\ & 1.67 \\ & 1.66 \\ & 1.63 \\ & 1.62 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.71 \\ & 1.70 \\ & 1.69 \\ & 1.65 \\ & 1.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.61 \\ & 1.52 \\ & 1.47 \\ & 1.46 \\ & 1.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.63 \\ & 1.65 \\ & 1.66 \\ & 1.69 \\ & 1.68 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total First Marriage Rate ${ }^{2}$ (per 1,000) | $\begin{array}{r} 1981 \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{~F} \\ 1982 \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{~F} \\ 1983 \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{~F} \\ 1984 \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{~F} \\ 1985 \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{~F} \end{array}$ | 675.6 648.4 682.5 646.4 661.7 624.6 607.4 657.1 532.1 | 718.8 689.6 <br> 722.5 <br> 665.8 <br> 795.4 <br> 746.2 <br> 805.4 <br> 783.6 <br> 722.5 | $\begin{aligned} & 706.7 \\ & 685.2 \\ & 674.6 \\ & 658.3 \\ & 655.0 \\ & 641.2 \\ & 656.8 \\ & 677.3 \\ & 651.0 \\ & 661.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 689.1 \\ & 667.6 \\ & 652.4 \\ & 645.1 \\ & 672.5 \\ & 664.7 \\ & 659.3 \\ & 673.4 \\ & 658.7 \\ & 668.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 570.5 \\ & 578.0 \\ & 523.4 \\ & 535.0 \\ & 49.1 \\ & 504.7 \\ & 494.7 \\ & 520.6 \\ & 487.8 \\ & 515.4 \end{aligned}$ | 734.2 <br> 715.9 <br> 731.2 <br> 723.7 <br> 705.7 <br> 701.2 <br> 700.3 <br> 709.8 <br> 695.0 708.0 |
| Rate of Natural Increase (per 1,000) | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \\ & 1983 \\ & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.2 \\ 10.2 \\ 9.4 \\ 8.7 \\ 8.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.4 \\ & 7.7 \\ & 6.9 \\ & 6.7 \\ & 7.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.7 \\ & 6.3 \\ & 6.2 \\ & 6.3 \\ & 5.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.7 \\ & 7.6 \\ & 7.5 \\ & 7.1 \\ & 6.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \\ & 7.3 \\ & 6.7 \\ & 6.6 \\ & 6.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.9 \\ & 7.0 \\ & 7.1 \\ & 7.4 \\ & 7.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Growth Rate (per 1,000) | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \\ & 1983 \\ & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.4 \\ 10.7 \\ 7.5 \\ 2.4 \\ 2.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.6 \\ 8.1 \\ 13.7 \\ 14.3 \\ 6.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.0 \\ 9.2 \\ 11.1 \\ 11.0 \\ 6.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.3 \\ 10.7 \\ 10.6 \\ 8.5 \\ 3.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.4 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 5.1 \\ & 5.9 \\ & 6.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ 12.7 \\ 12.7 \\ 14.2 \\ 13.0 \end{array}$ |
| Net Migration Rate (per 1,000 ) | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \\ & 1983 \\ & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -11.8 \\ 0.5 \\ -1.9 \\ -6.3 \\ -5.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -5.8 \\ 0.4 \\ 6.8 \\ 7.6 \\ -0.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -2.7 \\ 2.9 \\ 4.9 \\ 4.7 \\ 0.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -6.4 \\ 3.1 \\ 3.1 \\ 1.4 \\ -3.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.8 \\ -2.3 \\ -1.6 \\ -0.7 \\ 0.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \\ & 5.7 \\ & 5.6 \\ & 6.8 \\ & 5.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| Population Aged $65+$ as a Percentage of the Total Population on June 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \\ & 1983 \\ & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.7 \\ & 7.9 \\ & 8.0 \\ & 8.2 \\ & 8.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.2 \\ & 12.4 \\ & 12.4 \\ & 12.4 \\ & 12.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.9 \\ & 11.1 \\ & 11.2 \\ & 11.3 \\ & 11.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.1 \\ & 10.3 \\ & 10.4 \\ & 10.6 \\ & 10.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \\ & 9.0 \\ & 9.2 \\ & 9.4 \\ & 9.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.1 \\ & 10.2 \\ & 10.3 \\ & 10.5 \\ & 10.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| Life Expectancy at Birth ${ }^{3}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 71.95 \\ & 78.65 \\ & 72.08 \\ & 78.81 \\ & 72.37 \\ & 78.70 \\ & 72.37 \\ & 78.63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.83 \\ & 80.49 \\ & 72.83 \\ & 80.45 \\ & 72.70 \\ & 80.27 \\ & 72.63 \\ & 79.92 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70.96 \\ & 78.37 \\ & 71.12 \\ & 78.88 \\ & 71.34 \\ & 79.24 \\ & 72.15 \\ & 79.20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.08 \\ & 79.19 \\ & 71.51 \\ & 79.08 \\ & 71.91 \\ & 79.24 \\ & 72.30 \\ & 79.88 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.08 \\ & 78.71 \\ & 71.46 \\ & 79.12 \\ & 71.77 \\ & 79.41 \\ & 71.92 \\ & 79.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.28 \\ & 79.03 \\ & 72.63 \\ & 79.33 \\ & 72.92 \\ & 79.59 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000) | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & 1982 \\ & 1983 \\ & 1984 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.7 \\ 10.8 \\ 10.6 \\ 9.2 \\ 10.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.2 \\ 7.8 \\ 8.4 \\ 8.2 \\ 4.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.5 \\ 8.6 \\ 9.4 \\ 7.8 \\ 7.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.9 \\ 10.5 \\ 10.6 \\ 7.8 \\ 9.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.5 \\ & 8.8 \\ & 7.7 \\ & 7.3 \\ & 7.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \\ & 8.3 \\ & 8.0 \\ & 7.6 \\ & 7.3 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 4. Rates ${ }^{1}$ and Summary Demographic Indicators, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1981-1985 - Concluded
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|r|r|r|r|r|r|r|}\hline & & & & & & \text { North- } & \\ & \text { Manitoba } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Saskat- } \\ \text { chewan }\end{array} & \text { Alberta } & \text { British } & \text { Yukon } & \text { Test } & \text { Canada } \\ & & & & & & & \text { Tories }\end{array}\right]$
${ }_{2}^{1}$ The rates are calculated for the calendar year.
${ }^{2}$ Calculated for ages 15-49.
${ }^{3}$ For 1982 to 1984, these figures should be considered estimates, since the denominators used in their calculation were estimates.
Source: Various Statistics Canada Publications.
process has continued into the present. Evidence is provided by examination of the change in the age structure of the population over the past 25 years. During this period, the median age at the national level has increased by 4 years for males and 5 years for females (Table A4). On June 1, 1986, Canadian males had a median age of more than 30 years (30.4) and Canadian females, almost 32 years (31.9). These values represent the highest median ages in Canada's history.

Of the three principal factors having an influence on aging (mortality reduction, the age structure of migrants, and the low rate of fertility), without question it is the low level of fertility that has had the greatest effect on the observed changes, just as it was the high rate of fertility during the baby-boom that produced the low median age during that period. The 1961/1985 comparative age pyramid illustrates the transformations that have taken place in the age structure of the Canadian population (Chart 3).

## Fewer Young, More Elderly

Clearly, the fall in the birth rate has resulted in a smaller base for the 1986 pyramid, in comparison with the broad 1961 base. Furthermore, as the youths of 1961 are now in the adult group, the youth dependancy ratio (those aged 0-14 expressed as a percent of those aged 15-64) has been reduced considerably, from $58.1 \%$ in 1961 , to $31.2 \%$ in 1986. Progress in the area of mortality has had an effect on the top of the pyramid, such that more persons now reach an advanced age than ever before. The 1961 adult cohorts have a higher proportionate share of the 1986 elderly population than would have been anticipated, since not only has the mortality experience become slightly more favourable, but the decline in fertility has reduced the proportionate share of the young. Consequently, the elderly dependancy ratio increased from 13.1 to 15.6 percent during the period (the elderly dependancy ratio is the ratio of persons age $65+$ to those aged 15-64). The total dependancy ratio (the sum of the youth and elderly ratios), as a result of the above changes, decreased to 46.8 "dependents" per 100 adults in 1986, representing the lowest rate in Canadian history. While this situation leads to a favourable economic climate in terms of a reduction in the dependancy burden for those in the "productive years", at the same time it presents a challenge for job creation.

The large number of births which occurred during the nearly twenty years of the baby-boom resembles a large wave moving through the various phases of the life cycle (Chart 4). At each juncture in the aging process, the needs of the individuals in this huge cohort change, and with each change come new challenges.

Pre-schoolers (aged 0-5) have never accounted for as large a proportion of the population as they did in 1961, when $14.7 \%$ of Canadians were below school age. Their portion has also decreased considerably, but less than would be expected based on the low level of fertility. This attenuated decline is due
to the fact that the current pre-schoolers are children whose parents are part of the large "baby-boom" cohorts, a substantial number of whom have postponed childbearing. Pre-schoolers, as a consequence, accounted for $7.5 \%$ of the 1986 population, and are part of what has been called the "echo effect" of the baby-boom. This phenomenon is also clearly visible in Chart 4.

The broader youth segment (those aged 0-14) attained its greatest share of the population in 1961, while among the school-aged population (those aged 6-15), the peak was reached in 1971. At that time, 21.3\% of Canadians were of school age. In 1986, only $12 \%$ were in this age group.

Chart 3
Age Pyramid of the Canadian Population, June 1, 1961 and June 1, 1985


[^2]

The 17-24 age group, which largely represents entrants into the job market, attained its maximum in 1981, and its numbers will continue to diminish until the end of the century.

The adult group (15-64) represents a much broader age segment than that of the youth group, and as a consequence, variations in its size have lead to smaller relative changes in its proportion. As a result of the baby-boom "wave" this group has practically reached its maximum (at about $68 \%$ in 1986) after having reached a minimum (in recent history) of $58.4 \%$ in 1961 . Only unforeseen changes in migration or fertility are capable of slowing down the rate of decline in its proportion. A rise in fertility would reduce its share, as will the decline in mortality at advanced ages.

The elderly are currently attracting much interest, due to the rapid increase in their numbers, and the broad implications that such an increase has. The $65+$ age group grew from 7.6 to 10.4 percent of the overall population in 25 years, which represents a $143 \%$ increase in number. Even more impressive has been the increase in the $75+$ subgroup. Its ranks, currently numbering close to 1.1 million persons, is expected to increase in the near future as a result of the double effect of the arrival of a large number of persons at the age threshold, as well as increases in life expectancy at age 75 and beyond.

## An International Comparison

Few countries in the Western world have a population age distribution histogram that can justify being called a "pyramid". In addition to the general decline in fertility, there have been fluctuations in birth rates and a thinningout of some age groups. The pyramids for Canada and the United States, however, are not as irregular as those for European countries (Chart 5). For both Canada and the United States, the imbalance between the sexes in the upper age range is small, the indentations are shallow, and the base of the pyramid is larger. But this situation does not mean that North America is immune to important transformations in demographic structure, and in particular, to rapid aging.

## A North American Peculiarity

Not long ago the Canadian public became aware of the fate that weighs upon all populations: grow in size or grow old. The effects were first noted around the end of the 1960's with the emptying of the large schools that had been built to accommodate the baby-boom cohorts. Such school closures made visible the changes in the birth rate that had begun several years earlier. Currently, it is the arrival at retirement age of larger and larger contingents each year that has caught the attention of policy makers.

That the countries of Europe are farther along the aging path is well known. What requires more attention is the speed at which the aging process is progressing. In effect, it is more or less the speed with which the ratio of the group sizes change, that determines the extent of transformations in the socioeconomic
life of individuals, and in society in general. If one uses the youth dependancy ratio as a measure of aging "from the bottom, up", and that of the elderly as a measure of aging "from the top, down", then aging progresses over any period to the extent that the former decreases, in combination with an increase in the latter, The contrast between the Western European countries and North America in this regard is striking, especially in terms of aging "from the bottom, up" (Chart 6). In Europe, the youth dependancy ratio dropped during the 20 years between 1961 and 1981 from $37.8 \%$ to $32.5 \%$ (a slight decline of $5.3 \%$ ) while that of the United States fell from $51.6 \%$ to $33.9 \%$ (a drop of $17.7 \%$ ), and that of Canada from $58.2 \%$ to $33.2 \%$ (a drop of $25.0 \%$ ).

For the elderly, the opposite held true. Over the same period, Europe experienced a greater increase ( 3.3 percent) in the ratio of the elderly than did North America. The increases recorded for the same period of time were 2.4 percent for the United States, and 1.3 percent for Canada. The youth and elderly dependancy ratios are indicators of the two unique ways in which a single phenomenon (aging) evolves, and, as a consequence of the precipitous decline in the youth ratio, the total aging process in North America has been proceeding at a more rapid pace than that in Europe.

## Marital Status

Marital status is a transitory state, and with the exception of the status of single, is reversible. This leads to difficulty in measuring, with any precision, changes in propensity over time, since it is not known exactly to what to attribute any increase or decrease in numbers in the different categories of marital status. For example, the number of divorced persons results from the combined propensities to divorce and to remarry. The same is true for the status of widowed. At any time, the situation is comparable to a balance sheet in which the contribution of the "debits" and the "credits" to the total are unknown.

The comparison of the age distribution of singles over a thirty-five year period delivers a clear message on the behaviour of different birth cohorts with regard to marriage (Chart 7). An important observation is that recent generations are marrying later than earlier ones (Table A7). It is also apparent that these older generations married more than their elders. The 1928-29 male cohort ${ }^{3}$ saw $26 \%$ of its numbers married by age 23, while that of 1963-64, at the same age, had only $15 \%$ married. In the same way, the 1923-24 cohort, at age 28 , saw $65 \%$ married, while that of $1958-59$ had only $56 \%$ married, etc. By contrast, the 1888-89 generation had $12 \%$ of its members single at age 63 , while that of 1923-24 had only $7 \%$.

It is this simultaneous presence of the proportion still single, among

[^3]Chart 5
Population Pyramids for Selected Industrialized Countries, 1983 (Approximately)


Source: Data published by national statistics agencies.
different generations, that explains the age pyramid of singles at two dates. The 1985 pyramid has a much larger proportion of persons in the 20-24 age group than does that of the 1951 pyramid. To explain this disparity in proportion single between generations, one can cite the existence of common-law unions, the widespread use of contraception (which has reduced the risk of premarital pregnancy and, therefore, the rate of first marriage), and the generally more "permissive" social environment in which today's young find themselves. For the more aged, the explanations are less abundant. It may well be that many abandoned the idea of marriage once they had aged past the period of life when marriage is generally at its peak. For these cohorts, the peak occurred during the Great Depression.

Chart 6
Dependency Ratios, Europe, the United States
and Canada, 1945 to 1981




Note: One cannot help but be intrigued by the steep, short-lived downturn in the European dependency ratio roughly between 1970 and 1975, which does not appear in the North American curve. There is no simple explanation for this, but three possibilities come to mind. First, the decrease in the elderly population may be due to the decline in births during World War I, which produced the small cohorts that were, secondly. the hardest hit by the casualties of Worid War II. Thirdly, the ranks of the adult population were swollen by the lage baby-boom cohorts, which further reduced the ratio.

Source: Table A5.

Chart 7
Age Pyramid of Single Persons 15 years and Over, Canada, 1951-1986


[^4]An age and sex-specific comparison of the marital status distribution of Canadians at different points in time yields some interesting observations (Table A7). First, in spite of remarriages, there have been important increases for both sexes in the proportion divorced, especially since 1971. Second, there has been a reduction in the proportion widowed, again for both sexes, which can partially be attributed to the reduction in mortality among adults, as well as, to a certain extent, to remarriage. The result of these complex and intertwined changes has been an increase in the number of married persons at advanced ages.

Today, fewer people than ever approach old-age in solitude, and this holds true for both sexes. During the last part of life, however, the increased life expectancy of females means that the vast majority of elderly women are living alone. In fact, half of all elderly women living alone are widowed.

## MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

The annual number of marriages in Canada is subject to random fluctuations (Table 5). Therefore, slight annual increases or decreases should not be interpreted as signifying the beginning of a trend. However, since 1972 (a record high year in Canadian history), the number of years in which a decline has been recorded (9) exceeds the number in which an increase has been noted (4), and a general downward trend in the number of marriages is evident.

For both sexes, the number of marriages of people who had never been married before follows the same general trend. Such marriages have never been as numerous as in 1972, and their decline is the major factor in the overall downward movement, which has been particularly strong since 1976. In fact, since 1972, decreases from the previous year have been noted in all years, with the exception of 1979 and 1980.

To date, when a decline in the number of marriages has been recorded in a given year, the decrease in the number of first marriages has always been larger, and when the number of marriages has increased, the increase in the number of first marriages has been smaller. Remarriages, therefore, cushion fluctuations in first marriages. In addition, since most remarriages involve divorced persons, it would appear that the propensity of the divorced population to remarry is more constant than is the propensity to marry of those who have always been single.

## First Marriages

For decreases in the total rate of first marriage, it is not possible to distinguish the effect of postponed marriages from that of marriages that will never take place, since marriages that are put-off may never occur, and no "catch-up"

Table 5. Marriages, First Marriages, Remarriages, Canada, 1967-1985

| Year | Number of <br> Marriages | Number of First <br> Marriages |  |  | Number of Marriages in <br> Which at <br> Spoast One of the <br> Spad Previously <br> Been Married |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Males | Females | Number | $\%$ |  |
| 1967 | 165,879 | 151,883 | 151,488 | 20,417 | 12.3 |  |
| 1968 | 171,766 | 157,309 | 156,783 | 21,133 | 12.3 |  |
| 1969 | 182,183 | 162,853 | 162,690 | 27,494 | 15.1 |  |
| 1970 | 188,428 | 167,267 | 167,421 | 29,975 | 15.9 |  |
| 1971 | 191,324 | 168,944 | 169,072 | 31,698 | 16.6 |  |
| 1972 | 20,470 | 176,537 | 177,155 | 33,582 | 16.8 |  |
| 1973 | 199,064 | 173,355 | 174,135 | 36,047 | 18.1 |  |
| 1974 | 198,824 | 170,678 | 172,107 | 39,063 | 19.6 |  |
| 1975 | 197,585 | 167,022 | 168,817 | 42,300 | 21.4 |  |
| 1976 | 186,844 | 155,679 | 157,412 | 43,098 | 23.1 |  |
| 1977 | 187,344 | 154,906 | 156,854 | 44,750 | 23.9 |  |
| 1978 | 185,523 | 151,884 | 154,016 | 46,254 | 24.9 |  |
| 1979 | 187,811 | 152,731 | 154,982 | 48,309 | 25.7 |  |
| 1980 | 191,069 | 154,138 | 156,918 | 50,600 | 26.5 |  |
| 1981 | 190,082 | 151,978 | 154,506 | 52,340 | 27.5 |  |
| 1982 | 188,360 | 149,419 | 152,825 | 52,979 | 28.1 |  |
| 1983 | 184,675 | 144,960 | 147,968 | 53,342 | 28.9 |  |
| 1984 | 185,597 | 144,674 | 147,907 | 55,436 | 29.9 |  |
| 1985 | 184,096 | 144,009 | 146,718 | 54,632 | 29.7 |  |

Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Catalogue 84-205 Annual.
effect will ever be observed. Whatever the role of postponement or non-entry may be, comparisons of annual values for the same population over time, or of different populations in a given year, will indicate whether people are marrying more or less. Canadians abandoned the single life less in 1985 than they ever have, as the rate fell to 615 per thousand - a record low. At 638 , the rate for females was almost identical to that in 1984, and forms part of the downward movement we have been seeing since 1967.

The national rate of first marriage has been strongly influenced in recent years by Quebec (Table 6), since that province contains more than a quarter of Canada's population, and has not only the lowest rate of all the provinces, but one of the lowest rates in the world ( 488 per thousand for males and 515 for females). Among males, only two other provinces - Newfoundland and Alberta - have a rate of first marriage lower than the Canadian average, and even there the difference is very small. Were it not for Quebec, the national rate would be 661 per thousand, and no province would be far off this figure. A comparison of the two provinces with the largest populations reveals a striking contrast: the rate for Ontario males is more than $40 \%$ higher than that in Quebec. Between the Yukon and the Northwest Territories (the most sparsely populated regions) the contrast is also very strong, reflecting the large sociocultural differences between the two.

## Table 6. Total First Marriage Rate, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1985 (in thousands)

| Province | Male $^{1}$ | Female $^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Newfoundland | 555 | 532 |
| Prince Edward Island | 722 | 731 |
| Nova Scotia | 651 | 662 |
| New Brunswick | 659 | 669 |
| Quebec | 488 | 515 |
| Ontario | 695 | 708 |
| Manitoba | 690 | 701 |
| Saskatchewan | 634 | 659 |
| Alberta | 605 | 656 |
| British Columbia | 638 | 665 |
| Yukon | 588 | 588 |
| Northwest Territories | 348 | 394 |
| Canada | $\mathbf{6 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 8}$ |
| Canada excluding Quebec | $\mathbf{6 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 2}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Ages 17-49 inclusive.
${ }^{2}$ Ages 15-49 inclusive.
Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Vol. II, Marriage and Divorce, Catalogue 84-205.

No clear explanation has been found for the long-term fluctuations in marriage. In the short-term, economic prosperity is the most frequently cited factor. The nuptiality level in Quebec therefore, might be linked to the economic problems that, more than any other province, Quebec has encountered in recent years. The same explanation might also apply to the situation in Newfoundland.

Both marriages and common-law unions are an entry into the status of "living as couples". On the basis of the findings from the "Family History Survey" 4 , an increasing number of persons, and especially young persons, are opting for the latter. This trend provides part of the explanation for declines in the marriage rate.

Except in certain special circumstances (for instance, where the members of all cohorts have departed from their age-specific marriage rate), the movement in nuptiality over the years has been a fluctuation in the trend to marry young or to marry late. At present in Canada, the more recent the cohort, the less its members marry young. At age 20, for example, the 1955 male cohort was

[^5]marrying at the rate of 71 per 1,000 (in 1975), while the 1961 cohort, who were at the same age in 1981, was marrying at the rate of 41 per 1,000 (Table A8). The cohorts that had not been marrying at a high rate when they were young, however, were marrying at a higher rate around age thirty than had their elders. This leads to the observation that the marriage rate curves of recent cohorts intercept those of older cohorts. For example, the curve for the 1953 male cohort intercepts the curves of the 1948, 1943 and 1938 male cohorts (Chart 8A). The 1958 curve intercepts that for 1953, and the 1959 curve intercepts that for 1958.

It follows that the average age of people entering a first marriage is increasing. It went from 23.5 years in 1980 to 24.3 in 1984 for females, and from 25.7 in 1980 to 26.6 in 1984 for males. The average age of females at marriage is currently close to the maximum of 24.9 years, which was reached in 1942. Males are still quite far from the 1938 situation, when their average age at marriage reached an all-time high of 28.3 , and, if the current rates are the beginning of a trend, that peak may not be reached again. In 1983, it was only at age 27 that the rates exceeded those in the previous year. In 1984, this occurred at age 25 . The rates for 1985 show little, if any, difference.

## Remarriages

Remarriages, which used to occur more frequently because higher mortality rates led to an increased likelihood that the remaining spouse was still young, have declined considerably with the reduction in mortality. Subsequently, the increase in divorce produced a large number of candidates for a second or third marriage. In 1967, in 1 out of 8 marriages, one of the spouses had been married previously (Table 7). Seventeen years later, in $30 \%$ of all marriages (roughly 1 in 3 ), one of the spouses had been married before, and in 9 out of 10 of these cases, they had been divorced. The proportion is growing all the time. By way of comparison, at the beginning of the 1950s, fewer than 1 in 2 remarriages $(48 \%)$ included one spouse who had been divorced.

To qualify what has been said about the remarriage of divorced persons, it should be pointed out that the propensity of the divorced population to remarry has decreased. Since it is difficult to assess the number of persons who have divorced status in a given year, Pressat ${ }^{5}$ suggests using the total number of persons granted divorces over the preceding six years as the population at risk of remarriage. This figure serves as the denominator in the calculation of the rate of remarriage among the divorced in any given year. Using this method, one can see that interest in remarriage in Canada has been declining appreciably over the recent past. The reasons for this are no doubt the same as those given to explain the decrease in nuptiality among those who had not previously been married.

[^6]
## Divorces

In 1983, the number of divorces declined from the previous year (a drop of 1,$869 ;$ Table 8 ). This was the first time there had been such a decline since 1969. In 1984 and 1985, the decreases were larger ( 3,395 and 3,192 , respectively), however, it would be premature to conclude that divorce is declining, even though a few observations indicate a trend in that direction.

It is true that the decrease in divorce relates not only to numbers, but also to rates. For example, the overall divorce rate per 1,000 married women went from 11.6 in 1982 to 11.3 in 1983 and declined further to 10.6 in 1984. A decline in the crude rate has been observed in the United States, where, after having risen regularly since the end of the 1950s (2.1 in 1958), the rate has declined

Chart 8A
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Source: Table A8.
from 5.3 per 1,000 in 1981 to 5.0 in 1984. Even though there has been a decrease each year since 1981 in the total divorce index in Canada (Table 9), we cannot be sure that there has been a profound change in the attitude of Canadians towards divorce. Ordinarily, such major changes take place over generations, with the rates for younger people changing first, while the others remain more or less stable.

We can consider some factors exogenous to divorce in an effort to explain the sudden slowdown in rates. One factor discouraging divorce may be that some couples have been waiting for the recent Divorce Act amendments before starting divorce proceedings. The fact that property acquired during the

Chart 8B
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Table 7. Number and Frequency of Remarriage of Divorced Persons, Canada, 1977-1985

| Year | Number of Remarriages |  | Frequency of Remarriage (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Males | Females | Males | Females |
| 1977 | 26,227 | 23,555 | 63.0 | 56.6 |
| 1978 | 27,713 | 24,931 | 60.6 | 56.7 |
| 1979 | 29,220 | 26,492 | 58.6 | 53.1 |
| 1980 | 31,043 | 27,993 | 57.9 | 52.2 |
| 1981 | 32,405 | 29,517 | 57.4 | 52.3 |
| 1982 | 33,334 | 29,951 | 56.2 | 50.5 |
| 1983 | 34,483 | 31,397 | 55.6 | 50.6 |
| 1984 | 35,276 | 31,760 | 54.9 | 49.5 |
| 1985 | 34,780 | 32,018 | 53.1 | 48.8 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Catalogue 84-205; some data have been calculated by the author.

Table 8. Annual Number of Divorces Granted and Increase over Preceding Year, Canada, 1967-1985

|  | Number <br> of <br> Year | Increase Over <br> Preceding Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  |  | Number | $\%$ |
| 1967 | 11,165 | 178 |  |
| 1968 | 11,343 | 14,750 | 130 |
| 1969 | 26,093 | 3,682 | 14 |
| 1970 | 29,775 | -90 | -0.3 |
| 1971 | 29,685 | 2,704 | 9 |
| 1972 | 32,389 | 4,315 | 13 |
| 1973 | 36,704 | 8,315 | 23 |
| 1974 | 45,019 | 5,592 | 12 |
| 1975 | 50,611 | 3,596 | 7 |
| 1976 | 54,207 | 1,163 | 2 |
| 1977 | 55,376 | 1,785 | 3 |
| 1978 | 57,155 | 2,319 | 4 |
| 1979 | 59,474 | 2,545 | 4 |
| 1980 | 62,019 | 5,652 | 9 |
| 1981 | 67,671 | 2,765 | 4 |
| 1982 | 70,436 | $-1,869$ | -3 |
| 1983 | 68,567 | -395 | -5 |
| 1984 | 65,172 | $-3,392$ | -5 |
| 1985 | 61,980 | $-3,192$ |  |

Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Vol. II, Marriages and Divorces, Catalogue 84-205.
marriage must be divided may also be a consideration. It may also be that, in contemporary Canadian society, some couples who are breaking up no longer feel compelled to get a divorce, since they can form another couple without going through the formalities.

One might initially be tempted to attribute the reduction in the divorce rate to the increase in cohabitation. Many people who cohabit today would formerly have married, and the break-up of such unions would have involved divorces, while today they pass unnoticed. This reasoning does not hold, however, since there has been a reduction not only in numbers, but also in rates, for which the denominators are the marriages involved. Nevertheless, common-law unions would have some reducing effect, if in fact, they are more likely to replace marriages for which the risk of divorce is high.

Interprovincial variations are generally not of substantive importance, since they may simply be the result of differences in the way the courts operate. In addition, migratory movements make it impossible to say that the differences observed are a result of regional differences in behaviour. It should be noted, however, that there were decreases in divorce rates for all provinces in 1984 and, except for Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, in 1985 (Table A9).

## Common-law Unions

Mentioned several times as having a disruptive effect on the usual nuptiality and fertility statistics, common-law unions remain a type of civil status about which we have little information. By their very nature, their distribution in the population is difficult to measure. The 1981 Census attempted to establish, for the first time and in an indirect way, the number and characteristics of persons living as couples without being legally married. The probable differential under-reporting of common-law status by certain socioeconomic groups does not allow a sufficiently clear picture of the situation to be drawn in Canada. However, it is known that on Census Day in 1981 approximately 6\% of the couples enumerated were not legally married, and half of the 704,000 or so persons involved were between 20 and 30 years of age (Table 10). The Family History Survey conducted in 1983 by Statistics Canada provides more detailed information on cohabitation ${ }^{6}$.

## FERTILITY

Except for 1985, the number of births in Canada has been growing since 1973, the year in which the lowest number ( 343,373 births) since the 1959 babyboom peak ( 479,275 births) was reached. The numbers had been rising

[^7]Table 9. Duration-specific Divorce Rate (per 10,000), Canada, Marriage Cohorts 1943-44 to 1984-85

| Year | Number of Marriages per Calendar Year | Marriage Cohort | Cohort <br> Marriages | Marriage Duration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Year of Observation | Total Divorce Index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |  |
| 1944 | 104,656 | 1943-44 | 109,241 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 | 1969 | 1,370 |
|  | 111,376 | 1944-45 | 108,016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51 | 50 | 1970 | 1,863 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1945 \\ & 1946 \end{aligned}$ |  | 1945-46 | 124,387 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 | 56 | 48 | 1971 | 1,885 |
| 1947 | 137,398 130,400 | 1946-47 | 133,899 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 | 55 | 49 | 46 | 1972 | 2,007 |
|  | 130,400 126,118 | 1947-48 | 128,259 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 56 | 50 | 50 | 54 | 1973 | 2,233 |
| 1948 | $126,118$ | 1948-49 | 125,102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 | 58 | 56 | 52 | 60 | 58 | 1974 | 2,673 |
| 1949 | 124,087 125,083 | 1949-50 | 124,585 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51 | 60 | 55 | 58 | 59 | 68 | 64 | 1975 | 2,932 |
| 1950 | 125,083 128,408 | 1950-51 | 126,745 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51 | 64 | 61 | 59 | 60 | 73 | 69 | 71 | 1976 | 3,072 |
| 1951 | 128,408 128,474 | 1951-52 | 128,441 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53 | 65 | 63 | 62 | 63 | 74 | 74 | 76 | 69 | 1977 | 3,063 |
| 1952 |  | 1952-53 | 129,754 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54 | 69 | 70 | 64 | 67 | 75 | 80 | 76 | 69 | 55 | 1978 | 3,103 |
| 1953 |  | 1953-54 | 129,381 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 | 70 | 64 | 62 | 71 | 86 | 82 | 78 | 75 | 70 | 62 | 1979 | 3,180 |
| 1954 | 128,629 | 1954-55 | 128,329 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57 | 73 | 65 | 68 | 69 | 85 | 85 | 83 | 75 | 70 | 68 | 65 | 1980 | 3,277 |
| 1955 |  | 1955-56 | 130,271 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59 | 83 | 71 | 73 | 77 | 87 | 90 | 90 | 89 | 78 | 74 | 69 | 71 | 1981 | 3,529 |
| 1956 |  | 1956-57 | 132,949 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 | 82 | 76 | 75 | 78 | 92 | 105 | 96 | 87 | 85 | 84 | 75 | 74 | 66 | 1982 | 3,655 |
| 1957 | 133,186 131,525 | 1957-58 | 132,355 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61 | 79 | 81 | 81 | 83 | 91 | 101 | 97 | 92 | 84 | 82 | 77 | 78 | 73 | 66 | 1983 | 3,522 |
| 1958 |  | 1958-59 | 131,999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 68 | 91 | 82 | 80 | 86 | 96 | 105 | 103 | 92 | 89 | 80 | 78 | 83 | 75 | 67 | 67 | 1984 | 3,306 |
| 1959 |  | 1959-60 | 131,406 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 | 93 | 95 | 91 | 97 | 1111 | 111 | 110 | 100 | 95 | 90 | 84 | 91 | 87 | 76 | 67 | 64 | 1985 | 3,121 |
| 1960 |  | 1960-61 | 129,406 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73 | 97 | 95 | 95 | 97. | 119 | 119 | 116 | 108 | 100 | 95 | 94 | 95 | 94 | 81 | 76 | 64 |  |  |  |
| 1961 | 128,475 129,381 | 1961-62 | 128,928 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 | 105 | 99 | 106 | 103 | 121 | 133 | 123 | 115 | 108 | 97 | 96 | 98 | 105 | 88 | 79 | 71 |  |  |  |  |
| 1962 | $131.111$ | 1962-63 | 130,246 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 | 114 | 113 | 112 | 114 | 131 | 133 | 134 | 1241 | 118 | 104 | 99 | 107 | 105 | 91 | 85 | 78 |  |  | , |  |  |
| 1964 | $138,135$ | 1963-64 | 134,623 |  |  |  |  |  | 68 | 106 | 109 | 113 | 124 | 142 | 136 | 140 | 128 | $126 \mid$ | 114 | 110 | 113 | 109 | 100 | 93 | 82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 9. Duration-specific Divorce Rate (per 10,000), Canada, Marriage Cohorts 1943-44 to 1984-85 - Concluded

| Year | Number of Marriages per Calendar Year | Marriage Cohort | Cohort <br> Marriages | Marriage Duration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Year of Observation | Total Divorce Index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |  |
| 1965 | 145,519 | 1964-65 | 141,827 |  |  |  |  | 61 | 98 | 112 | 121 | 134 | 150 | 1531 | 153 | 139 | 134 | 124 | 1171 | 118 | 113 | 100 | 96 | 91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1965-66 | 150,557 |  |  |  | 42 | 931 | 112 | 128 | 1431 | 156 | 162 | 163 | 148 | 137 | 130 | 120 | 1211 | 115 | 112 | 101 | 92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1966 | 155,596 | 1966-67 | 160,737 |  |  | 31 | 681 | 1021 | 12613 | 139 | 1661 | 17717 | 171 | 155 | 145 | 136 | 132 | 1301 | 1281 | 117 | 105 | 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1967 | 165,879 | 1967-68 | 168,823 |  | 17 | 49 | 75 | 1151 | 1421 | 162 | 1831 | 1731 | 165 | 156 | 151 | 136 | 138 | 138 | 1171 | 109 | 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1968 | 171,766 | 1968-69 | 176,974 | 3 | 22 | 53 | 83 | 122 | 1581 | 182 | 184 | 171 | 165 | 160 | 152 | 147 | 144 | 132 | 111 | 103 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 182,183 | 1969-70 | 185,305 | 3 | 25 | 55 | 92 | 151 | 1771 | 192 | 1921 | 176\|17 | 174 | 163 | 162 | 157 | 139 | 128 | 112 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 188,428 | 1970-71 | 189,876 | 4 | 28 | 61 | 1061 | 161 | 1861 | 189 | 191 | 1841 | 180 | 172 | 166 | 150 | 130 | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1971 | 191,324 | 1971-72 | 195,907 | 4 | 33 | 74 | 1171 | 174 | 1931 | 196 | 1971 | 191 | 187 | 185 | 168 | 144 | 125 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1972 1973 | 199,064 | 1972-73 | 199,777 | 5 | 36 | 83 | 129 | 1812 | 2032 | 212 | 2032 | 2052 | 204 | 180 | 155 | 135 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1973 |  | 1973-74 | 198,944 | 5 | 44 | 94 | 136 | 184 | 2132 | 223 | 228 | 218 | 189 | 168 | 146 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1974 | 198,824 | 1974-75 | 198,205 | 6 | 52 | 104 | 147 | 199 | 224 | 243 | 232 | 214 | 185 | 162 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 197,585 | 1975-76 | 195,464 | 8 | 59 | 111 | 161 | 208 | 2342 | 246 | 226 | 193 | 167 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 1977 | 187,344 | 1976-77 | 190,343 | 8 | 63 | 116 | 166 | 223 | 2502 | 238 | 209 | 180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 1978 | 185,523 | 1977-78 | 186,434 | 7 | 65 | 117 | 165 | 237 | 2512 | 220 | 198 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1978 1979 | 187,811 | 1978-79 | 186,667 | 8 | 64 | 173 | 187 | 228 | 225 | 210 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1979 |  | 1979-80 | 189,440 | 8 | 68 | 137 | 178 | 207 | 212 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 1981 | 191,069 | 1980-81 | 190,575 | 9 | 74 | 133 | 157 | 190 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 1982 | 188,360 | 1981-82 | 188,217 | 10 | 69 | 120 | 147 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 1983 | 184,675 | 1982-83 | 186,518 | 9 | 67 | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1983 |  | 1983-84 | 185,136 | 9 | 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1985$ | 185,597 | 1984-85 | 184,846 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

slowly, however, as indicated by the small difference between the 1984 and 1983 figures. This was an increase in number, however, and should not be interpreted as an increase in the propensity to bear children. The crude birth rate, in fact, declined to 14.8 per thousand in 1985 from 15.3 in 1981, and the single most important measure of the level of fertility, the total fertility rate (TFR), currently stands at 1.67 births per woman, essentially the same as the 1981 value of 1.70 (Table A16). The precipitous decline in the TFR in Canada since 1959 has given way to a recent stability, with a pattern of minor fluctuations resembling that of most European countries in this regard.

Chart 9
Total Fertility Rates, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1970-1985


Table 10. Distribution of Persons Living in Common-Law Unions by Age, Canada, Based on 1981 Census Data

| Age Groups | Males |  |  | Females |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Common-law | Total Now <br> Married | Ratio $=$ <br> $(1)$ <br> $\div(2) \times 100$ | Common-law <br> Total Now <br> Married | Ratio $=$ <br> $(1)$ <br> $\div(2) \times 100$ |  |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ |  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ |  |
| $15-19$ | 7,900 | 13,900 | 56.83 | 32,000 | 66,900 | 47.83 |
| $20-24$ | 83,200 | 306,600 | 27.14 | 108,900 | 524,400 | 20.77 |
| $25-29$ | 87,100 | 676,600 | 12.87 | 77,000 | 785,300 | 9.80 |
| $30-34$ | 60,400 | 791,900 | 7.63 | 46,900 | 807,600 | 5.81 |
| $35-39$ | 37,700 | 678,900 | 5.55 | 29,200 | 655,100 | 4.46 |
| $40-44$ | 24,000 | 562,100 | 4.27 | 18,100 | 536,900 | 3.37 |
| $45-49$ | 17,400 | 528,200 | 3.29 | 13,100 | 494,400 | 2.65 |
| $50-54$ | 12,900 | 509,300 | 2.53 | 10,200 | 477,000 | 2.14 |
| $55-59$ | 8,900 | 465,600 | 1.91 | 7,200 | 443,000 | 1.62 |
| $60-64$ | 5,600 | 374,400 | 1.50 | 4,600 | 333,900 | 1.38 |
| $65-69$ | 3,700 | 306,300 | 1.21 | 2,700 | 244,100 | 1.11 |
| $70+$ | 3,400 | 397,800 | 0.85 | 2,400 | 243,000 | 0.99 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 5 2 , 2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 6 1 1 , 5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 2 8}$ | 352,200 | $\mathbf{5 , 6 1 1 , 5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 2 8}$ |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

A comparison between Canada and the United States indicates very little difference in total fertility rate. The slightly higher rate for the white U.S. population (a TFR of 1.72) does not represent a significant difference, and the rate for the total population (1.81), is due to the fact that the non-white segment has, at 2.22 , an appreciably higher TFR (Table 13).

Even though not substantial, some provincial differences in fertility exist in Canada. Briefly, the 1985 figures indicate a slightly lower fertility rate in the East, and a higher rate in the West, with Ontario at the fulcrum, almost exactly representing the national average (Chart 9). Quebec, however, deserves special attention since in 1985 this province had the lowest TFR of any province or territory in Canadian history. Since 1978, the national TFR has decreased at a rate of 1.6 percent per annum; in Quebec the decline has been 4.8 percent. At 1.43, the TFR in Quebec pulls down the national average, which, if Quebec were excluded, would approach 1.76 births per woman (Table 13).

Examination of fertility by birth order and age of mother affords an opportunity to gain a better understanding of the difference between Quebec and the other Canadian provinces. In the recent past, the TFR's by birth order for the rest of Canada became relatively stable, and, if there was any trend, it was towards a slight tendency to increase (Table 13). For Quebec, on the

Table 11. Births by Province, 1981-1985

| Province | Year |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1981 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
| Newfoundland | 10,130 | 9,173 | 8,929 | 8,560 | 8,500 |
| Prince Edward Island | 1,897 | 1,924 | 1,907 | 1,954 | 2,008 |
| Nova Scotia | 12,079 | 12,325 | 12,401 | 12,378 | 12,450 |
| New Brunswick | 10,503 | 10,489 | 10,518 | 10,360 | 10,121 |
| Quebec | 95,322 | 90,800 | 88,154 | 87,839 | 86,340 |
| Ontario | 122,183 | 124,856 | 126,826 | 131,296 | 132,208 |
| Manitoba | 16,073 | 16,123 | 16,602 | 16,651 | 17,097 |
| Saskatchewan | 17,209 | 17,722 | 17,847 | 18,014 | 18,162 |
| Alberta | 42,638 | 45,036 | 45,555 | 44,105 | 43,813 |
| British Columbia | 41,474 | 42,747 | 42,919 | 43,911 | 43,127 |
| Yukon | 536 | 525 | 540 | 519 | 464 |
| Northwest Territories | 1,302 | 1,362 | 1,491 | 1,444 | 1,437 |
| Canada | 371,346 | 373,082 | 373,689 | 377,031 | 375,727 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Births and Deaths, Catalogue 84-204.

Table 12. Total Fertility Rate (TFR) and Age-specific Fertility Rate of Mothers, by Race of Child, United States, 1976-1984

| Year | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | TFR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Per 1,000 Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 44.1 | 105.3 | 105.9 | 52.6 | 17.8 | 3.9 | 1.652 |
| 1977 | 44.1 | 107.7 | 110.9 | 55.3 | 18.0 | 3.8 | 1.703 |
| 1978 | 42.9 | 104.1 | 107.9 | 56.6 | 17.7 | 3.5 | 1.668 |
| 1979 | 43.7 | 107.0 | 110.8 | 59.0 | 18.3 | 3.5 | 1.716 |
| 1980 | 44.7 | 109.5 | 112.4 | 60.4 | 18.5 | 3.4 | 1.748 |
| 1981 | 44.6 | 106.3 | 111.3 | 60.2 | 18.7 | 3.4 | 1.726 |
| 1982 | 44.6 | 105.9 | 110.3 | 63.3 | 20.0 | 3.5 | 1.742 |
| 1983 | 43.6 | 102.6 | 108.0 | 64.0 | 21.0 | 3.5 | 1.718 |
| 1984 | 42.5 | 101.4 | 107.7 | 66.1 | 21.7 | 3.5 | 1.718 |
|  | Non-white Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 99.9 | 138.9 | 107.6 | 59.5 | 26.9 | 6.9 | 2.222 |
| 1977 | 99.5 | 142.3 | 111.5 | 63.4 | 27.3 | 6.9 | 2.278 |
| 1978 | 96.0 | 142.1 | 111.9 | 65.2 | 26.9 | 6.4 | 2.264 |
| 1979 | 96.5 | 144.3 | 114.6 | 68.3 | 27.3 | 6.4 | 2.310 |
| 1980 | 94.6 | 145.0 | 115.5 | 70.8 | 27.9 | 6.5 | 2.323 |
| 1981 | 91.8 | 140.8 | 115.9 | 68.5 | 27.6 | 6.3 | 2.274 |
| 1982 | 91.5 | 139.3 | 114.9 | 69.0 | 28.0 | 6.2 | 2.265 |
| 1983 | 89.3 | 136.8 | 112.1 | 68.4 | 28.6 | 5.9 | 2.225 |
| 1984 | 89.0 | 136.4 | 111.5 | 68.5 | 29.2 | 6.0 | 2.224 |
|  | All Races |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 52.8 | 110.3 | 106.2 | 53.6 | 19.0 | 4.3 | 1.738 |
| 1977 | 52.8 | 112.9 | 111.0 | 56.4 | 19.2 | 4.2 | 1.790 |
| 1978 | 51.5 | 109.9 | 108.5 | 57.8 | 19.0 | 3.9 | 1.760 |
| 1979 | 52.3 | 112.8 | 111.4 | 60.3 | 19.5 | 3.9 | 1.808 |
| 1980 | 53.0 | 115.1 | 112.9 | 61.9 | 19.8 | 3.9 | 1.840 |
| 1981 | 52.7 | 111.8 | 112.0 | 61.4 | 20.0 | 3.8 | 1.815 |
| 1982 | 52.9 | 111.3 | 111.0 | 64.2 | 21.1 | 3.9 | 1.828 |
| 1983 | 51.7 | 108.3 | 108.7 | 64.6 | 22.1 | 3.8 | 1.802 |
| 1984 | 50.9 | 107.3 | 108.3 | 66.5 | 22.8 | 3.9 | 1.805 |

Source: NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS (1984). Monthly Vital Statistics Report. Vol. 35, No. 4, supplement: Advance Report on Final Natality Statistics, 1984. Hyattsville: Public Health Service.
other hand, the rates declined uniformly. The maternal age and birth orderspecific rates declined at the national level (including in Quebec) for all ages up to and including 25 . For ages over 25 , the rates for the remainder of Canadian women increased (indicating a "catch-up" effect at older ages), whereas those for Quebec women over age 25 continued to decline. Thus, for Quebec, the TFR at all ages and birth orders has been decreasing.

The only notable change in the 1985 figures involves an increase in the fertility of Quebec women over age 25 at birth order 1 . The increase was too small, however, to have had any impact on the decline in the overall TFR for Quebec.

In summary, there does not appear to be any indication that fertility is on the rise in Canada. On the other hand, the decline appears to have slowed, or even stopped. With the exception of Quebec, the national picture shows very little variation. Part of the small overall change in the recent period can be attributed to a change in tempo, whereby an apparent delay in childbearing has produced the effect that some births, and even some first births, are occurring later than they did among previous generations of Canadians.

## MORTALITY

## Introduction

The stabilization of the crude death rate at 7 per 1,000 in recent years has occurred at the same time that the population has been aging, reflecting the overall reduction in mortality in Canada. Differences in the crude death rate between provinces can largely be attributed to different age structures. The provinces with older populations (Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Manitoba) have relatively high rates in comparison with those parts of the country with younger populations (Newfoundland, Alberta, and in particular, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories). In 1982, however, Saskatchewan had an unusually high rate, the origin of which was an increase of almost 700 deaths from the previous year. The return of the crude death rate to the 1981 level in 1983 and 1984 confirmed the existence of an anomaly, and subsequent analysis of deaths by cause revealed that deaths associated with respiratory problems, which mainly affect the elderly, accounted for $70 \%$ of this isolated increase.

## Unexpected Changes

The best description of the current state of mortality is provided by the life table, from which the most widely known indicators - expectation of life at different ages, and especially at birth - are taken.

Table 13. Age-specific Fertility Rates by Birth Order, Quebec and Canada Excluding Quebec and Newfoundland, 1981-1985

| Order | Year | 15-19 |  | 20-24 |  | 25-29 |  | 30-34 |  | 35-39 |  | 40-44 |  | Total Fertility Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) |
| 1 | 1981 | 13.1 | 24.6 | 57.4 | 54.4 | 55.4 | 47.7 | 16.6 | 16.8 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 732.5 | 738.0 |
|  | 1982 | 13.1 | 24.7 | 54.4 | 54.6 | 50.7 | 48.4 | 15.9 | 17.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 692.5 | 749.5 |
|  | 1983 | 12.6 | 23.0 | 53.1 | 53.1 | 51.3 | 49.4 | 16.3 | 19.2 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 688.0 | 748.5 |
|  | 1984 | 13.8 | 24.4 | 52.3 | 54.2 | 50.0 | 50.3 | 15.6 | 20.1 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 680.1 | 769.6 |
|  | 1985 | 12.7 | 22.2 | 48.1 | 49.6 | 51.2 | 51.2 | 17.1 | 21.4 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 667.4 | 748.6 |
| 2 | 1981 | 1.6 | 4.4 | 25.1 | 32.2 | 54.1 | 47.0 | 28.1 | 24.9 | 6.2 | 5.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 578.5 | 574.0 |
|  | 1982 | 1.6 | 4.4 | 23.5 | 31.5 | 50.4 | 46.5 | 26.0 | 26.0 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 539.5 | 575.5 |
|  | 1983 | 1.6 | 4.2 | 22.6 | 30.8 | 48.8 | 46.9 | 25.4 | 27.3 | 5.3 | 6.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 521.5 | 582.5 |
|  | 1984 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 23.2 | 32.4 | 48.8 | 48.4 | 26.0 | 28.3 | 5.4 | 6.9 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 528.9 | 606.0 |
|  | 1985 | 1.7 | 4.2 | 21.0 | 30.0 | 48.3 | 49.7 | 26.5 | 30.8 | 5.8 | 7.8 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 519.4 | 616.4 |
| 3 | 1981 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 4.6 | 8.6 | 17.7 | 19.7 | 16.9 | 15.6 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 223.0 | 248.5 |
|  | 1982 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 8.6 | 16.1 | 19.9 | 14.8 | 16.0 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 203.5 | 254.0 |
|  | 1983 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 8.2 | 15.0 | 19.7 | 14.2 | 16.3 | 4.1 | 5.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 189.5 | 253.0 |
|  | 1984 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 8.6 | 14.2 | 19.9 | 13.5 | 17.0 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 182.1 | 259.2 |
|  | 1985 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 3.7 | 8.2 | 14.0 | 20.2 | 13.4 | 17.9 | 4.3 | 5.9 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 180.6 | 267.0 |
| 4 | 1981 | - | - | 0.6 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 5.6 | 2.3 |  |  |  | 54.5 |  |
|  | 1982 | - | - | 0.6 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 5.3 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 52.0 | 79.5 |
|  | 1983 | - | - | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 48.0 | 78.5 |
|  | 1984 | - | - | 0.6 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 5.5 | 3.6 | 5.7 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 43.8 | -9.2 |
|  | 1985 | - | - | 0.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 6.2 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 43.4 | 82.9 |
| 5 and over | 1981 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 23.5 | 45.5 |
|  | 1982 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 22.0 | 44.5 |
|  | 1983 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 20.0 | 42.0 |
|  | 1984 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 17.9 | 41.4 |
|  | 1985 | - | - | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 16.8 | 41.6 |
| All | 1981 | 14.9 | 29.4 | 87.8 | 97.2 | 131.0 | 121.5 | 67.8 | 66.1 | 18.2 | 19.3 | 2.7 | 3.3 | $1612.0^{1}$ | $1684.0{ }^{1}$ |
| Orders | 1982 | 14.8 | 29.6 | 83.1 | 96.7 | 121.1 | 122.0 | 62.4 | 68.6 | 17.9 | 20.5 | 2.6 | 3.2 | $1509.5^{1}$ | 1703.01 |
|  | 1983 | 14.3 | 27.6 | 80.4 | 93.9 | 118.6 | 123.1 | 61.2 | 71.7 | 16.5 | 21.5 | 2.4 | 3.1 | $1467.0^{1}$ | $1704.51$ |
|  | 1984 | 15.8 | 29.4 | 80.1 | 97.1 | 116.2 | 125.9 | 60.0 | 74.1 | 16.2 | 21.4 | 2.2 | 3.0 | $1452.8{ }^{1}$ | $1771.5^{1}$ |
|  | 1985 | 14.5 | 26.9 | 73.4 | 89.6 | 116.6 | 128.5 | 61.8 | 79.3 | 17.0 | 23.6 | 2.2 | 3.4 | $1427.7^{1}$ | 1756.51 |

(A) Quebec.
(B) Canada excluding Quebec and Newfoundland.

INot including births where age of mother and/or birth order are unknown.
Source: Statistics Canada, Special Tabulations.

After a rapid rise in the value of life expectancy at birth until about 1956, the rate of improvement for Canadian males slowed considerably, leading many demographers around the 1960 's to predict that further gains would be progressively less significant. The substantial gains made during the second half of the 1970's were, therefore, largely unexpected. Nonetheless, the provisional tables calculated for the early years of the 1980's seem to indicate that the pattern of increase is being maintained (Table 4).

The evolution of life expectancy for females has been different. Until recently, female gains were greater than those for males, even though females also experienced a slowdown during the 1960's. In the most recent period, however, the change for females was not as pronounced as that for males. Consequently, the 1976-81 period saw, for the first time, the 5-year gain in life expectancy for males exceed that for females (Chart 10).

Chart 10
Increase in Life Expectancy at Birth
by Five-Year Intervals, Canada, 1931-1981


Source: Table A12.

In the period up to the mid-1970s, the largest part of the gains in life expectancy for both sexes were the result of declines in infant mortality, with the gains made at other ages providing a relatively smaller contribution. Progress in the area of infant mortality has by no means stopped, but the impact of the changes made in recent years has become weaker and is now overshadowed by improvements made at the more advanced ages. For example, females made a gain of 2.28 years in life expectancy at birth between 1946 and 1951, of which 19 percent was attributable to mortality reduction in the first year of life. In contrast, the percent attributable reduction for those aged 65 to 80 was only 11 percent. Between 1976 and 1981, however, the figures changed to 18 and 23 percent, respectively. The situation for males is even more striking, with the reduction in infant mortality accounting for 39 percent of the gain between 1946 and 1951, while the figure for the 65 to 80 group was only 8 percent. Between 1976 and 1981 the corresponding percentages were 16 and 18 , respectively.

The gains in life expectancy at younger ages are only slightly less remarkable. Here again, the life table provides a clear indication. Out of 100,000 life table males subject to the risk of dying at various ages in 1946, fully 64,613 were still living at age 65 . For 1981 , the figure had increased to 74,718 - representing an increment of more than 10,000 (or $16 \%$ ).

## Infant Mortality

Infant mortality has declined almost without interruption since the collection of information on the subject began. Over the past ten years, the rate has again dropped by almost $50 \%$ (Chart 11). With a rate of 7.9 per 1,000 in 1985, Canada's rate is lower than that in the United States (10.8 in 1984) and most of the countries of Western Europe, with the exception of Sweden.

Quebec, which once had the highest provincial rate of infant mortality, now has the lowest rate in Canada. This, above all, is the result of very low postneonatal mortality ( 2.1 per thousand live births in Quebec vs. 3.0 for Canada overall, in 1984). When such low levels are reached, annual variations should come as no surprise. For the most part, they reflect random fluctuations as a function of the small numbers involved.

Neonatal mortality (deaths in the first month of life), while more resistant to the efforts of the sciences, is also declining throughout Canada. The 1984 Quebec rate equalled the national average for neonatal infant mortality (5.2 per thousand), but the lowest rate was found in New Brunswick (4.0).

## Causes of Death by Province: Changes over Ten Years

Description of mortality in terms of cause by province is generally of limited interest due to the high mobility of the population. Provincial measurements are made for the purpose of comparison, and such comparisons give rise to
questions. The matter of genetic inheritance aside, these questions relate mainly to life styles (work and so on) and to the effectiveness of a province's health and medical services. Deaths, however, are classified by the deceased person's place of residence, and there is no indication how long the person had been living there. There is a great deal of interprovincial migration, and it is known that such migration can be directly or indirectly based, to some extent, on health considerations. Therefore, in principle, a province's mortality level cannot be closely linked to the effectiveness of its medical system. If decennial

Chart 11
Infant Mortality Rate Per 1,000 Live Births, Canada, 1931-1985

measurements based on standardized rates are compared, however, the provincial mortality levels by major causes of death yield interesting information7. Table A14 shows the 1983 number and percentage distributions for the major causes of death by province and territory, and for Canada overall. Detailed discussion of standardized mortality rates by cause, province and time period follows below.


#### Abstract

Cancer Table 14 shows that there has been little change in the pattern of cancer mortality for Canada as a whole over the 10 -year period from 1972-73 to 1982-83. Only very small changes in an upward direction for males, and in a downward direction for females, occurred. As far as males are concerned, Quebec has the highest provincial rate - appreciably higher than the national average - while the westernmost provinces (Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia) have distinctly lower rates. Whereas the respective positions of the provinces changed very little in ten years, the level in each has risen appreciably so in New Brunswick and Saskatchewan. For females, the slight decrease at the national level is the result of decreases in only a few provinces, Quebec in particular. The fact that Quebec has the lowest mortality connected with uterine and breast cancer has played a major role in the maintenance of a low overall rate of cancer in that province. Nova Scotia experienced an increase over the ten-year period, and now has the highest provincial rate.


> It should be noted that mortality connected with cancer of the respiratory system has increased appreciably at the national level. Male deaths from cancers of this kind have increased from 50 to more than 60 per 100,000 in ten years (Table 15). All of the provinces, at various levels, have experienced increases. New Brunswick had one of the lowest rates ten years ago, but has experienced the most rapid increase. Quebec has by far the highest rate of all the provinces ( 77.5 per 100,000 ). Next in line is Nova Scotia, with a rate of only 63.3. The high mortality rate from this type of cancer is solely responsible for Quebec's high mortality rate for all types of cancer combined.

> For the female population, the ten-year period saw a large increase in respiratory system cancer. Fortunately, the level was low to begin with. However, if this cause of death continues to advance in the next ten years

[^8]Table 14. Standardized Mortality Rates ${ }^{1}$ (per $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0 )}$ for Cancer, Canada, the Provinces and Territories, 1972-73 and 1982-83
For 1972-1973 - Causes 45 to 61, List A (8th revision)
For 1982-1983 - Causes 37 to 93, List A (9th revision)


[^9]Table 15. Standardized Mortality Rates ${ }^{1}$ (per $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ ) for Cancers of the Larynx and Bronchial Tubes, Canada, the Provinces and Territories, 1972-73 and 1982-83

For 1972-1973 - Causes 50 and 51, List A (8th revision)
For 1982-1983 - Causes 56 and 57, List A (9th revision)

| Province | Males |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change <br> (\%) | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change$(\%)$ |
|  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  |
| Newfoundland | 6 | 37.9 | 5 | 57.8 | 52.5 | 10 | 5.6 | 10 | 10.0 | 78.6 |
| Prince Edward Island ${ }^{2}$ | 8 | 36.0 | 6 | 55.5 | 54.2 | 9 | 6.8 | 9 | 10.7 | 57.4 |
| Nova Scotia | 3 | 47.6 | 2 | 63.3 | 33.0 | 3 | 10.4 | 4 | 17.4 | 67.3 |
| New Brunswick | 9 | 35.3 | 3 | 62.2 | 76.2 | 6 | 9.5 | 5 | 16.2 | 70.5 |
| Quebec | 1 | 57.4 | 1 | 77.5 | 35.0 | 2 | 10.7 | 7 | 15.1 | 41.1 |
| Ontario | 2 | 50.8 | 4 | 59.4 | 16.9 | 4 | 10.1 | 2 | 19.7 | 95.0 |
| Manitoba | 5 | 46.9 | 7 | 54.7 | 16.6 | 5 | 9.9 | 3 | 18.0 | 81.8 |
| Saskatchewan | 10 | 33.9 | 9 | 47.7 | 40.7 | 8 | 7.9 | 8 | 14.6 | 84.8 |
| Alberta | 7 | 36.6 | 10 | 46.6 | 27.3 | 7 | 9.1 | 6 | 16.0 | 75.8 |
| British Columbia | 4 | 47.2 | 8 | 51.4 | 8.9 | 1 | 12.6 | 1 | 21.7 | 72.2 |
| Yukon ${ }^{2}$ |  | 49.9 |  | 84.1 | 68.5 |  | ... |  | 26.8 | ... |
| Northwest Territories ${ }^{2}$ |  | 62.2 |  | 87.2 | 40.2 |  | 53.0 |  | 60.5 | 14.2 |
| Canada |  | 49.2 |  | 61.4 | 24.8 |  | 10.2 |  | 18.5 | 81.4 |
| Coefficent of Variation ${ }^{3}$ (\%) |  | 18.9 |  | 15.6 |  |  | 21.9 |  | 22.8 |  |

[^10]as it has in the past ten, the rate in 1993 will be 34 per 100,000, almost the same as the 1973 provincial rate for males in the least affected provinces. Nearly all studies have linked smoking with these types of cancer, and while smoking was not a widespread phenomenon among earlier generations of females, increases have been noted more recently. The increase in mortality connected with respiratory system cancers can, therefore, be regarded as being a consequence of the increased propensity to smoke observed within the female population. Cancer has a long latency period, and the number of women who smoke is still growing. Of interest is the fact that the rank order of the provinces, for both 1973 and 1983, is not the same for females and males. For females, British Columbia has the highest rate, followed closely by Ontario, where the rate almost doubled in ten years.

## Cardiovascular Diseases

(a) Ischaemic heart diseases

Ischaemic heart diseases have been on the decline in North America in the past several years. The death rate for this group of causes for the country as a whole is less than three-quarters what it was ten years ago, for both males and females (Table 16). Quite unexpectedly, the rate for females is the same as that for cancer mortality, whereas historically, the cardiovascular rate was distinctly higher. The size of the decrease has been almost the same for both sexes and in all provinces. However, attention should be called to the following:

- the distinctly smaller reduction in both the male and female rates in Newfoundland;
- the particularly large reduction in the female rate in Quebec and British Columbia, and;
- the generally low level in Western Canada.
(b) Cerebrovascular diseases

As with deaths from ischaemic heart diseases, deaths from cerebrovascular diseases have decreased significantly in all provinces. Although Newfoundland still has the highest provincial rate, it is also the province that has made the most progress (Table 17). The differences between the provinces are currently very small (coefficients of variation of $12.6 \%$ for males and $8.6 \%$ for females).

## Traffic Accidents

Traffic accident mortality rates for males have always been higher than those for females, but both have decreased dramatically (more than $40 \%$ ) at the national level in the ten-year period represented in Table 18. All of the provinces

Table 16. Standardized Mortality Rates ${ }^{1}$ (per $\mathbf{1 0 0}, \mathbf{0 0 0}$ ) for Ischaemic Heart Disease, Canada, the Provinces and Territories, 1972-73 and 1982-83

For 1972-1973 - Causes 83, List A (8th revision)
For 1982-1983 - Causes 136 to 139, List A (9th revision)

| Province | Males |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change <br> (\%) | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change <br> (\%) |
|  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  |
| Newfoundland | 6 | 264.7 | 4 | 226.6 | -14.4 | 4 | 182.0 | 1 | 167.5 | -8.0 |
| Prince Edward Island ${ }^{2}$ | 2 | 317.6 | 1 | 237.3 | -25.3 | 7 | 167.8 | 7 | 121.4 | -27.7 |
| Nova Scotia | 3 | 311.8 | 3 | 228.5 | -26.7 | 5 | 178.2 | 4 | 135.6 | -23.9 |
| New Brunswick | 4 | 307.2 | 5 | 225.5 | -26.6 | 3 | 183.0 | 3 | 137.2 | -25.0 |
| Quebec | 5 | 300.4 | 6 | 213.3 | -29.0 | 2 | 197.5 | 5 | 130.7 | -33.8 |
| Ontario | 1 | 325.1 | 2 | 230.6 | -29.1 | 1 | 208.8 | 2 | 153.0 | -26.7 |
| Manitoba | 8 | 251.8 | 7 | 206.7 | -17.9 | 8 | 157.6 | 6 | 128.4 | -18.5 |
| Saskatchewan | 10 | 214.1 | 10 | 180.2 | -15.8 | 10 | 130.0 | 10 | 109.7 | -15.6 |
| Alberta | 9 | 232.5 | 9 | 184.6 | -20.6 | 9 | 146.0 | 9 | 114.1 | -21.8 |
| British Columbia | 7 | 255.8 | 8 | 185.3 | -27.6 | 6 | 171.4 | 8 | 116.6 | -32.0 |
| Yukon ${ }^{2}$ |  | 192.6 |  | 198.5 | 3.1 |  | 23.6 |  | 135.5 | (474.2) ${ }^{2}$ |
| Northwest Territories ${ }^{2}$ |  | 153.0 |  | 110.7 | -27.6 |  | 51.9 |  | 25.6 | -50.7 |
| Canada |  | 288.9 |  | 213.3 | -26.2 |  | 189.7 |  | 136.7 | -27.9 |
| Coefficent of Variation ${ }^{3}$ (\%) |  | 14.1 |  | 10.1 |  |  | 13.6 |  | 13.7 |  |

[^11]Table 17. Standardized Mortality Rates ${ }^{1}$ (per $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0 )}$ for Cerebrovascular Disease, Canada, the Provinces and Territories, 1972-73 and 1982-83
For 1972-1973 - Cause 85, List A (8th revision)
For 1982-1983 - Causes 149 to 155, List A (9th revision)

| Province | Males |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change <br> (\%) | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change <br> (\%) |
|  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  |
| Newfoundland | 1 | 106.9 | 1 | 55.9 | -47.7 | 1 | 112.5 | 1 | 64.6 | -42.6 |
| Prince Edward Island ${ }^{2}$ | 5 | 75.7 | 10 | 34.4 | -54.6 | 8 | 78.0 | 10 | 46.7 | -40.1 |
| Nova Scotia | 2 | 84.1 | 3 | 48.1 | -42.8 | 2 | 98.3 | 2 | 59.6 | -39.4 |
| New Brunswick | 6 | 69.7 | 5 | 46.3 | -33.6 | 6 | 80.3 | 9 | 52.1 | -35.1 |
| Quebec | 3 | 80.4 | 2 | 49.3 | -38.7 | 3 | 83.3 | 5 | 54.1 | -35.1 |
| Ontario | 4 | 75.9 | 4 | 46.6 | -38.6 | 4 | 83.3 | 3 | 56.5 | -32.2 |
| Manitoba | 9 | 63.1 | 6 | 46.3 | -26.6 | 9 | 77.8 | 7 | 53.6 | -31.1 |
| Saskatchewan | 10 | 63.0 | 8 | 42.7 | -32.2 | 10 | 71.7 | 6 | 54.1 | -24.5 |
| Alberta | 7 | 64.0 | 9 | 40.2 | -37.2 | 7 | 78.9 | 4 | 55.6 | -29.5 |
| British Columbia | 8 | 64.0 | 7 | 44.2 | -30.9 | 5 | 80.6 | 8 | 52.5 | -34.9 |
| Yukon ${ }^{2}$ |  | 14.2 |  | 9.4 | -33.8 |  | 31.8 |  | 28.1 | -11.6 |
| Northwest Territories ${ }^{2}$ |  | 69.5 |  | 22.8 | -67.2 |  | 36.2 |  | 9.5 | -73.8 |
| Canada |  | 73.0 |  | 46.4 | -36.4 |  | 83.5 |  | 55.2 | -33.9 |
| Coefficent of Variation ${ }^{3}$ (\%) |  | 18.3 |  | 12.6 |  |  | 14.2 |  | 8.6 |  |

[^12]Table 18. Standardized Mortality Rates ${ }^{1}$ (per $\mathbf{1 0 0}, \mathbf{0 0 0}$ ) for Traffic Accidents, Canada, the Provinces and Territories, 1972-73 and 1982-83

For 1972-1973 - Causes AE 138, List A (8th revision)
For 1982-1983 - Causes AE 235 to 241, List A (9th revision)

| Province | Males |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change(\%) | 1972-1973 |  | 1982-1983 |  | Change <br> (\%) |
|  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  | Rank | Rate | Rank | Rate |  |
| Newfoundland | 10 | 29.0 | 8 | 24.0 | -17.2 | 9 | 13.3 | 8 | 8.4 | -36.8 |
| Prince Edward Island ${ }^{2}$ | 2 | 53.9 | 5 | 28.0 | -48.1 | 1 | 26.1 | 9 | 7.9 | -69.7 |
| Nova Scotia | 4 | 50.5 | 3 | 30.5 | -39.6 | 7 | 15.3 | 5 | 10.3 | -32.7 |
| New Brunswick | 1 | 57.3 | 2 | 33.6 | -41.4 | 3 | 18.4 | 2 | 11.8 | -35.9 |
| Quebec | 3 | 51.3 | 7 | 25.0 | -51.3 | 2 | 18.9 | 7 | 8.9 | -52.9 |
| Ontario | 8 | 37.1 | 10 | 20.3 | -45.3 | 8 | 13.4 | 10 | 7.7 | -42.5 |
| Manitoba | 9 | 31.4 | 9 | 21.2 | -32.5 | 10 | 11.6 | 6 | 9.5 | -18.1 |
| Saskatchewan | 7 | 40.9 | 1 | 36.8 | -10.0 | 5 | 16.6 | 1 | 11.9 | -28.3 |
| Alberta | 6 | 45.7 | 6 | 26.5 | -42.0 | 6 | 15.8 | 3 | 11.8 | -25.3 |
| British Columbia | 5 | 48.8 | 4 | 30.2 | -38.1 | 4 | 18.3 | 4 | 11.4 | -37.7 |
| Yukon ${ }^{2}$ |  | 91.8 |  | 34.2 | -62.7 |  | 22.5 |  | 42.0 | 86.7 |
| Northwest Territories ${ }^{2}$ |  | 51.6 |  | 48.3 | -6.4 |  | 15.2 |  | 5.3 | -65.1 |
| Canada |  | 43.8 |  | 24.9 | -43.2 |  | 16.1 |  | 9.3 | -42.2 |
| Coefficent of Variation ${ }^{3}$ (\%) |  | 21.6 |  | 19.1 |  |  | 24.3 |  | 17.0 |  |

[^13]participated in the decrease, however, the reduction was relatively small in Newfoundland and Saskatchewan, and was largest in Quebec (51\%). In 1983, Ontario had the lowest rate.

In short, after ten years of fighting the main causes of death, regional differences still remain in Canada. The convergence of the coefficients of variation at the bottom of the various tables, however, indicates a reduction in regional disparities, in keeping with that observed for other sociodemographic phenomena.

## Suicide

Suicide, is a cause of death that has always attracted a great deal of attention, and on which a close eye has been kept. Care must be taken, however, to distinguish suicide from attempted suicide. Vital statistics tell us only how many people have died through suicide. In this context, comparison of the average for 1980-1981 with that for 1984-85 reveals a few changes, but no major transformations. In considering the age-specific trend in suicide mortality since 1981 (Table 19), with the exception of those in the oldest age group and the 45-49 age group (for which a slight decline is observed), the rates for males have increased only very slightly. As a result, the standardized rate rose from 27.5 in 1981 to 28.1 per 100,000 in 1984, but declined to 26.3 in 1985. The increase between 1981 and 1984 was certainly not negligible, but the term "epidemic" would be inappropriate, especially when considering the fact that the absolute number of suicides increased by only about 350 in the 1980 to 1983 period (1980: 2,534 cases; 1981: 2,570; 1982: 2,726; 1983: 2,885).

The increase in propensity to commit suicide observed in 1984 was part of an overall trend that had been evolving since the 1950's. The trend is in the other direction for females, for whom the standardized rate has tended to decrease ( 9.6 in 1976, 8.7 in 1981, 8.2 in 1984 and 7.1 in 1985). The rates are declining for women of almost all ages.

There are also marked differences among the provinces, especially for females, where the coefficients of variation were almost double those for males in both the 1972-73 and 1982-83 periods (Table 20). For both periods and both sexes, Newfoundland and British Columbia had the lowest and the highest rates respectively, and were far from the national average. The sharpest increases in suicide were noted for males, where the overall change was 19.1 percent over the ten-year period. Particularly noteworthy in this respect were: Newfoundland (57.7); New Brunswick (56.2), and; Québec (56.2). Among females, where the general trend is toward lower rates, Québec experienced an increase of 42.4 percent over the period.

Table 19. Age-specific Suicide Mortality Rates (per 100,000), Canada, 1950, 1976, 1981, 1984 and 1985

| Age Group | Sex | $1951{ }^{1}$ | $1976{ }^{1}$ | $1981^{1}$ | $1984{ }^{1}$ | $1985{ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-19 | M | 3.9 | 18.6 | 20.3 | 22.0 | 20.1 |
|  | F | 1.8 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| 20-24 | M | 8.8 | 33.6 | 32.1 | 33.0 | 31.4 |
|  | F | 3.2 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 5.0 | 4.7 |
| 25-29 | M | 7.6 | 28.1 | 28.9 | 31.0 | 27.7 |
|  | F | 3.9 | 8.6 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.3 |
| 30-34 | M | 10.4 | 24.3 | 26.6 | 29.0 | 26.5 |
|  | F | 3.8 | 10.4 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.2 |
| 35-39 | M | 13.2 | 25.2 | 24.7 | 24.5 | 23.9 |
|  | F | 4.6 | 10.9 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 7.5 |
| 40-44 | M | 19.6 | 27.3 | 26.2 | 28.0 | 25.3 |
|  | F | 6.4 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 11.5 | 9.6 |
| 45-49 | M | 21.6 | 29.3 | 29.1 | 22.5 | 24.9 |
|  | F | 7.2 | 14.0 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 9.6 |
| 50-54 | M | 26.4 | 32.7 | 29.7 | 30.0 | 30.2 |
|  | F | 8.3 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 11.5 | 9.9 |
| 55-59 | M | 27.2 | 26.6 | 29.6 | 32.0 | 29.5 |
|  | F | 7.3 | 13.7 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 9.8 |
| 60-64 | M | 30.8 | 24.1 | 27.2 | 29.0 | 25.1 |
|  | F | 9.0 | 11.9 | 11.2 | 11.0 | 8.8 |
| 65-69 | M | 28.2 | 24.3 | 26.8 | 26.0 | 24.2 |
|  | F | 9.3 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 11.5 | 8.8 |
| 70-74 | M | 29.5 | 26.3 | 30.1 | 30.5 | 29.2 |
|  | F | 6.3 | 8.4 | 9.3 | 8.0 | 7.0 |
| 75-79 | M | 32.8 | 24.9 | 34.4 | 35.0 | 28.1 |
|  | F | 5.9 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 6.0 | 5.8 |
| 80-84 | M | 25.1 | 21.2 | 41.7 | 36.5 | 32.4 |
|  | F | 2.0 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 8.0 | 5.0 |
| Standardized Rate ${ }^{2}$ | M | 15.7 | 26.5 | 27.5 | 28.1 | 26.3 |
|  | F | 5.2 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 7.1 |

[^14]Table 20. Standardized Mortality Rates ${ }^{1}$ (per $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0 )}$ for Suicide, Canada, the Provinces and Territories, 1972-73 and 1982-83
For 1972-1973 - Cause AE 147, List A (8th revision)
For 1982-1983 - Causes AE 264 to 270, List A (9th revision)


[^15]
## MIGRATION

## International Immigrants

Since the end of World War II, immigration to Canada has behaved in a cyclical fashion. The average period for each cycle has been eight or nine years, with peaks occurring in $1951(190,000), 1957(200,000), 1967$ and 1974 $(220,000)$, and in 1980 (a 'low peak'' of only 140,000) (Chart 12). The 1983 and 1984 lows mark a departure from the established trend, insofar as they stem from a decision in November 1982 to reduce immigration levels. The brunt of this cut was borne by the "independents" and the "assisted relatives" classes ${ }^{8}$, as the combined number of immigrants in these classes dropped in the succeeding years to about half that recorded in 1982 (Table 21). The "independents'" class generally contains most of those who plan to enter the labour force, and it was this group of immigrants, in particular, who were the target of the cut-back. The number of immigrants in the family class was virtually unchanged.

While all areas of origin ${ }^{9}$ were affected, some experienced more reductions than others. The European countries that have traditionally supplied most of the "selected workers" group of immigrants have experienced the largest decreases. This was particularly true in the case of Great Britain, from where 19,000 such immigrants originated in 1981, but only 14,500 in 1982, and less than 5,000 in 1983 and 1984 (Table 22). In contrast, because of the political upheaval that afflicted Poland, Canada admitted 4,000 Poles in 1981, 9,000 in 1982, and an additional 5,000 in each of 1983 and 1984. This compares with annual levels of only slightly over 1,000 in previous years.

The flow of immigrants from Asia was reduced less drastically (a decrease of $18 \%$ from 1981) with fewer coming from India and slightly more from Hong Kong. Since the beginning of the decade, progressively fewer have been immigrating from the United States, and the number of immigrants from the Caribbean and South American countries has also been gradually declining.

> The average age of immigrants has risen substantially over the past three years, to 31 for males and almost 33 for females (Table A15). This high average age stems from the selection process. Constricting the admissibility of "selected workers" reduces the admittance of young adults and their young children. At the same time, the "family class" is comprised of relatively older people who, consequently, account for a larger proportion of total immigrants. As a result, 1983 marked the first time ever that Canada admitted more persons over age 65 than under age 5 . Since the number of immigrants is small, however, the impact on the overall age structure of the Canadian population is not significant.

[^16]

Table 21. International Immigration by Major Classes, Canada, 1970-1985

| Year |  |  | Total |  | Family |  | Independent <br> Immigrants <br> and Assisted <br> Relatives |  | Refugees <br> and |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Designated <br> Classes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 147,713 | 32,263 | 21.8 | $115,450^{1}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |
| 1971 | 121,900 | 33,450 | 27.4 | $88,450^{1}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |
| 1972 | 122,006 | 33,019 | 27.1 | 83,807 | 68.7 | 5,180 | 4.2 |  |  |  |
| 1973 | 184,200 | 41,677 | 22.6 | 140,164 | 76.1 | 2,359 | 1.3 |  |  |  |
| 1974 | 218,465 | 54,232 | 24.8 | 162,567 | 74.4 | 1,666 | 0.8 |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 187,881 | 64,124 | 34.1 | 118,191 | 62.9 | 5,566 | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 149,429 | 60,830 | 40.7 | 76,848 | 51.4 | 11,751 | 7.9 |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 114,914 | 51,355 | 44.7 | 56,259 | 48.9 | 7,300 | 6.4 |  |  |  |
| 1978 | 86,313 | 45,540 | 52.8 | 36,518 | 42.3 | 4,255 | 4.9 |  |  |  |
| 1979 | 112,096 | 46,763 | 41.7 | 37,454 | 33.4 | 27,879 | 24.9 |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 143,129 | 51,039 | 35.7 | 51,744 | 36.2 | 40,334 | 28.2 |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 128,618 | 51,017 | 39.7 | 62,622 | 48.7 | 14,979 | 11.6 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 121,147 | 49,980 | 41.2 | 54,242 | 44.8 | 16,925 | 14.0 |  |  |  |
| 1983 | 89,157 | 48,698 | 54.6 | 26,492 | 29.7 | 13,967 | 15.7 |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 88,239 | 43,814 | 49.6 | 29,083 | 33.0 | 15,342 | 17.4 |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 84,302 | 38,514 | 45.7 | 29,028 | 34.4 | 16,760 | 19.9 |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ The "Refugees and designated classes" category did not exist at that time.
Source: Employment and Immigration Canada.

Despite the reduced immigration of "selected workers", 44 percent of all 1984 immigrants were employable, since a large number, primarily from the "family" and 'refugee" classes, are destined for the labour force. Relative to 1981, however, the numbers were down in every occupational category (except entrepreneurs), in some cases by as much as $50 \%$ (Table 23). The increase in the entrepreneur class is likely to continue in the future, since the 1984 Annual Report to Parliament on Future Immigration Levels ${ }^{10}$ stresses the economic benefits of recruiting entrepreneurs, because entrepreneurs create jobs. Furthermore, the new category "investors" has been added alongside "selected workers" and "entrepreneurs" in the business immigration programme, in order to attract persons willing to make at least a three-year capital investment.

[^17]Table 22. Immigrant Population by Country of Birth, 1968-1985

|  | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Europe | 118,791 | 87.842 | 75,006 | 52.733 | 51.175 | 70,080 | 84,780 | 68,733 | 49,470 | 40,967 | 30,003 | 32,633 | 40,210 | 44,784 | 44,356 | 23,664 | 20,581 | 18,530 |
| Great Britain | 33,814 | 28,790 | 23,688 | 14,230 | 16,637 | 23,533 | 33,088 | 29,454 | 19,257 | 16,634 | 10,698 | 11,806 | 16,445 | 18,912 | 14,525 | 4,945 | 4,657 | 3,998 |
| Portugal | 8,720 | 7,917 | 8,594 | 9,776 | 9,280 | 14,417 | 17,268 | 9,158 | 6,194 | 4,238 | 3,420 | 3,742 | 4,222 | 3,292 | 2,308 | 1,373 | 869 | 917 |
| France | 5,370 | 3,612 | 2,958 | 2,059 | 1,880 | 2,411 | 2,811 | 2,831 | 2,415 | 2,090 | 1,322 | 1,547 | 1,461 | 1,681 | 1,821 | 1,237 | 970 | 994 |
| Greece | 7,952 | 7,106 | 6,440 | 4,822 | 4,008 | 5,800 | 5,654 | 3,954 | 2,429 | 1,874 | 1,324 | 1,187 | 1,044 | 924 | 884 | 617 | 578 | 579 |
| Italy | 20,880 | 10,685 | 8,659 | 5,937 | 4,847 | 6,176 | 5,818 | 4,919 | 4,008 | 3,088 | 2,647 | 2,134 | 1,873 | 2,057 | 1,496 | 879 | 892 | 733 |
| Poland | 1,854 | 1,563 | 1,403 | 1,527 | 1,664 | 1,629 | 1,373 | 1,191 | 1,366 | 1,293 | 1,153 | 1,263 | 1,395 | 4,093 | 9,259 | 5,374 | 4,640 | 3,642 |
| Others | 40,201 | 28,163 | 23,264 | 14,382 | 12,859 | 16,114 | 18,768 | 17,226 | 13,801 | 11,750 | 9,439 | 10,954 | 13,770 | 13,825 | 14,063 | 9,239 | 7,975 | 7,667 |
| Africa | 7.002 | 5.953 | 4,017 | 3,463 | 8,504 | 9,977 | 12,792 | 11,715 | 8,617 | 6,595 | 4.561 | 4,412 | 5,383 | 5,901 | 5,196 | 3,913 | 3,851 | 3,912 |
| Asia | 23,775 | 24.451 | 23.682 | 24.230 | 25,938 | 46,777 | 55,290 | 52,024 | 46,482 | 32,904 | 25,332 | 51,740 | 73,026 | 50,759 | 43,863 | 38,183 | 42,730 | 39,438 |
| Philippines | 2,762 | 3,138 | 3,305 | 4,213 | 4,113 | 6,886 | 9,897 | 7,688 | 6,109 | 6,101 | 4,368 | 3,927 | 6,147 | 5,978 | 5,295 | 4,597 | 3,858 | 3,183 |
| India | 4,675 | 6,736 | 7,089 | 6,301 | 6,746 | 11,672 | 16,016 | 13,401 | 8,562 | 6,772 | 6,077 | 5,486 | 9,531 | 9,415 | 8,858 | 7,810 | 6,082 | 4,517 |
| Hong Kong (C.C.B.) | 3,353 | 3,353 | 2,250 | 2,581 | 3,396 | 9,155 | 7,673 | 6,438 | 6,442 | 3,903 | 2,825 | 3,548 | 3,874 | 4,039 | 4,452 | 4,238 | 5,013 | 5,121 |
| China | 5,401 | 5,610 | 3,397 | 3,694 | 3,813 | 6,842 | 6,581 | 6,235 | 6,003 | 4,037 | 3,181 | 5,821 | 8,965 | 9,798 | 6,295 | 5,321 | 5,769 | 5,166 |
| Others | 7,584 | 5,614 | 7,641 | 7,441 | 7,870 | 12,222 | 15,123 | 18,262 | 19,366 | 12,091 | 8,881 | 32,958 | 44,509 | 21,529 | 18,963 | 16,217 | 22,008 | 21,451 |
| North and Central America | 18,482 | 20,927 | 22,670 | 22,508 | 21,137 | 23,861 | 25,147 | 19,268 | 16.494 | 12.755 | 9.713 | 9.128 | 9,442 | 10,183 | 10,030 | 10,200 | 10,223 | 10,898 |
| USA | 17,076 | 19.258 | 20,859 | 20.723 | 19.176 | 21,391 | 22.454 | 16,729 | 14,278 | 10,723 | 8,254 | 7,821 | 8.098 | 8.695 | 7.841 | 6,136 | 5.727 | 5,614 |
| West Indies | 8.904 | 13,803 | 13.286 | 11,202 | 8.696 | 19,809 | 24,441 | 18,790 | 15,066 | 11,822 | 8,330 | 6,535 | 7.515 | 8,797 | 8,717 | 7.258 | 5,696 | 6,240 |
| Australasia | 4,145 | 3.523 | 3.462 | 2.182 | 1.646 | 1,893 | 1.928 | 1.574 | 1,367 | 1,147 | 944 | 1.068 | 1,215 | 1,020 | 758 | 394 | 430 | 399 |
| South America | 2,368 | 4,158 | 4,506 | 4,598 | 4,036 | 10,353 | 12,204 | 13,102 | 10,496 | 7.774 | 6,682 | 5,810 | 5,381 | 6,114 | 6,892 | 4,825 | 4,046 | 4,273 |
| Oceania | . | . | .. | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | .. | 1.882 | 2,675 | 1.437 | 950 | 724 | 736 | 944 | 1,024 | 1,183 | 720 | 599 | 612 |
| Others | 507 | 874 | 1,084 | 984 | 874 | 1,450 | . | . | . | . | 24 | 34 | 1 | 36 | 152 | - | 83 | - |
| Total | 183,974 | 161,531 | 147,713 | 121,900 | 122,006 | 184,200 | 218,465 | 187,881 | 149,429 | 114,914 | 86,313 | 112,096 | 143,117 | 128,6181 | 121,147 | $89,157^{1}$ | 88,239 | 84,302 |

1 The total differs from the sum of the column because of immigrants whose country of birth is unknown.
Source: Employment and Immigration Canada, Immigration Statistics, ISSN 0576-2286.

From a numerical standpoint, the growth of the Canadian population has always been heavily dependent upon international migration. One out of every six people enumerated in the 1981 Census was born outside Canada't, and two out of three among this group were born in Europe. The volume of immigrants for 1985 conformed to the anticipated level of 85,000 (the preliminary figure is 84,273 ). An increase is anticipated in the next two years, however, as the maximum target number has been set at 115,000 for 1986 , and subsequently to 125,000 for 1987 .

The most recent population projections by Statistics Canada ${ }^{12}$ show that with an annual emigration level of 50,000 persons and a total fertility rate stabilizing at the level of 1.7 births per woman, Canada will need $175,000 \mathrm{im}-$ migrants each year to stabilize its population at $25,000,000$. Coupled with concerns over low natural increase, the demographic effects of the current immigration policy have generated sufficient interest such that '"...the federal government will be giving serious early consideration to the relationship between immigration levels and Canada's demographic future'"13.

## Interprovincial Migration

Migratory movements between provinces are influenced, in both the short and long run, by economic factors. Sudden demand for labour in a particular region will trigger an influx of people, occasionally followed by varying levels of return migration. A case in point is the population exchanges that have occurred between Eastern and Western Canada, especially since the early 1970's. The traditional east-to-west trickle of population, which has long contributed to rapid growth in British Columbia and Alberta, increased substantially for ten years as a result of increased exploration and development in the oil fields, particularly in Alberta. Between 1972 and 1983, British Columbia and Alberta gained half a million people through population exchanges with the rest of the country. As the world oil situation deteriorated, however, the migration balance in Alberta turned negative. In 1982-83, the absolute value of the change was 50,000 persons (Table 24). The trend intensified in 1983-84, as the province posted a net loss through migration of 32,000 . Long a loser in population exchanges, Ontario was the major beneficiary of this return flow, having recorded gains of some 23,600 in 1982-83 and 36,400 in 1983-84.

The most recent figures indicate that Ontario has maintained its strong attraction on interprovincial migrants, having made net gains in excess of 30,000 in each of the last two years. Furthermore, Alberta has almost reversed its net outflow situation, having recorded a loss of only 1,480 persons in 1985-86. This turnaround in migration has contributed substantially to the strong overall growth of Alberta in the current year.

[^18]Table 23. Distribution of Immigrant Population Destined for the Labour Force by Occupation, Canada, 1981, 1983, 1984 and 1985

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rank } \\ & \text { in } \\ & 1981 \end{aligned}$ | Occupational group | 1981 |  | 1983 |  | 1984 |  | 1985 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percentage | Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { centage } \end{aligned}$ | Number | Percentage | Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per- } \\ & \text { centage } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | Fabricating, assembling and repairing | 6,296 | 11.1 | 3,641 | 9.9 | 4,306 | 11.2 | 4,034 | 10.5 |
| 2 | Clerical | 7,044 | 12.4 | 3,540 | 9.5 | 3,150 | 8.2 | 3,087 | 8.0 |
| 3 | Natural sciences, engineering and mathematics | 6,932 | 12.2 | 2,749 | 7.4 | 2,059 | 5.3 | 2,097 | 5.5 |
| 4 | Services | 4,250 | 7.5 | 3,816 | 10.3 | 5,235 | 13.6 | 5,279 | 13.7 |
| 5 | Managerial, administrative | 3,601 | 6.3 | 1,934 | 5.2 | 1,529 | 4.0 | 1,497 | 3.9 |
| 6 | Construction | 2,194 | 3.9 | 1,555 | 4.2 | 1,543 | 4.0 | 1,660 | 4.3 |
| 7 | Machining | 2,529 | 4.4 | 982 | 2.6 | 972 | 2.5 | 969 | 2.5 |
| 8 | Medicine and health | 2,903 | 5.1 | 1,609 | 4.3 | 1,436 | 3.7 | 1,524 | 4.0 |
| 9 | Sales | 2,151 | 3.8 | 1,499 | 4.0 | 1,536 | 4.0 | 1,475 | 3.8 |
| 10 | Farming, horticulture and animal husbandry | 2,931 | 5.1 | 1,419 | 3.8 | 1,170 | 3.0 | 1,050 | 2.7 |
| 11 | Teaching | 1,677 | 2.9 | 1,212 | 3.3 | 1,187 | 3.1 | 1,263 | 3.3 |
| 12 | Processing | 1,170 | 2.1 | 655 | 1.8 | 175 | 0.5 | 213 | 0.6 |
| 13 | Transport equipment operating | 691 | 1.2 | 618 | 1.7 | 568 | 1.5 | 591 | 1.5 |
| 14 | Artistic, literary, performing arts | 1,131 | 2.0 | 673 | 1.8 | 645 | 1.7 | 707 | 1.8 |
| 15 | Social sciences | 555 | 1.0 | 395 | 1.1 | 300 | 0.8 | 357 | 0.9 |
| 16 | Material handling | 361 | 0.6 | 244 | 0.7 | 330 | 0.9 | 344 | 0.9 |
| 17 | Other crafts and equipment operating | 313 | 0.5 | 191 | 0.5 | 180 | 0.5 | 183 | 0.5 |
| 18 | Religion | 469 | 0.8 | 493 | 1.3 | 441 | 1.1 | 396 | 1.0 |
| 19 | Fishing, hunting, trapping | 135 | 0.2 | 50 | 0.1 | 65 | 0.2 | 112 | 0.3 |
| 20 | Entrepreneurs | 293 | 0.5 | 569 | 1.5 | 1,032 | 2.7 | 1,504 | 3.9 |
| 21 | Sports and recreation | 111 | 0.2 | 86 | 0.2 | 77 | 0.2 | 87 | 0.2 |
| 22 | Mining and quarrying including gas and oil | 67 | 0.1 | 46 | 0.1 | 56 | 0.1 | 44 | 0.1 |
| 23 | Forestry and logging | 19 | - | 22 | 0.1 | 16 | - | 20 | 0.1 |
|  | Not stated and other | 9,146 | 16.0 | 9,111 | 24.6 | 10,492 | 27.2 | 9,960 | 25.9 |
| Total Destined for Labour Force |  | 56,969 | 100.0 | 37,109 | 100.0 | 38,500 | 100.0 | 38,453 | 100.0 |

Source: Employment and Immigration Canada, Immigration Statistics, 1981, op.cit. Table 11, Page 38; 1983, Table 15, Page 40; 1984, Quarterly Statistics. Unpublished data for 1985.

Table 24. Net Interprovincial Migration for Provinces and Territories, 1972-73 to 1985-86

| Year | New-foundland | Prince Edward Island | Nova Scotia | New Brunswick | Quebec | Ontario | Manitoba | Saskatchewan | Alberta | British Columbia | Yukon and Northwest Territories |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1972-73 | -537 | 923 | 4,276 | 2,077 | -20,072 | 960 | -5,770 | -16,164 | 5,564 | 27,333 | 1,410 |
| 1973-74 | -3,316 | 502 | 1,274 | 1,448 | -15,135 | -2,886 | -1,596 | -11,604 | 2,235 | 30,496 | -1,418 |
| 1974-75 | 495 | 1,390 | 2,233 | 6,103 | -9,299 | -29,535 | -6,912 | 378 | 22,576 | 11,831 | 740 |
| 1975-76 | 591 | 649 | 3,895 | 6,561 | -12,643 | -21,179 | -4,238 | 5,845 | 24,621 | -4,419 | 317 |
| 1976-77 | -4,149 | 154 | -799 | -82 | $-26,366$ | -6,402 | -3,531 | 3,182 | 34,710 | 5,016 | -1,733 |
| 1977-78 | -4,311 | 700 | -416 | -1,348 | -46,429 | 8,510 | -4,674 | -1,719 | 32,543 | 17,576 | -432 |
| 1978-79 | -3,374 | -74 | -357 | -1,171 | -30,884 | -4,325 | -10,746 | -2,878 | 33,426 | 22,005 | -1,622 |
| 1979-80 | -3,597 | -358 | -2,732 | -2,761 | -29,976 | -22,362 | -13,864 | -4,493 | 41,435 | 40,164 | -1,456 |
| 1980-81 | -3,552 | -1,251 | -2,836 | -4,989 | -22,841 | -33,247 | -9,403 | -3,808 | 44,250 | 37,864 | -187 |
| 1981-82 | -5,693 | -856 | -1,936 | -2,842 | -25,790 | -5,665 | -2,625 | -323 | 36,562 | 8,705 | 463 |
| 1982-83 | 1,829 | 636 | 3,791 | 3,554 | -24,678 | 23,585 | 2,544 | 3,580 | -11.650 | -1,489 | -1,702 |
| 1983-84 | -2,026 | 797 | 3,804 | 1,792 | -17,417 | 36,400 | 339 | 2,133 | -31,986 | 6,636 | -472 |
| 1984-85 | -3,543 | 623 | 2,409 | 34 | -9,042 | 37,881 | 1,250 | -346 | -27,361 | -2,319 | 414 |
| 1985-86 | -4,864 | -238 | -1,544 | -3,021 | -3,415 | 33,856 | 2,193 | -7,828 | -1,480 | -7,657 | -1,616 |
| Total | -36,047 | 3,597 | 11,062 | 5,355 | -293,987 | 15,591 | -57,033 | -34,035 | 205,445 | 191,742 | -7,294 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Catalogue 91-210 annual.

British Columbia, after having reached a low in 1982-83 with a negative balance of 1,500 people, experienced a substantial turnaround in 1983-84, with a net gain of 6,600 persons. The figures for the two most recent years, however, indicate a return to net losses, with the exchange deficit reaching 7,657 persons in 1985-86. Quite the opposite situation has occurred in Quebec, however, as exchange deficits with other provinces have been progressively reduced from more than 26,000 in 1981-82, to slightly more than 3,400 in 1985-86. Moreover, this figure is substantially lower than that for any other year represented in Table 24. Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia all followed Newfoundland into the red in population exchanges in 1985-86. The latter had shown a net gain in 1982-83 for the first time since the 1975-76 period, whereas the remaining Atlantic provinces had shown net gains in each year from 1982-83 to 1984-85.

It is important to point out that interprovincial movements, which had averaged close to 375,000 persons annually for the previous 10 years, fell to 279,000 in 1983-1984, representing a 25 percent reduction (Table 25). The overall mobility rate, as a consequence, dropped from 16 to 11 per 1,000 . Undoubtedly, this is a classic example of the effects of an economic recession. The 1984-85 and 1985-86 figures, however, indicate a higher level of mobility in the population ( 382,600 in 1984-85 and 375,800 in 1985-86), and show a return to the levels observed in the 1970's.

Table 25. Interprovincial Migration of Children and Adults, In- and Out-migration, 1972-73 to 1985-86

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Censal } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ |  | New-foundland | Prince <br> Edward Island | Nova Scotia | New Brunswick | Quebec | Ontario | Manitoba | Saskatchewan | Alberta | British Columbia | Yukon and Northwest Territories | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1972-73 | In | $\begin{aligned} & 11,452 \\ & 11,989 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,332 \\ & 3,409 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,280 \\ & 20,004 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,370 \\ & 18,293 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35,594 \\ & 55,666 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96,003 \\ & 95,043 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28,862 \\ & 34,633 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,843 \\ & 37,007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62,749 \\ & 57,185 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77,851 \\ & 50,518 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,263 \\ & 5,852 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 389,599 \\ & 389,599 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1973-74 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,915 \\ & 16,231 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,756 \\ & 4,254 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26,281 \\ & 25,007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,459 \\ & 20,011 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40,773 \\ & 55,909 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 104,720 \\ & 107,605 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32,981 \\ & 34,577 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27,097 \\ & 38,701 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72,082 \\ & 69,847 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88,145 \\ & 57,649 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,203 \\ & 6,621 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 436,412 \\ & 436,412 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1974-75 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,328 \\ & 11,833 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,428 \\ & 4,037 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26,882 \\ & 24,649 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,103 \\ & 18,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37,834 \\ & 47,133 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 84,965 \\ 114,499 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30,188 \\ & 37,099 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30,270 \\ & 29,893 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79,884 \\ & 57,309 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77,711 \\ & 65,880 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,296 \\ & 6,557 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 416,890 \\ & 416,890 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1975-76 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,112 \\ & 11,520 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,392 \\ & 3,742 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,847 \\ & 20,952 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,369 \\ & 16,808 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32,915 \\ & 45,557 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 81,141 \\ 102,321 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26,565 \\ & 30,803 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28,459 \\ & 22,614 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76,210 \\ & 51,588 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58,276 \\ & 62,695 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,244 \\ & 5,927 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 374,528 \\ & 374,528 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1976-77 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,304 \\ 12,453 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,837 \\ & 3,683 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,849 \\ & 21,648 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,965 \\ & 16,047 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28,867 \\ & 55,233 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86,187 \\ & 92,589 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22,864 \\ & 26,395 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,058 \\ & 20,876 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81,332 \\ & 46,622 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58,199 \\ & 53,183 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,927 \\ & 8,660 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 357,389 \\ & 357,389 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1977-78 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8,181 \\ 12,492 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,933 \\ & 3,233 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,055 \\ & 20,471 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,135 \\ & 16,483 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,945 \\ & 70,374 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97,825 \\ & 89,315 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,761 \\ & 25,435 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,875 \\ & 22,594 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83,270 \\ & 50,727 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63,371 \\ & 45,795 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,070 \\ & 7,502 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 364,421 \\ & 364,421 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1978-79 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,462 \\ 11,836 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,584 \\ & 3,658 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,905 \\ & 20,262 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14,929 \\ & 16,100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25,524 \\ & 56,408 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87,125 \\ & 91,450 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,774 \\ & 29,520 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,528 \\ & 23,406 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86,057 \\ & 52,631 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67,506 \\ & 45,501 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,411 \\ & 8,033 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 358,805 \\ & 358,805 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1979-80 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,066 \\ 12,663 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,185 \\ & 3,543 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17,682 \\ & 20,414 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,855 \\ & 16,616 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22,018 \\ & 51,994 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 79,556 \\ 101,918 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,690 \\ & 32,554 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,293 \\ & 24,786 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100,710 \\ 59,275 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80,656 \\ & 40,492 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,677 \\ & 7,133 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 371,388 \\ & 371,388 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1980-81 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,238 \\ 12,790 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,116 \\ & 4,367 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,737 \\ & 21,573 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,356 \\ & 18,345 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22,905 \\ & 45,746 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 77,090 \\ 110,337 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,468 \\ & 29,871 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,924 \\ & 25,732 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 109,383 \\ 65,133 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80,515 \\ & 42,651 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,200 \\ & 6,387 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 382,932 \\ & 382,932 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1981-82 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,763 \\ 14,456 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,375 \\ & 4,231 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,899 \\ & 20,835 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,857 \\ & 16,699 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,349 \\ & 47,139 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83,619 \\ & 89,284 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,601 \\ & 24,226 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,808 \\ & 22,131 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100,046 \\ 63,484 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57,983 \\ & 49,278 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,619 \\ & 6,156 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 357,919 \\ & 357,919 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1982-83 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10,193 \\ 8,364 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,403 \\ & 2,767 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,166 \\ & 15,375 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,016 \\ & 11,462 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,881 \\ & 45,559 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86,885 \\ & 63,300 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,454 \\ & 17,910 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,081 \\ & 17,501 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59,381 \\ & 71,031 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44,221 \\ & 45,710 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,805 \\ & 6,507 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 305,486 \\ & 305,486 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1983-84 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,753 \\ & 8,779 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,219 \\ & 2,422 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,024 \\ & 14,220 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,450 \\ & 10,658 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,031 \\ & 40,448 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89,002 \\ & 52,602 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17,731 \\ & 17,392 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,901 \\ & 16,768 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41,126 \\ & 73,112 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44,088 \\ & 37,452 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,047 \\ & 5,519 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 279,372 \\ & 279,372 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1984-85 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,151 \\ 11,694 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,940 \\ & 3,317 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22,718 \\ & 20,309 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,427 \\ & 16,393 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32,900 \\ & 41,942 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 114,102 \\ 76,221 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,222 \\ & 22,972 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,731 \\ & 24,077 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67,915 \\ & 95,276 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62,221 \\ & 64,540 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,264 \\ & 5,850 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 382,591 \\ & 382,591 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1985-86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { Out } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,214 \\ 13,078 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,539 \\ & 3,777 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20,697 \\ & 22,241 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,506 \\ & 18,527 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33,244 \\ & 36,659 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 109,561 \\ 75,705 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22,278 \\ & 24,471 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,349 \\ & 29,177 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 75,575 \\ 77,055 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60,267 \\ & 67,924 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,614 \\ & 7,230 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 375,844 \\ & 375,844 \end{aligned}$ |

Source: Statistics Canada, Cat. 91-208; Demography Division, unpublished data - available upon request.

Appendix A

Table A1. Total Growth Rate, 1901-02 to 1985-86 and Rate of Natural Increase, 1928-29 to 1985-86, Canada

| Census Year | Total Growth Rate | Rate of Natural Increase | Census <br> Year | Total Growth Rate | Rate of Natural Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1901-02 | 2.26 | - | 44 | 1.28 | 1.33 |
| 03 | 2.82 | - | 45 | 1.05 | 1.27 |
| 04 | 3.07 | - | 46 | 1.82 | 1.51 |
| 05 | 2.96 | - | 47 | 2.11 | 1.94 |
| 06 | 1.57 | - | 48 | 2.17 | 1.84 |
| 07 | 5.02 | - | 49 | 2.18 | 1.80 |
| 08 | 3.28 | - | 50 | 1.97 | 1.81 |
| 09 | 2.61 | - | 51 | 2.17 | 1.84 |
| 10 | 2.73 | - | 1951-52 | 3.21 | 1.89 |
| 11 | 3.09 | - | 53 | 2.67 | 1.94 |
| 1911-12 | 2.49 | - | 54 | 2.98 | 2.03 |
| 13 | 3.24 | - | 55 | 2.69 | 2.06 |
| 14 | 3.18 | - | 56 | 2.44 | 1.99 |
| 15 | 1.29 | - | 57 | 3.29 | 2.05 |
| 16 | 0.25 | - | 58 | 2.83 | 2.01 |
| 17 | 0.73 | - | 59 | 2.36 | 1.96 |
| 18 | 1.09 | - | 60 | 2.21 | 1.94 |
| 19 | 1.98 | - | 61 | 2.06 | 1.90 |
| 20 | 2.91 | - | 1961-62 | 1.89 | 1.80 |
| 21 | 2.68 | - | 63 | 1.87 | 1.75 |
| 1921-22 | 1.48 | - | 64 | 1.90 | 1.66 |
| 23 | 1.02 | - | 65 | 1.83 | 1.52 |
| 24 | 1.47 | - | 66 | 1.89 | 1.29 |
| 25 | 1.64 | - | 67 | 1.81 | 1.16 |
| 26 | 1.68 | - | 68 | 1.59 | 1.05 |
| 27 | 1.95 | - | 69 | 1.45 | 1.03 |
| 28 | 2.03 | - | 70 | 1.41 | 1.02 |
| 29 | 1.97 | 1.21 | 71 | 1.27 | 1.02 |
| 30 | 1.78 | 1.32 | 1971-72 | 1.07 | 0.90 |
| 31 | 1.66 | 1.31 | 73 | 1.10 | 0.83 |
| 1931-32 | 1.28 | 1.29 | 74 | 1.45 | 0.82 |
| 33 | 1.17 | 1.23 | 75 | 1.48 | 0.83 |
| 34 | 1.02 | 1.12 | 76 | 1.29 | 0.84 |
| 35 | 0.97 | 1.09 | 77 | 1.21 | 0.84 |
| 36 | 0.97 | 1.08 | 78 | 1.04 | 0.82 |
| 37 | 0.87 | 0.98 | 79 | 0.97 | 0.83 |
| 38 | 0.97 | 1.03 | 80 | 1.24 | 0.84 |
| 39 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 81 | 1.24 | 0.83 |
| 40 | 1.01 | 1.11 | 1981-82 | 1.18 | 0.82 |
| 41 | 1.11 | 1.21 | 83 | 1.02 | 0.81 |
| 1941-42 | 1.28 | 1.27 | 84 | 0.96 | 0.80 |
| 43 | 1.21 | 1.36 | 85 | 0.93 | 0.80 |
|  |  |  | 1985-86 | 0.91 | 0.76 |

Sources: Statistics Canada, Annual Population Estimates, Catalogue 91-210. Statistics Canada, Population Growth in Canada, Catalogue 99-701. Statistics Canada, Births and Deaths, Catalogue 84-204. Statistics Canada, Demography Division, unpublished data.

Table A2. Immigration Rate, 1901-1984 and Total Fertility Rate ${ }^{1}$ (per 1,000), 1911, 1922-1985, Canada

| Year | Immi- <br> gration <br> Rate | Total <br> Fertility <br> Rate | Year | Immi- <br> gration <br> Rate | Total <br> Fertility <br> Rate | Year | Immi- <br> gration <br> Rate | Total <br> Fertility <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1901 | 10.4 | - | 1930 | 10.3 | 3,282 | 1959 | 6.1 | 3,935 |
| 1902 | 16.2 | - | 1931 | 2.7 | 3,200 | 1960 | 5.8 | 3,895 |
| 1903 | 24.5 | - | 1932 | 2.0 | 3,084 | 1961 | 3.9 | 3,840 |
| 1904 | 22.5 | - | 1933 | 1.4 | 2,864 | 1962 | 4.0 | 3,756 |
| 1905 | 23.6 | - | 1934 | 1.2 | 2,803 | 1963 | 4.9 | 3,669 |
| 1906 | 34.7 | - | 1935 | 1.0 | 2,755 | 1964 | 5.8 | 3,502 |
| 1907 | 42.5 | - | 1936 | 1.1 | 2,696 | 1965 | 7.5 | 3,145 |
| 1908 | 21.6 | - | 1937 | 1.4 | 2,646 | 1966 | 9.7 | 2,812 |
| 1909 | 25.5 | - | 1938 | 1.5 | 2,701 | 1967 | 10.9 | 2,597 |
| 1910 | 41.0 | - | 1939 | 1.5 | 2,654 | 1968 | 8.9 | 2,453 |
| 1911 | 46.0 | 4,700 | 1940 | 1.0 | 2,766 | 1969 | 7.7 | 2,405 |
| 1912 | 50.9 | - | 1941 | 0.8 | 2,832 | 1970 | 6.9 | 2,331 |
| 1913 | 52.5 | - | 1942 | 0.7 | 2,964 | 1971 | 5.7 | 2,187 |
| 1914 | 19.1 | - | 1943 | 0.7 | 3,041 | 1972 | 5.6 | 2,024 |
| 1915 | 4.6 | - | 1944 | 1.1 | 3,010 | 1973 | 8.4 | 1,931 |
| 1916 | 7.0 | - | 1945 | 1.9 | 3,018 | 1974 | 9.8 | 1,875 |
| 1917 | 9.0 | - | 1946 | 5.8 | 3,374 | 1975 | 8.3 | 1,852 |
| 1918 | 5.1 | - | 1947 | 5.1 | 3,595 | 1976 | 6.5 | 1,825 |
| 1919 | 13.0 | - | 1948 | 9.8 | 3,441 | 1977 | 4.9 | 1,806 |
| 1920 | 16.2 | - | 1949 | 7.1 | 3,456 | 1978 | 3.7 | 1,757 |
| 1921 | 10.4 | - | 1950 | 5.4 | 3,455 | 1979 | 4.7 | 1,764 |
| 1922 | 7.2 | 3,402 | 1951 | 13.9 | 3,503 | 1980 | 6.0 | 1,746 |
| 1923 | 14.8 | 3,234 | 1952 | 11.4 | 3,641 | 1981 | 5.3 | 1,704 |
| 1924 | 13.6 | 3,221 | 1953 | 11.4 | 3,721 | 1982 | 4.9 | 1,694 |
| 1925 | 9.1 | 3,132 | 1954 | 10.1 | 3,828 | 1983 | 3.6 | 1,680 |
| 1926 | 14.4 | 3,357 | 1955 | 7.0 | 3,831 | 1984 | 3.5 | 1,686 |
| 1927 | 16.5 | 3,319 | 1956 | 10.3 | 3,858 | 1985 | - | 1,669 |
| 1928 | 17.0 | 3,294 | 1957 | 17.0 | 3,925 |  |  |  |
| 1929 | 16.5 | 3,217 | 1958 | 7.3 | 3,880 |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Canada excluding Newfoundland for TFR.
Sources: Employment and Immigration Canada (1985). Immigration 1983. Ottawa:
Supply and Services Canada, Table 2.
Statistics Canada, Catalogue 91-210, Table 1.
Statistics Canada, Catalogue 84-204.
Henripin, J. (1968). 1961 Census Monograph, Catalogue 91-541: Trends and Factors of Fertility in Canada, Table 2.3.
Employment and Immigration Canada (1986). Immigration Statistics, 1984. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, Table G2.

Table A3. Demographic Accounts of the Provinces and Territories, 1951-1986

| Year | Population ${ }^{1}$ | Total Growth ${ }^{2}$ | Births ${ }^{2}$ | Deaths ${ }^{2}$ | Natural Increase | Net Migration ${ }^{2,3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Newfoundland |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $361.4{ }^{4}$ |  | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | $522.1{ }^{4}$ | $8.0^{5}$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1972 | $530.0^{6}$ | 7.9 | 12.8 | 3.2 | 9.6 | -1.7 |
| 1973 | $537.2^{6}$ | 7.2 | 13.0 | 3.4 | 9.6 | -2.4 |
| 1974 | $541.5{ }^{6}$ | 4.3 | 12.3 | 3.4 | 8.9 | -4.6 |
| 1975 | $549.1{ }^{6}$ | 7.6 | 11.5 | 3.2 | 8.3 | -0.7 |
| 1976 | $557.7^{4}$ | 8.6 | 10.9 | 3.3 | 7.6 | 1.0 |
| 1977 | $559.8{ }^{6}$ | 2.1 | 11.1 | 3.2 | 7.9 | -5.8 |
| 1978 | $561.5^{6}$ | 1.7 | 10.8 | 3.1 | 7.7 | -6.0 |
| 1979 | $563.5{ }^{6}$ | 2.0 | 10.4 | 3.2 | 7.2 | -5.2 |
| 1980 | $565.6^{6}$ | 2.1 | 10.3 | 3.3 | 7.0 | -4.9 |
| 1981 | $567.7^{4}$ | 2.1 | 10.3 | 3.2 | 7.1 | -5.0 |
| 1982 | 568.57 | 0.8 | 9.7 | 3.3 | 6.4 | -5.6 |
| 1983 | $576.0{ }^{7}$ | 7.5 | 9.2 | 3.5 | 5.7 | 1.8 |
| 1984 | $579.3{ }^{7}$ | 3.3 | 8.7 | 3.5 | 5.2 | -1.9 |
| 1985 | $580.7^{7}$ | 1.4 | 8.5 | 3.4 | 5.1 | -3.7 |
| 1986 | $580.2^{7}$ | -0.5 | 7.8 | 3.5 | 4.3 | -4.8 |
|  | Prince Edward Island |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $98.4{ }^{4}$ |  | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | $111.6^{4}$ | $0.7{ }^{5}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1972 | $112.6{ }^{6}$ | 1.0 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 1.1 | -0.1 |
| 1973 | $114.0{ }^{6}$ | 1.4 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
| 1974 | $115.2^{6}$ | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| 1975 | $117 . .^{6}$ | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| 1976 | $118.2^{4}$ | 1.1 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| 1977 | $119.3{ }^{6}$ | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| 1978 | $121.0^{6}$ | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| 1979 | $122.0^{6}$ | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | -0.1 |
| 1980 | $122.8{ }^{6}$ | 0.8 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | -0.1 |
| 1981 | $122.5{ }^{4}$ | 0.3 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | -1.2 |
| 1982 | $122.7^{7}$ | 0.2 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | -0.7 |
| 1983 | $124.3{ }^{7}$ | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| 1984 | $125.9{ }^{7}$ | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| 1985 | $127.4{ }^{7}$ | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| 1986 | $128.1{ }^{7}$ | 0.7 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 |

See footnote(s) at end of table.

Table A3. Demographic Accounts of the Provinces and Territories, 1951-1986 - Continued

| Year | Population ${ }^{1}$ | Total Growth ${ }^{2}$ | Births ${ }^{2}$ | Deaths ${ }^{2}$ | Natural Increase | Net <br> Migration ${ }^{2,3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nova Scotia |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $642.6^{4}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | $789.0^{4}$ | $7.3{ }^{5}$ |  |  |  | $\ldots$ |
| 1972 | $794.6{ }^{6}$ | 5.6 | 14.0 | 6.8 | 7.2 | -1.6 |
| 1973 | $804.3{ }^{6}$ | 9.7 | 13.4 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 3.2 |
| 1974 | $811.5^{6}$ | 7.2 | 12.9 | 7.0 | 5.9 | 1.3 |
| 1975 | $819.5{ }^{6}$ | 8.0 | 13.1 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 1.7 |
| 1976 | $828.6{ }^{4}$ | 9.1 | 13.1 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 2.9 |
| 1977 | $833.4{ }^{6}$ | 4.8 | 12.7 | 7.1 | 5.6 | -0.8 |
| 1978 | $837.5{ }^{6}$ | 4.1 | 12.3 | 6.8 | 5.5 | -1.4 |
| 1979 | $841.8^{6}$ | 4.3 | 12.6 | 6.9 | 5.7 | -1.4 |
| 1980 | $845.1{ }^{6}$ | 3.3 | 12.5 | 6.9 | 5.6 | -2.3 |
| 1981 | $847.4^{4}$ | 2.3 | 12.2 | 7.0 | 5.2 | -2.9 |
| 1982 | $851.7^{7}$ | 4.3 | 12.1 | 6.9 | 5.2 | -0.9 |
| 1983 | 861.57 | 9.8 | 12.4 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 4.5 |
| 1984 | $871.1^{7}$ | 9.6 | 12.4 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 4.3 |
| 1985 | $879.8^{7}$ | 8.7 | 12.4 | 6.8 | 5.6 | 3.1 |
| 1986 | $883.8{ }^{7}$ | 4.0 | 12.3 | 7.4 | 4.9 | -0.9 |
|  | New Brunswick |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $515.7^{4}$ |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 1971 | $634.6^{4}$ | $6.0{ }^{5}$ | 120 | 5.0 | 70 | -1.5 |
| 1972 | $640.1{ }^{6}$ | 5.5 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | -1.5 |
| 1973 | $647.1^{6}$ | 7.0 | 11.6 | 5.0 | 6.6 | 0.4 |
| 1974 | $653.6^{6}$ | 6.5 | 11.3 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 0.3 |
| 1975 | $665.2{ }^{6}$ | 11.6 | 11.7 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 5.1 |
| 1976 | $677.2^{4}$ | 12.0 | 11.8 | 5.2 | 6.6 | 5.4 |
| 1977 | $684.1^{6}$ | 16.9 | 11.8 | 5.1 | 6.7 | 0.2 |
| 1978 | $688.1^{6}$ | 4.0 | 11.1 | 5.2 | 5.9 | -1.9 |
| 1979 | $691.9^{6}$ | 3.8 | 10.8 | 5.1 | 5.7 | -1.9 |
| 1980 | $695.4^{6}$ | 3.5 | 10.8 | 5.3 | 5.5 | -2.0 |
| 1981 | $696.4{ }^{4}$ | 1.0 | 10.6 | 5.2 | 5.4 | -4.4 |
| 1982 | $698.9^{7}$ | 2.5 | 10.4 | 5.1 | 5.3 | -2.8 |
| 1983 | $707.7^{7}$ | 8.8 | 10.6 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 3.5 |
| 1984 | $714.6{ }^{7}$ | 6.9 | 10.4 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 1.7 -0.2 |
| 1985 | $719.6{ }^{7}$ | 5.0 | 10.5 | 5.3 5.3 | 5.2 4.8 | -0.2 -3.3 |
| 1986 | $721.1^{7}$ | 1.5 | 10.1 | 5.3 | 4.8 | -3.3 |

See footnote(s) at end of table.

Table A3. Demographic Accounts of the Provinces and Territories, 1951-1986 - Continued

| Year | Population ${ }^{1}$ | Total Growth ${ }^{2}$ | Births ${ }^{2}$ | Deaths ${ }^{2}$ | Natural Increase | Net <br> Migration ${ }^{2,3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Quebec |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 4,055.7 ${ }^{4}$ |  | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 1971 | 6,027.8 ${ }^{4}$ | $98.6{ }^{5}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |  |
| 1972 | 6,053.6 ${ }^{6}$ | 25.8 | 86.4 | 41.4 | 45.0 | -19.2 |
| 1973 | 6,078.9 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 25.3 | 83.4 | 42.3 | 41.1 | -15.8 |
| 1974 | 6,122.76 | 43.8 | 83.8 | 42.9 | 40.9 | 2.9 |
| 1975 | 6,179.0 ${ }^{6}$ | 56.3 | 89.0 | 44.4 | 44.6 | 11.7 |
| 1976 | 6,234.4 ${ }^{4}$ | 55.4 | 98.6 | 42.5 | 56.1 | -0.7 |
| 1977 | 6,284.0 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 49.6 | 94.1 | 43.1 | 51.0 | -1.4 |
| 1978 | 6,302.4 ${ }^{6}$ | 18.4 | 94.7 | 43.7 | 51.0 | -32.6 |
| 1979 | 6,338.9 ${ }^{6}$ | 36.5 | 98.1 | 42.5 | 55.6 | -19.1 |
| 1980 | 6,386.16 | 47.2 | 98.5 | 44.1 | 54.4 | -7.2 |
| 1981 | 6,438.2 ${ }^{\text {4 }}$ | 52.1 | 96.8 | 42.7 | 54.1 | 2.0 |
| 1982 | 6,479.8 ${ }^{7}$ | 41.6 | 93.8 | 43.1 | 50.7 | -9.1 |
| 1983 | 6,510.17 | 30.3 | 88.7 | 44.5 | 44.2 | -13.9 |
| 1984 | 6,544.97 | 34.8 | 88.5 | 43.7 | 44.8 | -10.0 |
| 1985 | 6,582.77 | 37.8 | 88.1 | 46.4 | 41.7 | -3.9 |
| 1986 | $6,627.2^{7}$ | 44.5 | 86.9 | 46.3 | 40.6 | 3.9 |
|  | Ontario |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 4,597.6 ${ }^{4}$ |  | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | 7,703.14 | $155.3{ }^{5}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| 1972 | 7,809.9 ${ }^{6}$ | 106.8 | 127.1 | 57.5 | 69.6 | 37.2 |
| 1973 | 7,908.8 ${ }^{6}$ | 98.9 | 124.0 | 58.8 | 65.2 | 33.7 |
| 1974 | 8,054.1 ${ }^{6}$ | 145.3 | 122.9 | 60.4 | 62.5 | 82.8 |
| 1975 | $8,172.2^{6}$ | 118.1 | 126.5 | 61.2 | 65.3 | 52.8 |
| 1976 | 8,264.54 | 92.3 | 123.6 | 60.6 | 63.0 | 29.3 |
| 1977 | 8,353.16 | 88.6 | 122.7 | 60.3 | 62.4 | 26.2 |
| 1978 | $8,439.6^{6}$ | 86.5 | 122.0 | 62.0 | 60.0 | 26.5 |
| 1979 | 8,501.36 | 61.7 | 121.7 | 60.3 | 61.4 | 0.3 |
| 1980 | 8,569.76 | 68.4 | 121.8 | 62.8 | 59.0 | 9.4 |
| 1981 | 8,624.7 ${ }^{4}$ | 55.0 | 123.0 | 62.6 | 60.4 | 5.4 |
| 1982 | 8,716.17 | 91.4 | 123.0 | 62.9 | 60.1 | 31.3 |
| 1983 | 8,825.2 ${ }^{7}$ | 109.1 | 126.5 | 64.5 | 62.0 | 47.1 |
| 1984 | 8,942.4 ${ }^{7}$ | 117.2 | 127.9 | 64.3 | 63.6 | 53.6 |
| 1985 | 9,064.27 ${ }^{7}$ | 121.8 | 133.2 | 65.5 | 67.7 | 54.1 |
| 1986 | 9,181.97 | 117.7 | 130.9 | 66.3 | 64.6 | 53.1 |

See footnote(s) at end of table.

Table A3. Demographic Accounts of the Provinces and Territories, 1951-1986 - Continued

| Year | Population ${ }^{1}$ | Total Growth ${ }^{2}$ | Births ${ }^{2}$ | Deaths ${ }^{2}$ | Natural Increase | Net Migration ${ }^{2,3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Manitoba |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $776.5^{4}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | $988.2^{4}$ | $10.6{ }^{5}$ | 17\% | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 1972 | $991.2^{6}$ | 3.0 | 17.7 | 8.0 | 9.7 | -6.7 |
| 1973 | $996.2^{6}$ | 5.0 | 17.1 | 8.3 | 8.8 | -3.8 |
| 1974 | 1,007.56 | 11.3 | 17.0 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 2.7 |
| 1975 | 1,013.6 ${ }^{6}$ | 6.1 | 17.3 | 8.4 | 8.9 | -2.8 |
| 1976 | 1,021.5 ${ }^{4}$ | 7.9 | 17.2 | 8.3 | 8.9 | -1.0 |
| 1977 | 1,027.4 ${ }^{6}$ | 5.9 | 16.6 | 8.2 | 8.4 | -2.5 |
| 1978 | 1,032.0 ${ }^{6}$ | 4.6 | 16.8 | 8.2 | 8.6 | -4.0 |
| 1979 | 1,028.0 ${ }^{6}$ | -4.0 | 16.4 | 8.2 | 8.2 | -12.2 |
| 1980 | 1,024.9 ${ }^{6}$ | -3.1 | 16.0 | 8.4 | 7.6 | -10.7 |
| 1981 | 1,026.2 ${ }^{4}$ | 1.3 | 16.0 | 8.3 | 7.7 | -6.4 |
| 1982 | 1,034.5 ${ }^{7}$ | 8.3 | 16.0 | 8.8 | 7.2 | 1.1 |
| 1983 | 1,048.1 ${ }^{7}$ | 13.6 | 16.4 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 5.6 |
| 1984 | 1,058.8 ${ }^{7}$ | 10.7 | 16.6 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 2.5 |
| 1985 | $1,070.6^{7}$ | 11.8 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 3.4 |
| 1986 | $1.078 .6^{7}$ | 8.0 | 17.1 | 8.9 | 8.2 | -0.2 |
|  | Saskatchewan |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $831.7^{4}$ | . | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 1971 | $926.2^{4}$ | $4.7{ }^{5}$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | , |
| 1972 | $914.0^{6}$ | -12.2 | 15.7 | 7.5 | 8.2 | -20.4 |
| 1973 | $904.5^{6}$ | -9.5 | 15.2 | 7.6 | 7.6 | -17.1 |
| 1974 | $899.7^{6}$ | -4.8 | 14.8 | 7.8 | 7.0 | -11.8 |
| 1975 | $907.4^{6}$ | 7.7 | 15.1 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 0.3 |
| 1976 | $921.3{ }^{4}$ | 13.9 | 15.7 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 6.0 |
| 1977 | 934.96 | 13.6 | 16.3 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 5.2 |
| 1978 | $943.5{ }^{6}$ | 8.6 | 16.4 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 0.2 |
| 1979 | $951.3^{6}$ | 7.8 | 16.9 | 7.4 | 9.5 | -1.7 |
| 1980 | $959.4{ }^{6}$ | 8.1 | 16.9 | 7.6 | 9.3 | -1.2 |
| 1981 | $968.3^{4}$ | 8.9 | 17.1 | 7.5 | 9.6 | 0.7 |
| 1982 | $979.1{ }^{7}$ | 10.8 | 17.4 | 7.8 | 9.6 | 1.2 |
| 1983 | $993.6{ }^{7}$ | 14.5 | 17.8 | 8.0 | 9.8 | 4.7 |
| 1984 | 1,006.9 ${ }^{7}$ | 13.3 | 18.0 | 7.6 | 10.4 | 2.9 |
| 1985 | 1,017.87 | 10.9 | 17.8 | 7.9 | 9.9 | 1.0 |
| 1986 | 1,021.07 | 3.2 | 18.1 | 8.3 | 9.8 | -6.6 |

See footnote(s) at end of table.

Table A3. Demographic Accounts of the Provinces and Territories, 1951-1986 - Continued

| Year | Population ${ }^{1}$ | Total Growth ${ }^{2}$ | Births ${ }^{2}$ | Deaths ${ }^{2}$ | Natural Increase | Net <br> Migration ${ }^{2,3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Alberta |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $939.5^{4}$ |  | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | 1,627.9 ${ }^{4}$ | $34.4{ }^{5}$ | ... | ... |  |  |
| 1972 | 1,657.3 ${ }^{6}$ | 29.4 | 29.6 | 10.7 | 18.9 | 10.5 |
| 1973 | 1,689.5 ${ }^{6}$ | 32.2 | 29.6 | 10.8 | 18.8 | 13.4 |
| 1974 | 1,722.46 | 32.9 | 29.1 | 10.9 | 18.2 | 14.7 |
| 1975 | 1,778.3 ${ }^{6}$ | 55.9 | 30.5 | 11.4 | 19.1 | 36.8 |
| 1976 | 1,838.0 ${ }^{4}$ | 59.7 | 32.4 | 11.5 | 20.9 | 38.8 |
| 1977 | 1,912.76 | 74.7 | 33.8 | 11.4 | 22.4 | 52.3 |
| 1978 | 1,983.1 ${ }^{6}$ | 70.4 | 34.7 | 11.8 | 22.9 | 47.5 |
| 1979 | 2,052.8 ${ }^{6}$ | 69.7 | 36.1 | 12.0 | 24.1 | 45.6 |
| 1980 | 2,140.6 ${ }^{6}$ | 87.8 | 37.8 | 12.3 | 25.5 | 62.3 |
| 1981 | 2,237.3 ${ }^{4}$ | 96.7 | 41.0 | 12.6 | 28.4 | 68.3 |
| 1982 | 2,318.5 ${ }^{7}$ | 81.2 | 43.8 | 13.1 | 30.7 | 50.5 |
| 1983 | 2,346.5 ${ }^{7}$ | 28.0 | 45.3 | 12.8 | 32.5 | -4.5 |
| 1984 | 2,350.2 ${ }^{7}$ | 3.7 | 44.9 | 12.6 | 32.3 | -28.6 |
|  | 2,358.07 | 7.8 | 45.4 | 12.7 | 32.7 | -24.9 |
|  | 2,389.5 ${ }^{7}$ | 31.5 | 45.0 | 13.6 | 31.4 | 0.1 |
|  | British Columbia |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 1,165.2 ${ }^{4}$ |  | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | 2,184.6 ${ }^{4}$ | $51.0{ }^{5}$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| 1972 | 2,241.46 | 56.8 | 34.4 | 17.7 | 16.7 | 40.1 |
| 1973 | 2,302.46 | 61.0 | 34.6 | 18.0 | 16.6 | 44.4 |
| 1974 | 2,375.76 | 73.3 | 34.5 | 18.6 | 15.9 | 57.4 |
| 1975 | 2,433.2 ${ }^{6}$ | 57.5 | 36.1 | 19.5 | 16.6 | 40.9 |
| 1976 | 2,466.64 | 33.4 | 36.2 | 19.2 | 17.0 | 16.4 |
| 1977 | 2,499.46 | 32.8 | 35.9 | 18.3 | 17.6 | 15.2 |
| 1978 | 2,542.36 | 42.9 | 36.1 | 18.8 | 17.3 | 25.6 |
| 1979 | 2,589.4 ${ }^{6}$ | 47.1 | 38.0 | 19.1 | 18.9 | 28.2 |
| 1980 | 2,666.0 ${ }^{6}$ | 76.6 | 38.9 | 19.2 | 19.7 | 56.9 |
| 1981 | 2,744.2 ${ }^{4}$ | 78.2 | 40.7 | 19.7 | 21.0 | 57.2 |
| 1982 | 2,791.1 ${ }^{7}$ | 46.9 | 42.6 | 20.2 | 22.4 | 24.5 |
| 1983 | 2,820.6 ${ }^{7}$ | 29.5 | 42.4 | 20.3 | 22.1 | 7.4 |
| 1984 | 2,857.97 | 37.3 | 43.4 | 20.3 | 23.1 | 14.2 |
|  | 2,884.77 | 26.8 | 44.3 | 20.3 | 24.0 | 2.8 |
|  | 2,905.97 | 21.2 | 44.7 | 21.8 | 22.9 | -1.7 |

See footnote(s) at end of table.

Table A3. Demographic Accounts of the Provinces and Territories, 1951-1986 - Concluded

| Year | Population ${ }^{1}$ | Total Growth ${ }^{2}$ | Births ${ }^{2}$ | Deaths ${ }^{2}$ | Natural Increase | Net Migration ${ }^{2,3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yukon |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (in thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 9.14 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| 1971 | $18.4{ }^{4}$ | $0.5^{5}$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |  |
| 1972 | $19.5{ }^{6}$ | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| 1973 | 20.56 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| 1974 | $20.5{ }^{6}$ | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | -0.3 |
| 1975 | $21.3{ }^{6}$ | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| 1976 | $21.8{ }^{4}$ | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| 1977 | $21.8{ }^{6}$ | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.4 |
| 1978 | 22.56 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| 1979 | $22.3{ }^{6}$ | -0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.6 |
| 1980 | $22.3{ }^{6}$ | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.4 |
| 1981 | $23.2{ }^{4}$ | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| 1982 | $23.7{ }^{7}$ | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| 1983 | $22.4{ }^{7}$ | -1.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -1.7 |
| 1984 | $22.4{ }^{7}$ | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.4 |
| 1985 | $23.2{ }^{7}$ | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| 1986 | 22.97 | -0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.7 |
|  | Northwest Territories |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1951 | $16.0{ }^{4}$ | ... | $\ldots$ | . | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 1971 | $34.8{ }^{4}$ | 0.95 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 1972 | $37.3{ }^{6}$ | 2.5 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| 1973 | $39.4{ }^{6}$ | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| 1974 | $39.6{ }^{6}$ | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| 1975 | $41.2^{6}$ | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| 1976 | $42.6^{4}$ | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| 1977 | $42.8{ }^{6}$ | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | -0.8 |
| 1978 | $43.6{ }^{6}$ | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | -0.2 |
| 1979 | $44.0{ }^{6}$ | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | -0.6 |
| 1980 | $44.7{ }^{6}$ | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.1 | -0.4 |
| 1981 | $45.7{ }^{4}$ | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.1 | -0.1 |
| 1982 | $47.2^{7}$ | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.4 |
| 1983 | 48.57 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| 1984 | 49.77 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
| 1985 | 51.07 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| 1986 | $50.9{ }^{7}$ | -0.1 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | -1.1 |

[^19]Table A4. Median Age of the Population, Canada, 1921-1986

| Year | Males | Females | Year | Males | Females |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1921 | 24.7 | 23.2 | 1954 | 27.4 | 27.5 |
| 1922 | 24.8 | 23.3 | 1955 | 27.3 | 27.4 |
| 1923 | 24.8 | 23.4 | 1956 | 27.2 | 27.3 |
| 1924 | 24.9 | 23.6 | 1957 | 26.9 | 27.1 |
| 1925 | 24.9 | 23.7 | 1958 | 26.6 | 26.9 |
| 1926 | 25.0 | 23.8 | 1959 | 26.5 | 26.8 |
| 1927 | 25.1 | 23.9 | 1960 | 26.3 | 26.7 |
| 1928 | 25.2 | 24.0 | 1961 | 26.1 | 26.6 |
| 1929 | 25.3 | 24.0 | 1962 | 25.8 | 26.4 |
| 1930 | 25.4 | 24.0 | 1963 | 25.4 | 26.1 |
| 1931 | 25.5 | 24.0 | 1964 | 25.2 | 26.0 |
| 1932 | 25.6 | 24.2 | 1965 | 25.0 | 25.9 |
| 1933 | 25.8 | 24.4 | 1966 | 25.0 | 25.9 |
| 1934 | 26.0 | 24.7 | 1967 | 25.0 | 26.0 |
| 1935 | 26.2 | 24.9 | 1968 | 25.1 | 26.1 |
| 1936 | 26.4 | 25.2 | 1969 | 25.2 | 26.3 |
| 1937 | 26.6 | 25.4 | 1970 | 25.4 | 26.5 |
| 1938 | 26.9 | 25.8 | 1971 | 25.7 | 26.7 |
| 1939 | 27.1 | 26.1 | 1972 | 25.9 | 27.0 |
| 1940 | 27.4 | 26.4 | 1973 | 26.3 | 27.3 |
| 1941 | 27.5 | 26.6 | 1974 | 26.6 | 27.7 |
| 1942 | 27.6 | 26.7 | 1975 | 26.9 | 28.0 |
| 1943 | 27.7 | 26.9 | 1976 | 27.2 | 28.4 |
| 1944 | 27.8 | 27.1 | 1977 | 27.6 | 28.8 |
| 1945 | 27.9 | 27.2 | 1978 | 27.9 | 29.2 |
| 1946 | 28.0 | 27.4 | 1979 | 28.3 | 29.6 |
| 1947 | 27.9 | 27.5 | 1980 | 28.6 | 29.9 |
| 1948 | 27.9 | 27.5 | 1981 | 29.0 | 30.3 |
| 1949 | 27.8 | 27.5 | 1982 | 29.3 | 30.7 |
| 1950 | 27.8 | 27.6 | 1983 | 29.6 | 31.1 |
| 1951 | 27.8 | 27.6 | 1984 | 30.0 | 31.5 |
| 1952 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 1985 | 30.4 | 31.9 |
| 1953 | 27.5 | 27.6 | 1986 | 30.7 | 32.3 |

Sources: Statistics Canada, Catalogue 91-210, Vol. 1 (1982). Statistics Canada, Catalogue 91-518 (1971-1981).
Demography Division, unpublished data (1921-1970, 1983-1986).

Table A5. Evolution of Dependancy Ratios, Canada, United States and Western Europe ${ }^{1}$, 1961-1981

| Country | Year | Youth <br> Dependancy <br> Ratio | Change <br> Since <br> 1961 | Elderly <br> Dependancy <br> Ratio | Change <br> Since <br> 1961 | Total <br> Dependancy <br> Ratio | Change <br> Since <br> 1961 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canada | 1961 | 58.2 | - | 13.0 | - | 71.2 | - |
|  | 1966 | 55.4 | -2.8 | 13.0 | - | 68.4 | -2.8 |
|  | 1971 | 47.5 | -10.7 | 13.0 | - | 60.5 | -10.7 |
|  | 1976 | 39.0 | -19.2 | 13.2 | 0.2 | 52.2 | -19.0 |
|  | 1981 | 33.2 | -25.0 | 14.3 | 1.3 | 47.5 | -23.7 |
| United | 1961 | 51.6 | - | 14.9 | - | 66.5 | - |
|  | 1966 | 50.3 | -1.3 | 15.6 | 0.7 | 65.9 | -0.6 |
|  | 1971 | 44.8 | -6.8 | 15.9 | 1.0 | 60.7 | -5.8 |
|  | 1976 | 38.2 | -13.4 | 16.4 | 1.5 | 54.6 | -11.9 |
|  | 1981 | 33.9 | -17.7 | 17.3 | 2.4 | 51.2 | -15.3 |
| Europe | 1961 | 37.8 | - | 15.9 | - | 53.7 | - |
|  | 1966 | 37.8 | $-\overline{7.7}$ | 17.2 | 1.3 | 55.0 | 1.3 |
|  | 1971 | 37.1 | -0.7 | 18.2 | 2.3 | 55.3 | 1.6 |
|  | 1976 | 35.0 | -2.8 | 16.0 | 0.1 | 51.0 | -2.7 |
|  | 1981 | 32.5 | -5.3 | 19.2 | 3.3 | 51.7 | -2.0 |

${ }^{1}$ The dependancy ratios for Western Europe are the weighted average of the dependancy ratios of the following countries: Austria, Belgium, France, West Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom. The weights correspond to population size.
Source: United Nations, Demographic Yearbooks.

Table A6. Distribution of Singles, Aged $15+$, by Age and Sex, Canada, 1951 and 1986

| Age Group | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1951 | 1986 | 1951 | 1986 |
| $15-19$ | 33.4 | 31.6 | 39.0 | 36.3 |
| $20-24$ | 25.3 | 32.4 | 21.5 | 30.4 |
| $25-29$ | 12.3 | 16.0 | 9.6 | 11.8 |
| $30-34$ | 6.3 | 6.3 | 5.9 | 5.2 |
| $35-39$ | 4.8 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 3.3 |
| $40-44$ | 3.8 | 2.0 | 4.2 | 2.0 |
| $45-49$ | 3.2 | 1.5 | 3.4 | 1.5 |
| $50-54$ | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 1.3 |
| $55-59$ | 2.2 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.4 |
| $60-64$ | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.4 |
| 65 and over | 4.1 | 2.7 | 4.5 | 5.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Sources: Statistics Canada. 1951 Census of Canada.
Statistics Canada, Demography Division, unpublished data.

Table A7. Percentage Distribution of the Population by Marital Status, Age and Sex, Canada, 1951, 1956, 1961, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986

| Age | 1951 | 1956 | 1961 | 1966 | 1971 | 1976 | 1981 | 1986 | 1951 | 1956 | 1961 | 1966 | 1971 | 1976 | 1981 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | Single |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Married |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 99.0 | 98.9 | 98.7 | 98.8 | 98.4 | 98.0 | 98.4 | 99.7 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 |
| 20-24 | 74.4 | 72.2 | 69.5 | 70.0 | 67.6 | 67.7 | 71.9 | 85.0 | 25.5 | 27.8 | 30.4 | 30.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 27.8 | 14.8 |
| 25-29 | 35.1 | 33.9 | 29.6 | 27.4 | 25.6 | 27.0 | 32.0 | 42.1 | 64.6 | 65.8 | 70.1 | 72.3 | 73.3 | 71.7 | 66.3 | 55.7 |
| 30-34 | 19.6 | 18.7 | 17.4 | 15.1 | 13.3 | 13.1 | 15.0 | 18.0 | 79.9 | 80.8 | 82.1 | 84.3 | 85.1 | 84.8 | 82.1 | 77.0 |
| 35-39 | 14.9 | 13.8 | 13.0 | 12.2 | 10.3 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 10.6 | 84.2 | 85.5 | 86.2 | 87.0 | 87.9 | 88.4 | 86.9 | 83.3 |
| 40-44 | 13.3 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 85.2 | 86.5 | 87.7 | 80.0 | 88.3 | 88.9 | 87.9 | 85.6 |
| 45-49 | 13.2 | 12.0 | 10.5 | 10.1 | 9.1 | 8.3 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 84.6 | 86.1 | 87.6 | 88.2 | 88.2 | 88.3 | 87.8 | 86.2 |
| 50-54 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 10.5 | 10.0 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 7.8 | 6.8 | 83.7 | 84.5 | 86.5 | 87.4 | 88.0 | 87.8 | 86.8 | 86.1 |
| 55-59 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 11.2 | 10.2 | 9.2 | 8.0 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 82.8 | 82.8 | 84.0 | 85.5 | 86.4 | 87.3 | 86.2 | 85.4 |
| 60-64 | 11.5 | 11.6 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 9.7 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 7.1 | 80.1 | 80.6 | 81.0 | 82.9 | 84.3 | 85.4 | 85.5 | 85.0 |
| $65+$ | 11.8 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 10.6 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 65.7 | 66.6 | 68.5 | 69.1 | 71.8 | 74.0 | 76.6 | 76.3 |
|  | Widowed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Divorced |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20-24 | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| 25-29 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 2.1 |
| 30-34 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 4.8 |
| 35-39 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 5.9 |
| 40-44 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 3.9 | 6.3 |
| 45-49 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 3.9 | 6.2 |
| 50-54 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 3.8 | 5.7 |
| 55-59 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 4.9 |
| 60-64 | 8.0 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 3.9 |
| $65+$ | 22.3 | 21.7 | 20.4 | 19.4 | 16.7 | 15.2 | 14.1 | 13.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 2.4 |

Source: See end of table

Table A7. Percentage Distribution of the Population by Marital Status, Age and Sex, Canada, 1951, 1956, 1961, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986 - Concluded

| Age | 1951 | 1956 | 1961 | 1966 | 1971 | 1976 | 1981 | 1986 | 1951 | 1956 | 1961 | 1966 | 1971 | 1976 | 1981 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | Single |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Married |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | 92.1 | 91.6 | 91.3 | 92.4 | 92.5 | 91.8 | 93.4 | 97.8 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 8.7 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 8.1 | 6.6 | 2.1 |
| 20-24 | 48.5 | 44.3 | 40.5 | 44.2 | 43.5 | 45.3 | 51.1 | 67.1 | 51.2 | 55.5 | 59.2 | 55.4 | 55.7 | 53.9 | 48.0 | 32.0 |
| 25-29 | 20.7 | 18.7 | 15.4 | 14.9 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 20.1 | 25.3 | 78.5 | 81.0 | 83.8 | 84.1 | 82.5 | 81.0 | 76.8 | 70.8 |
| 30-34 | 13.8 | 11.6 | 10.6 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 10.5 | 11.9 | 84.4 | 87.0 | 88.1 | 89.1 | 88.1 | 86.8 | 84.3 | 81.2 |
| 35-39 | 12.4 | 10.3 | 9.2 | 7.9 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 7.3 | 8.2 | 84.8 | 87.2 | 88.5 | 89.5 | 89.0 | 88.1 | 85.9 | 83.0 |
| 40-44 | 12.3 | 10.6 | 8.9 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 83.2 | 85.1 | 87.0 | 88.3 | 88.3 | 87.9 | 85.9 | 83.0 |
| 45-49 | 11.7 | 10.9 | 9.5 | 7.9 | 7.0 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 81.2 | 82.3 | 83.7 | 85.3 | 86.0 | 85.7 | 84.7 | 82.6 |
| 50-54 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 10.4 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 77.6 | 78.0 | 79.2 | 80.0 | 81.6 | 82.3 | 81.6 | 80.7 |
| 55-59 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.5 | 10.2 | 9.0 | 7.3 | 6.3 | 5.8 | 72.7 | 72.6 | 73.0 | 73.9 | 74.8 | 76.2 | 76.8 | 76.3 |
| 60-64 | 9.8 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 10.7 | 10.2 | 8.7 | 7.1 | 6.0 | 65.5 | 65.2 | 64.8 | 64.2 | 65.8 | 67.2 | 68.7 | 70.1 |
| $65+$ | 10.4 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 10.3 | 10.7 | 10.2 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 41.6 | 41.4 | 41.2 | 39.1 | 39.2 | 39.0 | 39.9 | 41.1 |
|  | Widowed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Divorced |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-19 | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | - | - | - |
| 20-24 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| 25-29 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 3.6 |
| 30-34 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 6.4 |
| 35-39 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 3.8 | 5.7 | 7.8 |
| 40-44 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 3.8 | 5.8 | 8.7 |
| 45-49 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 5.4 | 8.1 |
| 50-54 | 11.0 | 10.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 8.8 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 6.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 4.7 | 7.0 |
| 55-59 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 15.9 | 15.0 | 14.5 | 14.0 | 13.0 | 12.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 3.9 | 5.7 |
| 60-64 | 24.4 | 24.5 | 24.4 | 24.5 | 22.6 | 22.0 | 21.1 | 19.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 4.5 |
| $65+$ | 47.9 | 48.5 | 48.4 | 50.3 | 49.4 | 49.8 | 49.0 | 48.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 2.3 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Censuses of Canada, Catalogue 99-704, Vol. 1, Table 36, 1978, Catalogue 92-825, Table 22, 1976, Catalogue 92-901, Table 4, 1981, and unpublished estimates of Population by Sex, Age and Marital Status, June 1986.

Table A8. Age-specific First Marriage Rates (per 1,000) for Male Cohorts, 1938-1968 and Female Cohorts 1940-1970, Canada

| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Year of Birth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1968 | 1967 | 1966 | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1962 | 1961 | 1960 | 1959 | 1958 | 1957 | 1956 | 1955 | 1954 | 1953 | 1952 | 1951 | 1950 | 1949 | 1948 | 1947 | 1946 | 1945 | 1944 | 1943 | 1942 | 1941 | 1940 | 1939 | 1938 |
|  | Year of $17{ }^{\text {th }}$ Birthday |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1985 | 1984 | 1983 | 1982 | 1981 | 1980 | 1979 | 1978 | 1977 | 1976 | 1975 | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 | 1971 | 1970 | 1969 | 1968 | 1967 | 1966 | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1962 | 1961 | 1960 | 1959 | 1958 | 1957 | 1956 | 1955 |
| 17 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 4.9 | 3.3 |
| 18 |  | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 8.6 | 9.6 | 11.1 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 18.3 | 19.7 | 20.6 | 21.9 | 18.9 | 17.9 | 17.2 | 16.9 | 17.8 | 18.1 | 18.3 | 15.9 | 15.3 | 17.1 | 18.0 | 19.2 | 19.0 | 19.2 | 19.3 | 18.5 |
| 19 |  |  | 10.2 | 11.3 | 13.4 | 16.7 | 19.9 | 22.7 | 25.3 | 28.7 | 32.4 | 36.6 | 41.3 | 44.7 | 48.0 | 48.7 | 44.2 | 41.7 | 39.8 | 41.0 | 44.2 | 44.6 | 39.2 | 37.7 | 38.1 | 43.1 | 42.6 | 44.5 | 43.9 | 44.2 | 43.1 |
| 20 |  |  |  | 22.1 | 24.8 | 29.4 | 35.4 | 40.7 | 44.9 | 49.7 | 53.4 | 58.8 | 62.0 | 71.3 | 77.6 | 81.7 | 83.6 | 77.3 | 73.6 | 73.4 | 77.4 | 82.8 | 73.3 | 70.6 | 71.7 | 73.7 | 74.5 | 75.5 | 74.2 | 76.8 | 76.0 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  | 38.2 | 42.4 | 48.3 | 55.2 | 61.8 | 68.1 | 71.6 | 75.0 | 79.4 | 82.9 | 96.9 | 100.2 | 109.5 | 116.5 | 116.5 | 114.0 | 120.1 | 127.6 | 118.1 | 112.9 | 114.0 | 116.8 | 111.3 | 113.4 | 114.7 | 112.9 | 114.8 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57.8 | 62.4 | 70.0 | 74.3 | 80.5 | 82.4 | 83.2 | 86.3 | 92.3 | 102.6 | 110.4 | 118.5 | 127.1 | 125.3 | 130.3 | 140.0 | 128.6 | 128.2 | 130.6 | 130.6 | 122.6 | 121.1 | 118.4 | 118.6 | 117.8 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.4 | 67.4 | 68.6 | 74.6 | 77.7 | 81.3 | 80.4 | 81.6 | 84.7 | 87.5 | 96.4 | 101.0 | 110.2 | 118.3 | 116.1 | 130.7 | 121.1 | 119.6 | 128.1 | 131.3 | 121.9 | 119.4 | 114.7 | 114.5 | 112.8 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67.0 | 68.2 | 69.6 | 70.4 | 72.1 | 73.5 | 72.6 | 72.5 | 73.7 | 75.2 | 82.4 | 87.3 | 92.5 | 97.5 | 97.3 | 98.3 | 98.5 | 106.0 | 111.0 | 108.3 | 106.0 | 101.1 | 98.5 | 98.6 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.8 | 63.9 | 61.2 | 62.4 | 63.8 | 63.2 | 62.1 | 61.4 | 62.5 | 61.9 | 67.0 | 68.9 | 72.7 | 75.3 | 78.1 | 75.2 | 80.8 | 84.8 | 85.5 | 86.6 | 83.9 | 82.2 | 79.5 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.5 | 52.8 | 52.7 | 53.5 | 52.2 | 50.9 | 50.2 | 48.8 | 49.8 | 48.7 | 51.4 | 52.6 | 55.5 | 58.5 | 56.2 | 59.7 | 62.0 | 64.3 | 64.6 | 64.1 | 65.2 | 63.1 |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45.0 | 42.7 | 42.5 | 42.4 | 41.5 | 40.4 | 39.0 | 38.9 | 38.2 | 39.8 | 40.7 | 42.4 | 42.3 | 42.1 | 44.9 | 46.7 | 47.8 | 49.6 | 49.2 | 48.8 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37.8 | 36.2 | 35.2 | 34.4 | 33.6 | 32.9 | 31.8 | 31.5 | 31.3 | 29.7 | 30.7 | 31.1 | 31.3 | 31.2 | 33.5 | 34.0 | 35.9 | 36.8 | 37.2 | 37.4 |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.4 | 29.8 | 29.1 | 27.5 | 27.4 | 26.4 | 25.0 | 23.7 | 23.6 | 23.2 | 24.1 | 23.3 | 23.9 | 25.9 | 24.7 | 27.5 | 28.0 | 28.4 | 29.2 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.4 | 23.6 | 23.0 | 21.8 | 21.0 | 20.6 | 19.5 | 18.9 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 18.5 | 18.6 | 18.9 | 19.5 | 20.4 | 22.4 | 21.5 | 21.8 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.2 | 18.7 | 18.0 | 16.8 | 16.1 | 15.7 | 14.7 | 14.3 | 14.6 | 14.2 | 14.1 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 15.3 | 15.6 | 16.5 | 16.5 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.5 | 15.2 | 13.4 | 13.3 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 13.7 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.1 | 11.6 | 11.2 | 10.3 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 9.2 | 8.7 | 9.3 | 10.2 | 9.6 | 10.8 | 10.6 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.7 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 8.6 | 8.4 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.8 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 6.8 | 6.4 | 7.0 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.3 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 5.0 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.4 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.3 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.7 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.4 |

Table A8. Age-specific First Marriage Rates (per 1,000) for Male Cohorts, 1938-1968 and Female Cohorts 1940-1970, Canada

| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Year of Birth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1970 | 1969 | 1968 | 1967 | 1966 | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1962 | 1961 | 1960 | 1959 | 1958 | 1957 | 1956 | 1955 | 1954 | 1953 | 1952 | 1951 | 1950 | 1949 | 1948 | 1947 | 1946 | 1945 | 1944 | 1943 | 1942 | 1941 | 1940 |
|  | Year of $15^{\text {th }}$ Birthday |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1985 | 1984 | 1983 | 1982 | 1981 | 1980 | 1979 | 1978 | 1977 | 1976 | 1975 | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 | 1971 | 1970 | 1969 | 1968 | 1967 | 1966 | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1962 | 1961 | 1960 | 1959 | 1958 | 1957 | 1956 | 1955 |
| 15 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 5.2 |
| 16 |  | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 11.4 | 13.9 | 15.8 | 17.4 | 18.6 | 17.6 | 17.7 | 16.7 | 15.7 | 16.5 | 16.8 | 17.6 | 19.5 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 22.4 | 25.7 | 26.7 | 26.5 | 27.2 | 27.9 |
| 17 |  |  | 7.6 | 8.5 | 9.6 | 11.1 | 12.8 | 15.3 | 17.2 | 19.7 | 23.7 | 27.4 | 33.0 | 36.1 | 39.9 | 41.8 | 40.1 | 40.6 | 38.6 | 39.7 | 40.8 | 41.0 | 44.8 | 48.7 | 45.4 | 48.5 | 53.5 | 56.8 | 59.2 | 62.1 | 61.3 |
| 18 |  |  |  | 24.7 | 25.8 | 29.8 | 34.6 | 39.1 | 45.4 | 49.8 | 54.6 | 61.6 | 68.1 | 77.6 | 82.3 | 87.0 | 92.3 | 85.2 | 82.7 | 82.0 | 81.7 | 84.5 | 88.0 | 93.6 | 87.2 | 86.2 | 94.3 | 101.6 | 104.6 | 110.9 | 109.5 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  | 41.1 | 44.4 | 49.8 | 56.8 | 64.2 | 70.5 | 74.5 | 79.6 | 85.3 | 91.3 | 101.4 | 106.5 | 115.8 | 119.7 | 113.2 | 108.7 | 108.6 | 110.3 | 116.5 | 123.1 | 109.4 | 106.7 | 112.7 | 122.0 | 120.2 | 126.2 | 124.0 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  | 58.1 | 61.6 | 67.1 | 76.0 | 81.4 | 87.4 | 90.0 | 92.4 | 96.2 | 97.2 | 108.7 | 116.2 | 123.3 | 130.3 | 126.8 | 121.5 | 126.1 | 132.8 | 141.3 | 124.7 | 118.5 | 124.9 | 125.7 | 124.0 | 126.9 | 124.0 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69.7 | 74.3 | 75.6 | 81.8 | 84.7 | 89.3 | 89.5 | 90.8 | 90.4 | 91.1 | 102.5 | 109.0 | 117.5 | 125.7 | 128.8 | 126.7 | 134.6 | 143.0 | 132.1 | 122.9 | 124.5 | 127.3 | 119.5 | 120.7 | 116.3 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73.1 | 74.1 | 74.3 | 76.7 | 80.0 | 79.0 | 79.4 | 76.5 | 77.5 | 79.1 | 86.2 | 89.9 | 95.4 | 100.7 | 101.3 | 105.8 | 115.9 | 105.1 | 100.7 | 103.0 | 104.4 | 95.1 | 94.1 | 91.9 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69.5 | 68.4 | 67.1 | 68.4 | 67.5 | 66.5 | 64.8 | 62.0 | 63.2 | 61.6 | 66.5 | 68.2 | 71.0 | 74.0 | 73.4 | 83.0 | 76.3 | 74.1 | 78.2 | 78.0 | 73.6 | 70.9 | 67.2 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 59.6 | 58.2 | 56.2 | 55.7 | 53.0 | 52.9 | 49.9 | 48.1 | 47.7 | 46.8 | 50.4 | 50.6 | 51.0 | 51.8 | 49.9 | 53.4 | 50.6 | 53.6 | 55.9 | 54.2 | 52.3 | 50.7 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49.8 | 47.4 | 44.5 | 43.3 | 42.2 | 40.8 | 38.4 | 37.0 | 36.5 | 35.7 | 36.9 | 36.5 | 36.3 | 36.5 | 38.2 | 37.7 | 38.1 | 39.2 | 39.0 | 38.8 | 36.6 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.9 | 37.4 | 35.4 | 33.7 | 31.6 | 30.2 | 29.3 | 27.8 | 28.2 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 26.1 | 25.7 | 27.7 | 25.7 | 27.9 | 28.2 | 28.1 | 27.7 | 27.2 |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.2 | 29.1 | 27.0 | 25.9 | 24.5 | 24.3 | 22.2 | 21.6 | 21.0 | 20.3 | 20.0 | 18.8 | 20.1 | 18.9 | 19.9 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 20.6 | 19.6 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.4 | 22.8 | 20.8 | 19.7 | 18.6 | 18.0 | 16.9 | 16.3 | 15.6 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 15.7 | 14.8 | 15.5 | 14.9 | 15.3 | 15.8 | 16.7 |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.5 | 17.3 | 16.3 | 15.7 | 14.8 | 13.9 | 12.9 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 11.1 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 12.4 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.5 | 14.0 | 12.5 | 12.0 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 9.6 | 10.3 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.8 | 10.6 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.4 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.2 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.1 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.4 | 5.2 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.3 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 4.1 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 |

Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

Table A9. Number of Divorces Granted, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1979-1985

| Province | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | Change <br> from 1983 <br> to 1984 | Change <br> from 1984 <br> to 1985 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Newfoundland | 483 | 555 | 569 | 625 | 711 | 590 | 561 | -121 | -29 |
| Prince Edward Island | 144 | 163 | 187 | 206 | 215 | 195 | 213 | -20 | 18 |
| Nova Scotia | 2,275 | 2,314 | 2,285 | 2,281 | 2,340 | 2,264 | 2,337 | -76 | 73 |
| New Brunswick | 1,223 | 1,326 | 1,334 | 1,663 | 1,942 | 1,427 | 1,360 | -515 | -67 |
| Quebec | 14,379 | 13,899 | 19,193 | 18,579 | 17,365 | 16,845 | 15,814 | -520 | $-1,031$ |
| Ontario | 21,793 | 22,442 | 21,680 | 23,644 | 23,073 | 21,636 | 20,854 | $-1,437$ | -782 |
| Manitoba | 2,152 | 2,282 | 2,399 | 2,392 | 2,642 | 2,611 | 2,314 | -31 | -297 |
| Saskatchewan | 1,528 | 1,836 | 1,932 | 1,815 | 2,000 | 1,988 | 1,927 | -12 | -61 |
| Alberta | 6,531 | 7,580 | 8,418 | 8,882 | 8,758 | 8,454 | 8,102 | -304 | -352 |
| British Columbia | 8,826 | 9,464 | 9,533 | 10,165 | 9,348 | 8,988 | 8,330 | -360 | -658 |
| Yukon | 62 | 82 | 75 | 117 | 88 | 100 | 96 | 12 | -4 |
| Northwest Territories | 78 | 76 | 66 | 67 | 85 | 74 | 72 | -11 | -2 |
| Canada | $\mathbf{5 9 , 4 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 , 6 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 , 4 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 , 5 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 , 1 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 , 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 , 3 9 5}$ | $-\mathbf{- 3 , 1 9 2}$ |

Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Vol. II, Marriages and Divorces, Catalogue 84-205.

Table A10. Divorces by Duration of Marriage, Canada, 1969-1985

| Duration (years) | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 51 | 58 | 75 | 84 | 99 | 105 | 129 | 153 | 148 | 139 | 157 | 152 | 163 | 195 | 162 | 174 | 177 |
| 1 | 281 | 390 | 473 | 524 | 645 | 716 | 872 | 1,026 | 1,144 | 1,204 | 1,216 | 1,124 | 1,282 | 1,403 | 1,306 | 1,246 | 1,220 |
| 2 | 505 | 834 | 931 | 1,023 | 1,165 | 1,457 | 1,662 | 1,863 | 2,061 | 2,163 | 2,214 | 2,340 | 2,517 | 2,586 | 2,540 | 2,259 | 2,052 |
| 3 | 636 | 1,094 | 1,258 | 1,466 | 1,712 | 2,019 | 2,285 | 2,585 | 2,701 | 2,916 | 3,144 | 3,144 | 3,263 | 3,493 | 3,364 | 2,944 | 2,776 |
| 4 | 867 | 1,406 | 1,639 | 1,950 | 2,152 | 2,794 | 3,063 | 3,411 | 3,610 | 3,669 | 3,940 | 4,264 | 4,420 | 4,425 | 4,257 | 3,913 | 3,628 |
| 5 | 909 | 1,389 | 1,688 | 2,022 | 2,403 | 2,797 | 3,277 | 3,525 | 3,779 | 4,064 | 4,245 | 4,469 | 4,873 | 4,766 | 4,687 | 4,206 | 4,018 |
| 6 | 918 | 1,430 | 1,586 | 1,926 | 2,237 | 2,731 | 3,216 | 3,558 | 3,583 | 3,847 | 4,227 | 4,487 | 4,809 | 4,811 | 4,538 | 4,101 | 3,914 |
| 7 | 916 | 1,479 | 1,468 | 1,718 | 2,146 | 2,674 | 3,096 | 3,259 | 3,565 | 3,630 | 3,855 | 4,206 | 4,545 | 4,593 | 4,424 | 3,979 | 3,690 |
| 8 | 945 | 1,352 | 1,474 | 1,524 | 1,900 | 2,356 | 2,839 | 2,919 | 3,032 | 3,270 | 3,497 | 3,735 | 4,090 | 4,327 | 4,236 | 3,780 | 3,432 |
| 9 | 918 | 1,251 | 1,271 | 1,466 | 1,664 | 2,129 | 2,435 | 2,741 | 2,782 | 2,921 | 3,231 | 3,413 | 3,670 | 4,071 | 3,750 | 3,663 | 3,258 |
| 10 | 892 | 1,224 | 1,230 | 1,364 | 1,484 | 1,911 | 2,165 | 2,456 | 2,492 | 2,640 | 2,824 | 3,023 | 3,262 | 3,625 | 3,590 | 3,346 | 3,204 |
| 11 | 805 | 1,206 | 1,249 | 1,230 | 1,332 | 1,707 | 1,830 | 2,163 | 2,229 | 2,328 | 2,549 | 2,692 | 2,998 | 3,154 | 3,291 | 3,092 | 2,904 |
| 12 | 894 | 1,051 | 1,082 | 1,193 | 1,260 | 1,554 | 1,733 | 1,886 | 1,967 | 2,070 | 2,191 | 2,302 | 2,597 | 2,912 | 2,852 | 2,823 | 2,690 |
| 13 | 766 | 1,092 | 1,067 | 1,050 | 1,277 | 1,538 | 1,718 | 1,751 | 1,726 | 1,904 | 1,953 | 2,120 | 2,324 | 2,550 | 2,583 | 2,476 | 2,445 |
| 14 | 735 | 1,083 | 1,005 | 1,075 | 1,137 | 1,458 | 1,541 | 1,589 | 1,619 | 1,701 | 1,764 | 1,807 | 2,091 | 2,328 | 2,339 | 2,364 | 2,196 |
| 15 | 649 | 933 | 920 | 994 | 1,093 | 1,269 | 1,465 | 1,500 | 1,484 | 1,542 | 1,535 | 1,660 | 1,818 | 2,051 | 1,976 | 1,960 | 2,076 |
| 16 | 700 | 959 | 837 | 949 | 1,039 | 1,206 | 1,390 | 1,450 | 1,396 | 1,390 | 1,353 | 1,481 | 1,675 | 1,725 | 1,883 | 1,837 | 1,826 |
| 17 | 674 | 892 | 837 | 872 | 998 | 1,228 | 1,333 | 1,362 | 1,320 | 1,290 | 1,253 | 1,295 | 1,519 | 1,604 | 1,682 | 1,687 | 1,618 |
| 18 | 631 | 821 | 902 | 804 | 884 | 1,131 | 1,398 | 1,286 | 1,216 | 1,254 | 1,233 | 1,232 | 1,397 | 1,470 | 1,469 | 1,527 | 1,511 |
| 19 | 641 | 796 | 795 | 828 | 916 | 1,097 | 1,171 | 1,275 | 1,215 | 1,175 | 1,184 | 1,216 | 1,259 | 1,365 | 1,346 | 1,355 | 1,382 |
| 20 | 624 | 749 | 761 | 781 | 874 | 1,116 | 1,091 | 1,177 | 1,152 | 1,118 | 1,050 | 1,107 | 1,228 | 1,360 | 1,186 | 1,258 | 1,293 |
| 21 | 598 | 731 | 687 | 737 | 793 | 971 | 1,066 | 1,062 | 1,154 | 1,128 | 1,080 | 1,028 | 1,201 | 1,219 | 1,133 | 1,107 | 1,110 |
| 22 | 642 | 713 | 700 | 720 | 744 | 936 | 1,038 | 1,010 | 961 | 1,014 | 1,121 | 1,020 | 1,093 | 1,145 | 1,045 | 1,020 | 1,022 |
| 23 | 642 | 730 | 641 | 646 | 732 | 912 | 938 | 991 | 973 | 902 | 966 | 998 | 1,027 | 995 | 997 | 982 | 909 |
| 24 | 546 | 692 | 650 | 636 | 753 | 841 | 863 | 963 | 892 | 913 | 875 | 896 | 986 | 966 | 892 | 886 | 822 |
| 25 | 485 | 543 | 594 | 621 | 696 | 725 | 798 | 887 | 881 | 848 | 799 | 830 | 927 | 876 | 846 | 887 | 844 |
| $26+$ | 4,083 | 4,286 | 3,840 | 4,152 | 4,539 | 5,598 | 6,141 | 6,294 | 6,223 | 6,046 | 5,951 | 5,898 | 6,542 | 6,335 | 6,108 | 6,173 | 5,896 |
| Not Stated | 40 | 58 | 27 | 39 | 29 | 103 | 60 | 67 | 66 | 69 | 67 | 79 | 97 | 83 | 85 | 77 | 68 |
| Total | 21,993 | 29,242 | 29,687 | 32,394 | 36,703 | 45,079 | 50,613 | 54,209 | 55,371 | 57,155 | 59,474 | 62,018 | 67,673 | 70,433 | 68,567 | 65,172 | 61,981 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Health Division, Vital Statistics Section, unpublished data; Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Catalogue 84-205, 1984, Table 18.

Table A11. Deaths and Crude Death Rates (per 1,000), Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1981-1985

| Year | Newfoundland | Prince <br> Edward <br> Island | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nova } \\ & \text { Scotia } \end{aligned}$ | New <br> Brunswick | Quebec | Ontario | Manitoba | Saskatchewan | Alberta | British Columbia | Yukon | Northwest Territories | Canada |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Deaths |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 3,230 | 992 | 6,958 | 5,139 | 42,684 | 62,838 | 8,648 | 7,523 | 12,823 | 19,857 | 141 | 196 | 171,029 |
| 1982 | 3,385 | 980 | 6,941 | 5,197 | 43,497 | 63,696 | 8,490 | 8,202 | 12,968 | 20,707 | 118 | 232 | 174,413 |
| 1983 | 3,498 | 1,050 | 7,047 | 5,206 | 44,275 | 64,507 | 8,521 | 7,611 | 12,588 | 19,827 | 113 | 241 | 174,484 |
| 1984 | 3,520 | 1,109 | 6,913 | 5,272 | 44,449 | 64,703 | 8,290 | 7,710 | 12,730 | 20,686 | 108 | 237 | 175,727 |
| 1985 | 3,557 | 1,110 | 7,315 | 5,230 | 45,707 | 66,747 | 8,756 | 8,031 | 13,231 | 21,302 | 123 | 214 | 181,323 |
|  | Crude death rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 5.7 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 6.6 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 7.8 | 5.7 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 4.3 | 7.0 |
| 1982 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 7.4 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 7.1 |
| 1983 | 6.1 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 7.3 | 8.1 | 7.7 | 5.4 | 7.0 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| 1984 | 6.1 | 8.9 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 5.4 | 7.2 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 7.0 |
| 1985 | 6.1 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 5.6 | 7.4 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 7.2 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Births and Deaths, Catalogue 84-204.

Table A12. Life Expectancy 1931-1981 and Increase in Life Expectancy 1931-36 to 1976-81, Canada

| Year | Life Expectancy |  | Increase in Life Expectancy <br> Over the Preceding 5 Years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1931 | 60.00 | 62.06 | - | - |
| 1936 | 61.34 | 63.66 | 1.34 | 1.60 |
| 1941 | 63.04 | 66.31 | 1.70 | 2.65 |
| 1946 | 65.06 | 68.62 | 2.02 | 2.31 |
| 1951 | 66.40 | 70.90 | 1.34 | 2.28 |
| 1956 | 67.68 | 72.95 | 1.28 | 2.05 |
| 1961 | 68.44 | 74.26 | 0.76 | 1.31 |
| 1966 | 68.73 | 75.25 | 0.29 | 0.99 |
| 1971 | 69.40 | 76.45 | 0.67 | 1.20 |
| 1976 | 70.26 | 77.70 | 0.86 | 1.25 |
| 1981 | 71.88 | 79.06 | 1.62 | 1.36 |

Source: Nagnur, D. (1986) Longevity and Historical Life Tables, 1921-1981, Canada and the Provinces. Table C1. Statistics Canada, Catalogue 89-506.

Table A13. Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 Live Births), Canada, 1931-1985

| Year | Rate | Year | Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1931 | 86.0 | 1959 | 28.4 |
| 1932 | 74.6 | 1960 | 27.3 |
| 1933 | 74.1 | 1961 | 27.2 |
| 1934 | 72.7 | 1962 | 27.6 |
| 1935 | 72.5 | 1963 | 26.3 |
| 1936 | 67.7 | 1964 | 24.7 |
| 1937 | 77.4 | 1965 | 23.6 |
| 1938 | 64.2 | 1966 | 23.1 |
| 1939 | 61.4 | 1967 | 22.0 |
| 1940 | 57.6 | 1968 | 20.8 |
| 1941 | 61.1 | 1969 | 19.3 |
| 1942 | 55.4 | 1970 | 18.8 |
| 1943 | 55.0 | 1971 | 17.5 |
| 1944 | 56.3 | 1972 | 17.1 |
| 1945 | 52.5 | 1973 | 15.5 |
| 1946 | 47.8 | 1974 | 15.0 |
| 1947 | 46.2 | 1975 | 14.3 |
| 1948 | 44.4 | 1976 | 13.5 |
| 1949 | 43.4 | 1977 | 12.4 |
| 1950 | 41.5 | 1978 | 12.0 |
| 1951 | 38.5 | 1979 | 10.9 |
| 1952 | 38.2 | 1980 | 10.4 |
| 1953 | 35.6 | 1981 | 9.6 |
| 1954 | 31.9 | 1982 | 9.1 |
| 1955 | 31.3 | 1983 | 8.5 |
| 1956 | 31.9 | 1984 | 8.1 |
| 1957 | 30.9 | 1985 | 7.9 |
| 1958 | 30.2 |  |  |
| 5954 |  |  |  |

Source:Statistics Canada, Catalogues 84-204 and 84-206.

Table A14. Distribution of Deaths by Major Causes, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1983

| Cause | Canada | Newfoundland | Prince Edward Island | Nova Scotia | New Brunswick | Quebec | Ontario | Manitoba | Saskatchewan | Alberta | British Columbia | Yukon | Northwest Territories |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ischaemic Heart Disease | $\begin{aligned} & 47,949 \\ & (27 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 994 | 316 | 1,904 | 1,508 | 11,387 | 19,396 | 2,341 | 1,904 | 3,000 | 5,163 | 20 | 16 |
| Cerebrovascular Disease | $\begin{array}{r} 14,086 \\ (8 \%) \end{array}$ | 327 | 70 | 545 | 418 | 3,358 | 5,426 | 684 | 660 | 891 | 1,694 | 3 | 10 |
| Cancers | $\begin{aligned} & 43,282 \\ & (25 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 806 | 252 | 1,715 | 1,163 | 11,543 | 16,132 | 2,107 | 1,735 | 2,808 | 4,951 | 24 | 46 |
| Traffic Accidents | $\begin{aligned} & 4,156 \\ & (2 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 94 | 27 | 171 | 117 | 1,158 | 1,185 | 147 | 226 | 432 | 582 | 8 | 9 |
| Others | $\begin{gathered} 65,011 \\ (37 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 1,277 | 385 | 2,712 | 2,000 | 16,829 | 22,368 | 3,242 | 3,086 | 5,457 | 7,137 | 58 | 160 |
| TOTAL | $\begin{aligned} & 174,484 \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3,498 | 1,050 | 7,047 | 5,206 | 44,275 | 64,507 | 8,521 | 7,611 | 12,588 | 19,527 | 113 | 241 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Causes of Death, Catalogue 84-203.

Table A15. Age-sex Distribution per 1,000 Immigrants to Canada, 1970, 1980, 1983, 1984, 1985

| Age | 1970 |  | 1980 |  | 1983 |  | 1984 |  | 1985 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females |
| $0-4$ | 43 | 40 | 35 | 32 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 23 | 25 | 24 |
| $5-9$ | 39 | 37 | 43 | 38 | 30 | 29 | 31 | 30 | 32 | 29 |
| $10-14$ | 26 | 25 | 42 | 37 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 32 | 36 | 33 |
| $15-19$ | 33 | 40 | 57 | 49 | 46 | 47 | 44 | 43 | 44 | 43 |
| $20-24$ | 106 | 124 | 74 | 75 | 67 | 86 | 65 | 84 | 66 | 78 |
| $25-29$ | 105 | 87 | 72 | 66 | 70 | 77 | 72 | 80 | 76 | 78 |
| $30-34$ | 60 | 46 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 49 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| $35-39$ | 34 | 25 | 29 | 25 | 29 | 30 | 30 | 33 | 34 | 35 |
| $40-44$ | 19 | 16 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 18 | 21 | 20 | 22 |
| $45-49$ | 10 | 11 | 13 | 17 | 13 | 18 | 13 | 18 | 15 | 19 |
| $50-54$ | 6 | 9 | 15 | 23 | 14 | 23 | 13 | 23 | 13 | 20 |
| $55-59$ | 6 | 10 | 17 | 24 | 18 | 30 | 17 | 28 | 16 | 24 |
| $60-64$ | 6 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 21 | 26 | 21 | 25 | 18 | 23 |
| $65+$ | 10 | 17 | 22 | 29 | 31 | 42 | 31 | 42 | 27 | 39 |
| Mean | 25.5 | 26.3 | 27.8 | 30.0 | 30.9 | 32.7 | 30.6 | 32.8 | 30.1 | 32.3 |

Source: Employment and Immigration Canada, Immigration Statistics, ISSN 0576-2286.

Table A16. Total Fertility Rate, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1978-1985

| Province | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 |
| Newfoundland | 2.18 | .. | 2.03 | 1.86 | 1.79 | .. | .. | .. |
| Prince Edward |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Island | 2.04 | 1.97 | 1.94 | 1.91 | 1.93 | 1.89 | 1.89 | 1.90 |
| Nova Scotia | 1.77 | 1.71 | 1.67 | 1.64 | 1.67 | 1.66 | 1.63 | 1.62 |
| New Brunswick | 1.78 | 1.76 | 1.68 | 1.71 | 1.70 | 1.69 | 1.65 | 1.60 |
| Quebec | 1.69 | 1.75 | 1.70 | 1.61 | 1.52 | 1.47 | 1.46 | 1.43 |
| Ontario | 1.68 | 1.67 | 1.66 | 1.63 | 1.65 | 1.66 | 1.69 | 1.68 |
| Manitoba | 1.91 | 1.88 | 1.84 | 1.86 | 1.84 | 1.87 | 1.86 | 1.88 |
| Saskatchewan | 2.20 | 2.19 | 2.14 | 2.14 | 2.17 | 2.13 | 2.11 | 2.09 |
| Alberta | 1.98 | 1.97 | 2.01 | 1.94 | 1.96 | 1.96 | 1.92 | 1.93 |
| British Columbia | 1.72 | 1.72 | 1.73 | 1.71 | 1.74 | 1.73 | 1.76 | 1.73 |
| Yukon | 2.03 | 2.19 | 2.09 | 2.14 | 2.04 | 2.36 | 2.25 | 1.97 |
| Northwest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Territories | 3.04 | 3.30 | 3.37 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.20 | 2.99 | 2.86 |
| Canada | $\mathbf{1 . 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 7}$ |

.. : unavailable.
Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics, Catalogue 84-204.

PART II

## CHILDBEARING PERFORMANCE OF MARRIED CANADIAN-BORN WOMEN

Nuptiality and fertility have always been closely related, the sanction of the first providing the basis for full realization of the potential in the second. Today, however, statistics show that because of the availability of contraceptives, and perhaps because of changes in attitude, the relationship is weakening. Out-of-wedlock births are increasing at the same time as the general fertility rate is declining - although the increase should not be exaggerated, for married couples still account for the vast majority of births. Moreover, since a large proportion of out-of-wedlock births are "redeemed" by late marriages which are often the legalization of common-law unions, fertility statistics relating only to married women are still, for all practical purposes, a good single measure of the reproductive performance of the population as a whole.

This section analyses the changes that have occurred in the number - and when possible the timing - of births to married women who were born in Canada ${ }^{1}$. All too often, published data on childbearing present only a snapshot for a single period of time - for instance, the number of births in a given year classified by marital status and age of mother. Yet, the events in every succeeding year can be very different, and we may wonder to what extent the data for a single period in time will be indicative of the completed fertility of each woman once her reproductive years are over. In other words, it is important to understand how the reproductive performance of married couples evolves from one generation to the next. The total fertility rate, which is one of the most frequently quoted measures of fertility, is a fickle measure. While certainly informative, it can easily be misinterpreted. For instance, most laymen, upon being told that the total fertility rate is currently less than 2 children per woman, might jump to the conclusion that couples are no longer replacing themselves. This may or may not be correct, but it cannot be ascertained without an analysis of cohort behaviour - that is to say an analysis of the fertility patterns of women who have completed their reproductive period and of variables indicating what the ultimate fertility levels of younger cohorts might be. In both the 1971 and 1981 Census questionnaires, married women were asked how many children they had ever borne. This information provides a reasonably precise reading of their fertility and can be used to compare the reproductive performances of homologous groups of women from different periods of time.

[^20]
## Comparability of Data

Specifically, the two questions addressed to ever-married women ${ }^{2}$ in both the 1971 and 1981 Censuses were: "How many children were ever borne to you?" and "What were the month and year of your first marriage?". The point to note is that the wording of these questions was the same in both censuses, but the responses were not processed in exactly the same way. This raised problems. Upon close examination ${ }^{3}$ it was concluded that the two data series could be used for an analysis of the type proposed here, provided the deficiencies were taken into consideration. Crosstabulating the information on parity ${ }^{4}$ against age at the time of the census and age at marriage yielded a wealth of information, which served as the basis for the analysis that follows.

## Fertility and Marriage

Even a fecund woman is infertile until she has borne her first child. Since natural sterility among young women is rare, and furthermore since fecundity during this period is high, the number, or proportion, of childless married women after a certain number of years of marriage can be attributed mostly to voluntary infertility. The changes that have occurred recently with respect to voluntary infertility are depicted in Chart 1, which shows the percentages of childless women after five years of marriage (1946 and 1956 birth cohorts) and ten years of marriage ( 1941 and 1951 birth cohorts) ${ }^{5}$.

Clearly, no matter which cohort is examined, the proportion of married women who are childless at age 25 (or age 30 ) is related to the duration of marriage. A curve fits the data well, indicating that the younger the age at time of marriage, the greater the chances of having a first child within the first five (or ten) years of marriage.

It is also obvious that the more recent the cohort, the higher the level of childlessness for a given age at marriage, and for a given duration of marriage. In the two graphs, this is reflected in the fact that the curve for the younger cohort is consistently above the curve for the older cohort.

At the very least, it can be said that women in more recent cohorts seem less eager to have their first child than were their predecessors.

[^21]Chart 1
Proportion of Childless Women in Selected Generations After 5 and 10 Years of Marriage in Two Like Birth-Marriage Cohorts, Canada


Source: Table B2.

## Completed Fertility and Age at Marriage

The fact that more recent cohorts are remaining childless longer than did their counterparts in the past provides no information about the total number of children that may in fact be borne to these cohorts by age 50 . Where birth control is practiced, the interval between marriage and first birth is, in theory, not very strongly correlated with completed fertility; no longer at the mercy of nature, women can either have the child or children they want early ${ }^{6}$ and then stop reproducing, or they can postpone childbearing until later, but still have a family that is reasonably large by current standards. Also, not all women decide, before the end of their reproductive period, that they will have no more children. As a result, individual histories intertwine to produce a statistical picture with subtle shadings. Nevertheless, the data on completed fertility

[^22](Table 1) reveal that as a general rule, the earlier women marry, the more children they have. With remarkable consistency over time, the average completed fertility of women born in the same year and married at age 18 is roughly twice as high as that of women married at age 30 . This is not a complete surprise: the earlier the age at marriage, the greater the exposure to the risk of pregnancy since fecundity decreases with age. Moreover, women who at an early age want (or at least are not opposed to) large families, usually marry young.

This information is important since the proportion of women who marry at a later age has been rising in recent years, as indicated by the increase in the current mean age at first marriage. ${ }^{7}$

These two observations give rise to an interesting question: since women who had married at the age of 30 in the mid-1960s (and were 40 in 1981) had almost replaced themselves, will the cohorts that are currently in their most fertile years replace themselves too?

Table 1. Final or Completed Fertility of Married Women at Certain Ages at Marriage for Selected Cohorts, Canada

| Cohort | Completed Fertility per 1,000 <br> Women by Age at Marriage |  |  |  | All <br> Ages at <br> Marriage | Age of <br> Women in <br> 1981 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18 <br> years | 21 <br> years | 25 <br> years | 27 <br> years |  |  |  |
|  | 4,833 | 3,879 | 3,087 | 2,713 | 2,253 | 3,224 | 68 |
| 1916 | 4,480 | 3,731 | 3,009 | 2,575 | 2,151 | 3,237 | 65 |
| 1919 | 4,522 | 3,744 | 3,157 | 2,826 | 2,562 | 3,392 | 62 |
| 1922 | 4,436 | 3,921 | 3,143 | 2,878 | 2,472 | 3,563 | 59 |
| 1925 | 4,448 | 3,723 | 3,202 | 2,921 | 2,247 | 3,571 | 56 |
| 1928 | 4,607 | 3,765 | 3,167 | 2,730 | 2,337 | 3,614 | 53 |
| 1931 | 4,331 | 3,645 | 2,869 | 2,620 | 2,049 | 3,514 | 50 |
| 1934 | 4,183 | 3,436 | 2,798 | 2,489 | 1,944 | 3,438 | 47 |
| 1937 | 3,870 | 3,108 | 2,379 | 1,954 | 1,880 | 3,156 | 44 |
| 1940 | 3,441 | 2,704 | 2,083 | 1,926 | 1,601 | 2,833 | 41 |
| 1943 | 3,095 | 2,389 | 1,894 | 1,717 | 1,531 | 2,468 | 38 |

Source: Statistics Canada, 1981 Census of Canada.

[^23]
## Cohort Fertility

Cohort fertility can be properly understood only within its historical perspective. The tables that follow in the text and Appendix B relate the fertility of women during the 1920s and 1930s to the economic and social context in which they lived. The mere fact that women, or rather couples, now have almost complete control over their fertility does not mean that the birth rate will be inexorably reduced until society dies out. Like couples of the past, though probably in different ways, every new generation of couples is subject to subtle pressures, currents of thought, needs and events that shape their reproductive considerations.

The analysis in this section is based on that population of female respondents who had reached, or had almost reached, the end of their reproductive period at the time of the 1981 Census, and who were born between 1904 and 1943. These women lived through three events, different in nature, that had a major impact on fertility: 1) the severe economic difficulties of the 1930s; 2) the prosperity of the postwar era; and 3 ) the increased use of contraceptives during the 1960s.

When one examines these cohorts within the context of these events, one discovers a correspondence between the events and the fertility of the cohorts likely to have been most affected by the events. This observed correspondence, it must be cautioned, should not be overstated: it requires careful interpretation.

For a long time, researchers have been looking for a theory that could explain variations in fertility, as well as fluctuations in fertility rates. None has succeeded. The underlying influences behind variations in fertility are obscure. They are probably diverse, vary according to circumstance, and sometimes work in combination with factors which are determinants under one set of circumstances, but have no effect under others. Also, one must take as facts those events that seem to have had an impact, but avoid the temptation of discovering ingenuously through them "laws" associating periods of prosperity or recession to a certain level of fertility.

Census data do not lend themselves very well to a reconstruction of the fertility profiles of past generations. The data provide only final balances in terms of the number of children born: other relevant characteristics are not disclosed.

The three events in question are represented in Table 2 by the single years that it was felt best capture the essence of each event. For example, 1933 was chosen because it was, although arguably, the harshest year of the Depression which started in 1929 and lasted until the outbreak of the war. Similarly, 1950 was chosen because it more or less approximates the blossoming of the era of prosperity that took hold after the war and persisted over a considerable number of years; and, 1968 was chosen because it was around this time that oral contraceptives, though known and used earlier, became widely publicized and commonly prescribed by the medical profession.

Table 2. Correspondence Between the Age of Women Belonging to Certain Cohorts (Married Between 18 and 24), Certain Dates and Their Completed Fertility, Canada

| Cohort | Age of Women in |  |  |  | Completed Fertility <br> per 1,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1933 | 1950 | 1968 | 1981 | Ever-married Women |
| 1904 | 29 | 46 |  |  | 3,990 |
| 1907 | 26 | 43 |  |  | 3,859 |
| 1910 | 23 | 40 |  |  | 3,677 |
| 1913 | 20 | 37 | 55 | 68 | 3,650 |
| 1916 | 17 | 34 | 52 | 65 | 3,597 |
| 1919 |  | 31 | 49 | 62 | 3,645 |
| 1922 |  | 28 | 46 | 59 | 3,756 |
| 1925 |  | 25 | 43 | 56 | 3,747 |
| 1928 |  | 22 | 40 | 53 | 3,802 |
| 1931 |  | 19 | 37 | 50 | 3,690 |
| 1934 |  | 16 | 34 | 47 | 3,544 |
| 1937 |  |  | 31 | 44 | 3,238 |
| 1940 |  |  | 28 | 41 | 2,871 |
| 1943 |  |  | 25 | 38 | 2,485 |

1933 - period of economic crisis.
1950 - post-war period of prosperity.
1968 - coincides approximately with the introduction of widespread oral contraceptives.

To simplify matters, we have confined our analysis to the correlation between these events and the fertility of women who married between the ages of 18 and 24 . For any generation, as previously shown, this is the age group that is the most prolific. Fluctuations in fertility in this one subgroup of the generation explain a good part of the fluctuations in fertility of the entire generation.

Those women born in 1904 had the highest fertility (almost four children per woman). They passed through their reproductive years at a time when contraceptives were difficult to obtain and less effective than they are today, and the social setting was, for the most part, favourable to large families. The Depression did not have an appreciable effect on the fertility of these women, because by then their prime childbearing years were behind them; furthermore, the Depression was, for all intents and purposes, quite brief, so that it was possible to "recoup" some births ${ }^{8}$.

[^24]The women born between 1913 and 1916 were at the peak of their fertility during the Depression, and were still only 24 to 27 years old in 1940 when the Depression was superseded by the war. However, the prosperity that flowered in the 1950s had little impact on this generation since its members were then approaching age 40 (although it is a fact that some of them were in their 30s when they gave birth). The completed fertility for this generation was slightly lower than for the one born in 1904: just over 3.5 children per woman (if this level seems to be quite high it is because this analysis is restricted to women who married young).

By comparison with the above cohorts, women born between 1919 and 1928 encountered fewer obstacles to reproduction. They were still children when the Depression hit, but close to their peak fecundity during the prosperous 1950s. By the mid-1960s when contraceptives had become readily available, these women had already had fairly large families. The 1922 cohort, for instance, averaged 3.8 children per woman - a level only $5 \%$ lower than that of the 1904 cohort.

Women born in 1934, 1935 and subsequent years show a very sharp decline in fertility. As they were approaching peak fecundity the blossom of post-war prosperity had already begun to fade. At the same time, changing attitudes towards birth control enabled them to prevent the birth of more children than planned. Accordingly, for women marrying between the ages of 18 and 24, those born in 1943 will not average much more than 2.5 children per woman.

> In short, then, it appears that: 1) "exogenous" or "environmental" factors may have an influence upon the number of children born - even to women with the highest likelihood of becoming mothers (i.e. 18-24 year age group), but this influence is moderate; 2 ) the low level of fertility among recent generations is solely responsible for the decline in fertility recorded by the annual indices. Considering the rate of the decline, the question can be asked:

## Will Recent Cohorts Replace Themselves?

Now let us consider whole generations and not just respective subgroups of women who married between the ages of 18 and 24 . The completed fertility of a cohort cannot, of course, be known until its members have reached the age of 50 . With rare exceptions age 50 marks the end of the reproductive period. Accordingly, the latest cohort for which completed fertility measures can be computed on the basis of 1981 Census data is for women born prior to 1932 . Nevertheless, it was possible to determine which cohorts had already replaced themselves by giving birth to an average of two children per woman ${ }^{9}$.

[^25]We see that women of the 1947 cohort - who were 34 years of age in 1981 had already borne sufficient offspring ( 2.07 per woman) to replace themselves (Table 3). In respect of more recent cohorts, available data on cumulative fertility to 1981 allow only a speculative assessment as to whether these cohorts will attain replacement level fertility. Without resorting to sophisticated mathematics, we have reason to believe that the birth cohorts for 1948 to 1951 will probably do so; but the 1952 cohort may not. By 1981 this cohort had already averaged 1,589 children per 1,000 women: to achieve replacement level, these 1,000 women would have to bear approximately 400 more children. Is this likely to happen?

## Fertility and Birth Order

More precise estimates of fertility than the foregoing can be derived from parity progression ratios ${ }^{10}$. Stated one way, the parity progression ratio is the probability that the number of children born to a woman close to, or at, completed fertility, might have been greater by one child; stated another way, the parity progression ratio is the proportion of women with " n " children who go on to have one more.

When " $n$ "' equals zero, the ratio $a_{0}$ denotes the proportion of women who go on to have at least one child; $a_{1}$, the proportion of women who have had one child but go on to have at least a second one; $a_{2}$, the proportion who have had two but go on to have at least a third one; etc...

In calculating parity progression ratios, the data are arranged to show the distribution of women by the exact number of children they have borne, as well as the average number of births per woman. For instance, the figures below (from Table 6) show the childbearing history in 1981 for married women belonging to the 1952 birth cohort.

| 0 | children: | 198 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | child: | 243 | yield | 243 children |
| 2 | children: | 385 | yield | 770 children |
| 3 | children: | 135 | yield | 405 children |
| 4 | children: | 30 | yield | 120 children |
| 5 | children: | 6 | yield | 30 children |
| 6 | children: | 2 | yield | 12 children |
| $7+$ children: | 1 | yield | 8 children |  |
|  |  |  | yield | $\mathbf{1 , 5 8 8}$ children |

[^26]Table 3. Completed Fertility by the Same Cohort After the 1971 and 1981 Censuses (Cohorts 1912 to 1953, All Ages at Marriage), Canada

| Cohort | Age in <br> 1971 | Number of <br> Children <br> per Woman | Age in <br> 1981 | Number of <br> Children <br> per Woman | Difference | Difference <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1953 | 18 | 0.610 | 28 | 1.458 | 0.848 | 139.0 |
| 1952 | 19 | 0.629 | 29 | 1.589 | 0.960 | 152.6 |
| 1951 | 20 | 0.697 | 30 | 1.710 | 1.013 | 145.3 |
| 1950 | 21 | 0.756 | 31 | 1.831 | 1.075 | 142.2 |
| 1949 | 22 | 0.835 | 32 | 1.913 | 1.078 | 129.1 |
| 1948 | 23 | 0.958 | 33 | 1.993 | 1.035 | 108.0 |
| 1947 | 24 | 1.110 | 34 | 2.073 | 0.963 | 86.8 |
| 1946 | 25 | 1.337 | 35 | 2.161 | 0.824 | 61.6 |
| 1945 | 26 | 1.560 | 36 | 2.279 | 0.719 | 46.1 |
| 1944 | 27 | 1.730 | 37 | 2.351 | 0.621 | 35.9 |
| 1943 | 28 | 1.961 | 38 | 2.468 | 0.507 | 25.9 |
| 1942 | 29 | 2.159 | 39 | 2.567 | 0.408 | 18.9 |
| 1941 | 30 | 2.413 | 40 | 2.701 | 0.288 | 11.9 |
| 1940 | 31 | 2.573 | 41 | 2.833 | 0.260 | 10.1 |
| 1939 | 32 | 2.760 | 42 | 2.951 | 0.191 | 6.9 |
| 1938 | 33 | 2.887 | 43 | 3.030 | 0.143 | 5.0 |
| 1937 | 34 | 3.022 | 44 | 3.156 | 0.134 | 4.4 |
| 1936 | 35 | 3.139 | 45 | 3.236 | 0.097 | 3.1 |
| 1935 | 36 | 3.213 | 46 | 3.313 | 0.100 | 3.1 |
| 1934 | 37 | 3.329 | 47 | 3.438 | 0.109 | 3.3 |
| 1933 | 38 | 3.400 | 48 | 3.473 | 0.073 | 2.1 |
| 1932 | 39 | 3.408 | 49 | 3.515 | 0.107 | 3.1 |
| 1931 | 40 | 3.472 | 50 | 3.514 | 0.042 | 1.2 |
| 1930 | 41 | 3.513 | 51 | 3.529 | 0.016 | 0.5 |
| 1929 | 42 | 3.541 | 52 | 3.594 | 0.053 | 1.5 |
| 1928 | 43 | 3.539 | 53 | 3.614 | 0.075 | 2.1 |
| 1927 | 44 | 3.510 | 54 | 3.589 | 0.079 | 2.3 |
| 1926 | 45 | 3.540 | 55 | 3.543 | 0.003 | 0.1 |
| 1925 | 46 | 3.524 | 56 | 3.571 | 0.047 | 1.3 |
| 1924 | 47 | 3.487 | 57 | 3.551 | 0.064 | 1.8 |
| 1923 | 48 | 3.448 | 58 | 3.503 | 0.055 | 1.6 |
| 1922 | 49 | 3.450 | 59 | 3.563 | 0.113 | 3.3 |
| 1921 | 50 | 3.382 | 60 | 3.456 | 0.074 | 2.2 |
| 1920 | 51 | 3.357 | 61 | 3.420 | 0.063 | 1.9 |
| 1919 | 52 | 3.329 | 62 | 3.392 | 0.063 | 1.9 |
| 1918 | 53 | 3.284 | 63 | 3.348 | 0.064 | 1.9 |
| 1917 | 54 | 3.207 | 64 | 3.285 | 0.078 | 2.4 |
| 1916 | 55 | 3.163 | 65 | 3.237 | 0.074 | 2.3 |
| 1915 | 56 | 3.132 | 66 | 3.224 | 0.092 | 2.9 |
| 1914 | 57 | 3.131 | 67 | 3.138 | 0.007 | 0.2 |
| 1913 | 58 | 3.113 | 68 | 3.224 | 0.111 | 3.6 |

Source: From 1981 Census data.

These women were still fecund in 1981: at least theoretically the 1952 birth cohort should still have about ten years of fertility left in 1981. The objective, then, is to estimate the distribution according to parity at completed fertility and to calculate how many children the members of the cohort will have borne.

The only plausible means of accomplishing this is by extrapolating the trend of parity ratios from cohorts of women who have already attained completed fertility, or have already passed through the most prolific phases of it. Obviously, there is no full guarantee that these estimates will be accurate.

Considering that few women have a first child after 35, the trend observed for the cohorts from 1932 to 1946 provides the basis for estimating the expected $\mathrm{a}_{0}$ for the 1952 generation. The estimate of $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ for the 1952 generation is based on observation of the 1932 to 1945 cohorts; the estimate of $a_{2}$ on cohorts from 1932 to only 1944; and so on. Thus the values of a series that could still undergo considerable change are excluded. This was the method used for calculating the parity ratios as they appear in the bottom line of Table 5 , and from them the distribution of women in the 1952 birth cohort by the number of children they will have borne at completed fertility.

| 0 | children: | 103 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | child: | 148 | yield | 148 children |
| 2 | children: | 405 | yield | 808 children |
| 3 | children: | 251 | yield | 753 children |
| 4 | children: | 71 | yield | 284 children |
| 5 | children: | 16 | yield | 80 children |
| 6 | children: | 5 | yield | 30 children |
| $7+$ children: | 1 | yield | 8 children |  |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ | yield | $\mathbf{2 , 1 1 1}$ children |

Comparing this projected distribution at completed fertility to the distribution as it actually appeared in 1981 shows that 95 women belonging to the 1952 birth cohort, who were childless in 1981, would have a child; and 95 who had one child in 1981 would have at least one more. Similarly, the number of parity-two women is expected to increase by 19 ; parity-three women by 116 ; and parity-four women by 41 . Viewed from a 1984 standpoint, these last two increases seem to have little chance of occurring, although this is what would have to happen if the generation is to be replaced.

Census statistics for 1971 and 1981 (Table 4) show that when they were between the ages of 29 and 39, married women born in 1942 increased their progeny by 400 children, or $19 \%$, from the number of children $(2,153)$ already born by 1971. If one assumes a similar outcome for the 29-39 age group in the 1952 cohort (i.e. a $20 \%$ increase over the 1,588 children already born) this would result in only 1,905 births, short of replacement level for the generation.

Table 4. Changes in the Parity Distribution per $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ Women in the 10-Year Period Framed by the 1971 and 1981 Censuses


## Discussion

A cohort analysis of fertility for Canadian-born women reveals three features: first, women are remaining childless for longer and longer periods of time; second, from one generation to the next, the proportion of women who marry late increases; and, third, the longer that marriage is deferred, the lower is the completed fertility. As for the average number of children born per woman, this has fluctuated over time, in part because of "environmental" circumstances that were favourable or unfavourable to fertility, or because of technological innovations with respect to either partial or virtually total control over childbirth. If it is true that until now the effect of birth control has been to reduce population growth, there is nothing to support the view that this is the only effect that it will have in the future. Although tenuous, there are signs of a reappraisal among "three-parity" (and higher) women which may foreshadow a rise in the total fertility of young cohorts ${ }^{11}$. An infatuation with maternity cannot be totally discounted, but if the available statistics are taken into account, the married women of the 1952 generation (that is to say, women aged 32 in 1984) are barely replacing themselves.

The analysis thus far has dwelt upon married women only. If unmarried women (who make up a certain proportion of each cohort) have fewer children than married women, the evidence is stronger yet that overall current generations will not replace themselves: nor - taking into account the tendency of today's generation to postpone childbearing - will those that follow. Dumas and Boyer ${ }^{12}$ show that the fertility of married women is slightly higher than that of married women and women living in common-law unions taken together, and even higher than that of single women living alone. As only Canadian-born women were considered, it would be necessary to impute an unreasonably high fertility to the relevant foreign-born cohorts in order to markedly change the picture.

[^27]Table 5. Parity Progression Ratios for Cohorts of Married Women Born in Canada

| Cohort | Age in 1981 | $\mathrm{a}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{7}$ | $a_{8}$ | $\mathrm{a}_{9+}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1924 | 57 | . 908 | . 894 | . 751 | . 681 | . 659 | . 658 | . 660 | . 678 | . 660 | . 692 |
| 1925 | 56 | . 909 | . 898 | . 760 | . 678 | . 644 | . 661 | . 667 | . 673 | . 683 | . 669 |
| 1926 | 55 | . 916 | . 896 | . 757 | . 685 | . 634 | . 641 | . 647 | . 658 | . 648 | . 647 |
| 1927 | 54 | . 916 | . 904 | . 765 | . 690 | . 644 | . 633 | . 643 | . 649 | . 638 | . 637 |
| 1928 | 53 | . 919 | . 905 | . 768 | . 690 | . 636 | . 638 | . 633 | . 650 | . 684 | . 636 |
| 1929 | 52 | . 920 | . 910 | . 771 | . 682 | . 631 | . 626 | . 631 | . 643 | . 641 | . 651 |
| 1930 | 51 | . 923 | . 911 | . 765 | . 668 | . 612 | . 612 | . 628 | . 638 | . 626 | . 628 |
| 1931 | 50 | . 926 | . 914 | . 759 | . 667 | . 614 | . 609 | . 614 | . 622 | . 601 | . 622 |
| 1932 | 49 | . 931 | . 915 | . 765 | . 665 | . 598 | . 593 | . 596 | . 618 | . 627 | . 591 |
| 1933 | 48 | . 932 | . 913 | . 763 | . 665 | . 594 | . 578 | . 574 | . 583 | . 613 | . 558 |
| 1934 | 47 | . 934 | . 915 | . 758 | . 647 | . 578 | . 577 | . 578 | . 598 | . 613 | . 594 |
| 1935 | 46 | . 929 | . 912 | . 747 | . 630 | . 552 | . 569 | . 553 | . 573 | . 574 | . 570 |
| 1936 | 45 | . 934 | . 907 | . 732 | . 615 | . 544 | . 546 | . 537 | . 552 | . 541 | . 511 |
| 1937 | 44 | . 930 | . 911 | . 719 | . 600 | . 532 | . 512 | . 495 | . 545 | . 575 | . 582 |
| 1938 | 43 | . 933 | . 904 | . 693 | . 571 | . 501 | . 495 | . 506 | . 528 | . 497 | . 534 |
| 1939 | 42 | . 928 | . 901 | . 679 | . 543 | . 500 | . 497 | . 503 | . 536 | . 538 | . 447 |
| 1940 | 41 | . 930 | . 898 | . 650 | . 512 | . 462 | . 482 | . 481 | . 521 | . 428 | . 471 |
| 1941 | 40 | . 927 | . 884 | . 619 | . 484 | . 431 | . 463 | . 475 | . 484 | . 509 | . 509 |
| 1942 | 39 | . 922 | . 878 | . 576 | . 453 | . 412 | . 442 | . 433 | . 451 | . 458 | . 557 |
| 1943 | 38 | . 918 | . 871 | . 545 | . 427 | . 389 | . 417 | . 424 | . 509 | . 493 | . 507 |
| 1944 | 37 | . 912 | . 859 | . 513 | . 385 | . 372 | . 405 | . 426 | . 475 | . 486 | . 510 |
| 1945 | 36 | . 907 | . 851 | . 488 | . 363 | . 361 | . 414 | . 410 | . 455 | . 388 | . 515 |
| 1946 | 35 | . 899 | . 838 | . 445 | . 331 | . 324 | . 425 | . 429 | . 419 | . 462 | . 433 |
| 1947 | 34 | . 892 | . 820 | . 424 | . 312 | . 288 | . 347 | . 373 | . 406 | . 341 | . 429 |
| 1948 | 33 | . 881 | . 808 | . 394 | . 283 | . 257 | . 294 | . 518 | . 353 | . 400 | . 583 |
| 1949 | 32 | . 870 | . 788 | . 379 | . 265 | . 279 | . 345 | . 322 | . 379 | . 636 | . 429 |
| 1950 | 31 | . 856 | . 764 | . 358 | . 259 | . 269 | . 358 | . 386 | . 377 | . 652 | . 265 |
| 1951 | 30 | . 834 | . 735 | . 327 | . 231 | . 250 | . 305 | . 289 | . 429 | . 417 | . 800 |
| 1952 | 29 | . 802 | . 697 | . 312 | .226 | . 234 | . 347 | . 333 | . 414 | . 250 | . 667 |
| 1952 | Projected | . 897 | . 835 | . 461 | . 273 | . 249 | . 297 | . 329 | .357 | . 498 | . 337 |

Source: Fertility data from the 1981 Census.

Table 6. Distribution of Number of Children Born per $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ Married Women for Selected Cohorts, 1981

| Cohort | Number of Children Born |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Number of Children per 1000 Women ${ }^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |
| 1924 | 92 | 96 | 202 | 195 | 142 | 93 | 61 | 38 | 27 | 16 | 38 | 3,551 |
| 1925 | 91 | 93 | 196 | 200 | 150 | 92 | 60 | 89 | 26 | 18 | 35 | 3,571 |
| 1926 | 84 | 95 | 199 | 196 | 156 | 97 | 61 | 38 | 26 | 17 | 31 | 3,543 |
| 1927 | 84 | 88 | 194 | 196 | 156 | 103 | 64 | 40 | 27 | 17 | 31 | 3,589 |
| 1928 | 81 | 87 | 193 | 198 | 160 | 101 | 66 | 40 | 23 | 18 | 33 | 3,614 |
| 1929 | 80 | 83 | 192 | 205 | 162 | 104 | 64 | 39 | 25 | 16 | 30 | 3,594 |
| 1930 | 77 | 82 | 198 | 214 | 167 | 102 | 60 | 37 | 24 | 15 | 24 | 3,529 |
| 1931 | 74 | 80 | 204 | 214 | 165 | 103 | 62 | 37 | 24 | 14 | 23 | 3,514 |
| 1932 | 69 | 79 | 200 | 218 | 174 | 106 | 62 | 35 | 21 | 15 | 21 | 3,515 |
| 1933 | 68 | 81 | 202 | 217 | 175 | 108 | 63 | 36 | 19 | 13 | 18 | 3,473 |
| 1934 | 66 | 79 | 207 | 229 | 177 | 102 | 59 | 33 | 19 | 12 | 17 | 3,438 |
| 1935 | 71 | 82 | 214 | 234 | 179 | 95 | 56 | 30 | 17 | 10 | 12 | 3,313 |
| 1936 | 66 | 86 | 227 | 239 | 174 | 94 | 52 | 27 | 15 | 9 | 11 | 3,236 |
| 1937 | 70 | 83 | 238 | 244 | 171 | 95 | 50 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 10 | 3,156 |
| 1938 | 67 | 90 | 259 | 250 | 167 | 84 | 41 | 20 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 3,030 |
| 1939 | 72 | 92 | 268 | 260 | 154 | 78 | 38 | 18 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 2,951 |
| 1940 | 70 | 94 | 293 | 265 | 149 | 66 | 32 | 14 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 2,833 |
| 1941 | 73 | 107 | 312 | 262 | 140 | 57 | 26 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2,701 |
| 1942 | 78 | 112 | 343 | 255 | 124 | 49 | 22 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2,567 |
| 1943 | 82 | 119 | 364 | 250 | 113 | 42 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2,468 |
| 1944 | 88 | 129 | 381 | 247 | 97 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2,351 |
| 1945 | 93 | 135 | 395 | 240 | 88 | 29 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 1 | - | 2,279 |
| 1946 | 101 | 146 | 418 | 224 | 75 | 21 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | - | 2,161 |
| 1947 | 108 | 161 | 421 | 213 | 69 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 2,073 |
| 1948 | 119 | 169 | 432 | 201 | 59 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1,993 |
| 1949 | 130 | 185 | 426 | 191 | 50 | 13 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 1,913 |
| 1950 | 144 | 202 | 420 | 173 | 44 | 10 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 1,831 |
| 1951 | 166 | 221 | 412 | 154 135 | 35 30 | 8 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | 1,710 1,589 |
| 1952 | 198 | 243 | 395 | 135 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 1,585 |

${ }^{1}$ The figures may differ considerably from those that appear in another publication on the subject of fertility, "Fertility in Canada from Baby-boom to Baby-bust", because they relate to married women born in Canada, and the information does not come from the same source: Census in this case and Vital Statistics in the other.
Source: 1981 Census of Canada - unpublished data.

## Conclusion

The overall fertility rate today is appreciably below the replacement threshold of 2.1 children per woman. Examination of the most fertile subgroups portion of recent cohorts of ever-married Canadian-born women shows that more recent cohorts will not replace themselves. It should be noted, nonetheless, that the reproductive level of the cohorts concerned is somewhat higher than what one might expect if one's assessment is based on only the annual total fertility rate. Possibly this too will decline with time; but it is noteworthy that women of recent cohorts devote to childbearing only a small fraction of the time during which they are fecund. Some unforeseen (but possible) changes in aspirations regarding maternity could modify the quantity and tempo of child-bearing in the future.

## Appendix B

## Weaknesses in the Data

In 1971, persons in common-law relationships were not in the universe of the census data base; in 1981, they were considered married. Thus, in 1981, an unmarried woman living in a common-law relationship who had borne a child - to be counted as married according to the questionnaire instructions was asked to report the starting date of her current union as if it were her date of marriage. Few women complied with these requests, and where no date was given, none was imputed during processing. This problem, however, accounts for only a small part of the differences (as we shall see later) between 1971 and 1981 cohort sizes (Table B1).

Aside from the aforementioned problem of common-law unions, in the 1981 Census no marriage date was imputed for married respondents who failed to report the date of their first marriage, whereas in 1971, Statistics Canada did assign a marriage date to such respondents. Nor was age at marriage calculated in the same manner in the two censuses ${ }^{13}$. These differences have a significant impact on the distribution of women by age at marriage, although for the measures used in this study, the effect was minimal. Lastly, to prevent any distortion by immigrants' fertility patterns, the analysis was confined to women born in Canada.

Given the foregoing constraints, and those of a different nature to be described below, we nevertheless selected groups of women on the basis of age and age at marriage to form very specific birth-marriage cohorts to be examined over a ten-year interval. For the following reasons, their numbers in 1971 and 1981 may not be the same:

1) some 1971 respondents died or migrated by 1981 ;
2) some respondents born in Canada were present in 1981, but out of the country in 1971 (1971 figure < 1981 figure);
3) age at marriage was calculated in a different manner in the two censuses;
4) the inflation of the sample ( $1 / 3$ in $1971,1 / 5$ in 1981) may have produced different numbers for the same group of persons.

A further consideration is that all censuses differ due to undercoverage, and such undercoverage varies by age, with more young people escaping enumeration than older people. Consequently, the completeness of the coverage of the same birth-marriage cohorts at a ten-year interval will be different on each occasion (1971 figure < 1981 figure).

[^28]Table B1. Number of Ever-married Women, Married at Age 21, Canada, 1971 and 1981

| Age in 1971 | Number | Age in 1981 | Number | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 14,525 | 32 | 19,970 | 5,445 |
| 23 | 19,455 | 33 | 20,345 | 890 |
| 24 | 20,905 | 34 | 20,180 | - 725 |
| 25 | 16,455 | 35 | 17,070 | 615 |
| 26 | 15,870 | 36 | 15,835 | -35 |
| 27 | 14,605 | 37 | 14,730 | 125 |
| 28 | 14,145 | 38 | 13,810 | -335 |
| 29 | 12,560 | 39 | 12,680 | 120 |
| 30 | 11,825 | 40 | 12,150 | 325 |
| 31 | 10,950 | 41 | 10,780 | - 170 |
| 32 | 10,540 | 42 | 11,145 | 605 |
| 33 | 10,270 | 43 | 11,135 | 865 |
| 34 | 10,390 | 44 | 10,170 | - 220 |
| 35 | 10,580 | 45 | 10,800 | 220 |
| 36 | 10,505 | 46 | 10,770 | 265 |
| 37 | 10,260 | 47 | 10,180 | -80 |
| 38 | 10,890 | 48 | 11,065 | 175 |
| 39 | 10,655 | 49 | 10,660 | 5 |
| 40 | 10,390 | 50 | 10,335 | - 55 |
| 41 | 10,345 | 51 | 10,860 | 515 |
| 42 | 10,080 | 52 | 9,750 | -330 |
| 43 | 9,760 | 53 | 9,680 | -80 |
| 44 | 10,195 | 54 | 9,485 | -710 |
| 45 | 10,445 | 55 | 9,845 | $-600$ |
| 46 | 10,580 | 56 | 10,585 | 5 |
| 47 | 9,460 | 57 | 8,945 | - 515 |
| 48 | 8,610 | 58 | 7,935 | -675 |
| 49 | 8,930 | 59 | 8,410 | - 520 |
| 50 | 9,240 | 60 | 9,205 | -35 |
| 51 | 8,700 | 61 | 8,610 | -90 |
| 52 | 7,760 | 62 | 8,565 | 805 |
| 53 | 7,570 | 63 | 6,395 | - 1,175 |
| 54 | 6,865 | 64 | 6,095 | -770 |
| 55 | 5,830 | 65 | 5,515 | -315 |
| 56 | 6,280 | 66 | 5,585 | -695 |
| 57 | 5,705 | 67 | 5,325 | -380 |
| 58 | 5,130 | 68 | 4,350 | -780 |

Source: 1981 Census of Canada.

Finally, persons living in senior citizens' residences were not enumerated in 1981, whereas they had been ten years earlier. Women who were living in such residences in 1971 simply appear to have vanished in 1981 (1971 figure > 1981 figure).

In any case, since the comparisons relate to the number of children born per 1,000 women, it will be assumed that women who were either absent or supernumerary in the second census exhibited the same behaviour as those present in both.

Table B2. Percentage of Childless Women After Five and Ten Years of Marriage in Two Sets of Two Like Birth-Marriage Cohorts, Canada (figures used for graph No. 1)

| Year of Birth |  | Age at Marriage |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mathrm{R}^{2} \\ \text { (Semilogarith- } \\ \text { mic Fit) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |
| After Five Years of Marriage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1946 | Observed <br> Value | 14.5 | 23.3 | 33.3 | 47.7 | 61.0 | 71.4 |  | . 972 |
|  | Fitted <br> Value | 16.4 | 22.6 | 31.1 | 42.8 | 59.0 | 81.2 |  |  |
| 1956 | Observed <br> Value | 20.5 | 30.0 | 41.2 | 50.4 | 65.6 | 77.2 |  | . 982 |
|  | Fitted Value | 22.4 | 29.1 | 37.8 | 49.3 | 63.9 | 83.1 |  |  |
| After Ten Years of Marriage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1941 | Observed <br> Value | 4.8 | 5.8 | 7.5 | 10.0 | 13.4 | 17.0 | 24.2 | . 995 |
|  | Fitted <br> Value | 4.5 | 5.9 | 7.8 | 10.2 | 13.4 | 17.5 | 23.0 |  |
| 1951 | Observed Value | 8.2 | 11.2 | 13.9 | 18.3 | 20.0 | 26.8 | 27.5 | . 970 |
|  | Fitted <br> Value | 8.9 | 11.0 | 13.5 | 16.7 | 20.4 | 25.0 | 30.7 |  |

Source: Statistics Canada, 1981 Census, unpublished data.

## THE FERTILITY OF SINGLE WOMEN

## The Problem and the Data

The term 'illegitimate fertility", now considered anachronistic, has been superseded by the more neutral term "out-of-wedlock fertility". Out-ofwedlock fertility remains, nevertheless, a useful indicator of social mores, and, as such, continues to be of interest to social scientists and policy-makers alike. Since out-of-wedlock fertility relates primarily to single women, it is their fertility that will be studied here ${ }^{1}$.

The time series of fertility rates for single women, published by Vital Statistics, is subject to a number of limitations. These limitations require some discussion before an analysis of the series can be attempted.

1) It should be pointed out that Vital Statistics cannot provide a continuous picture of the fertility of single women over the past ten years. Because of incomplete registration in at least two provinces (Alberta and Quebec), there were a substantial number of births in 1974, 1975 and 1976 for which the mother's marital status is unknown. Thus, only a short time series, beginning with 1977, is available.
2) Aside from the above unusual years, in any year there are invariably a number of birth registrations on which this information is not recorded. These births cannot be allocated to any other marital status classes without implicitly making unjustifiable assumptions. For this reason, and because of their small numbers since 1977, it is preferable to ignore them, even if the result is a slight understatement of the number of births to single mothers.
3) While inaccurate birth registrations have an impact on the numerator in the rate calculation, the denominator, which consists of the population at risk, is no less flawed. A significant source of error is the greater census undercoverage of single women than of the rest of the female population, particularly at the ages of highest fertility. For example, the 1981 Census undercoverage rate for single women aged 15 and over stood at $3.8 \%$, as against $1.65 \%$ for females of all marital statuses and ages. This results in an exaggerated rate, since the denominator is too small.
4) A much more serious bias is introduced into the rates by the difference between the Census and Vital Statistics definitions in classifying the population by marital status. Birth registration data from Vital Statistics identify the mother's legal marital status, whereas the Census classifies women who are not widowed or divorced on the basis of whether they are living with a partner, irrespective of the legal or common-law status of the arrangement. Hence, women who are legally single but living

[^29]with a partner are classified in the Census as "married" ${ }^{2}$. It therefore follows that the younger the age group, the greater the probability of the single female population being understated. This discrepancy between the numerator and denominator tends to exaggerate the fertility of single women still further ${ }^{3}$.

For these reasons, published data and rates must be interpreted with caution.

## Most Single Mothers are Young, But the Number of Older Ones is Growing

Births to single women are on the rise in Canada, but not at the same rate in all age groups (Table 1). Up to 1980, teenagers (age 15 to 19) accounted for the largest share ( $41 \%$ ). In 1981, however, this group contributed only $38 \%$, the same percentage as that of the young adult group (20-24). This pattern persisted into 1984, with downward movement for the 15-19 age group, and upward movement for the 20-24 age group. For the 1977-1984 period as a whole, births to single women 25 years of age and over climbed from $17 \%$ to $30 \%$. It would seem, then, that the number of adult single mothers is increasing. Should the conclusion be drawn that the fertility of single women has risen?

The changes between 1977 and 1984 in the age structure of the population are not unrelated to the phenomenon just described. Because of previous fluctuations in the number of births for one thing, but chiefly because of increasing age at first marriage, there has been a change in both the number of single women in each age group, and in the relative proportion of each age group in the total population (Table 2).

Between 1977 and 1984, the number of young single women (15-19) fell by 99,400 , but increases of 202,200 and 95,900 were recorded for the $20-24$ and 25-29 age groups, respectively. As a result, the proportionate share of adolescents in the under 30 group declined to $50 \%$ from $61 \%$, while that of young adults (20-29) increased from $39 \%$ to $50 \%$. These changes can have an impact on the number of births, but they do not suffice as an explanation for the changes in fertility rates, which have shown a much stronger progression in the adult age groups than in the adolescent age group. Whereas since 1977 the fertility rate for adolescents has increased by less than one per thousand, that for young adults has increased by nine per thousand, and that for adults over 25 , much more (Table 1).

[^30]Table 1. Births and Fertility Rates of Unmarried Women by Age of Mother, Canada, 1977-1984

| Year | < 15 | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | $40+$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 296 | 16,800 | 11,645 | 4,008 | 1,365 | 367 | 69 | 34,634 |
| 1978 | 308 | 16,806 | 12,610 | 4,336 | 1,536 | 426 | 83 | 36,749 |
| 1979 | 297 | 16,671 | 14,059 | 5,259 | 1,812 | 442 | 77 | 38,633 |
| 1980 | 260 | 17,188 | 15,770 | 6,035 | 2,119 | 478 | 84 | 41,955 |
| 1981 | 262 | 17,217 | 17,699 | 7,124 | 2,557 | 613 | 96 | 45,585 |
| 1982 | 262 | 17,880 | 20,038 | 8,425 | 3,027 | 801 | 93 | 50,608 |
| 1983 | 215 | 16,516 | 21,531 | 9,933 | 3,639 | 936 | 120 | 52,929 |
| 1984 | 244 | 16,065 | 22,822 | 11,167 | 4,207 | 1,108 | 147 | 55,794 |
|  | Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 1.3 | 15.8 | 22.9 | 23.4 | 16.8 | 7.8 | 1.7 | $17.9^{1}$ |
| 1978 | 1.3 | 15.6 | 23.7 | 23.9 | 17.5 | 8.5 | 2.0 | 18.2 |
| 1979 | 1.3 | 15.5 | 25.5 | 27.3 | 19.3 | 8.4 | 1.8 | 18.9 |
| 1980 | 1.3 | 16.0 | 27.5 | 29.2 | 21.2 | 8.6 | 2.1 | 20.0 |
| 1981 | 1.4 | 16.3 | 29.6 | 32.6 | 24.0 | 10.4 | 2.3 | 21.1 |
| 1982 | 1.4 | 17.2 | 31.8 | 36.4 | 27.2 | 12.4 | 2.2 | 22.7 |
| 1983 | 1.2 | 16.4 | 32.0 | 40.6 | 31.3 | 13.6 | 2.7 | 24.1 |
| 1984 | 1.3 | 16.5 | 31.7 | 43.1 | 34.5 | 15.1 | 3.2 | 25.3 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Increase } \\ \text { 1977-1984 } \end{gathered}$ | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.8 | 19.7 | 17.7 | 7.3 | 1.5 | 7.4 |
| Increase in \% | 0.0 | 4.4 | 38.4 | 84.2 | 105.4 | 93.6 | 88.2 | 41.3 |

${ }^{1}$ Standardized Population of Canada in 1976.
Source: Statistics Canada, Catalogue 84-204.

Little of this change in fertility (Table 2) can be explained by structural changes within the groups. The proportion of adolescents aged 18-19 years, which constitutes the most fertile subgroup of adolescents, increased from $36 \%$ to $41 \%$ between 1977 and 1984. This can explain the slight increase in the rate for the group as a whole. The internal structure of the 20-29 age groups did not play any role, however, since the age composition remained almost stable over the period in question. (Table 2).

This shift towards a larger contribution of older age groups in total out-ofwedlock fertility appears to be significant, but gives rise to the suspicion that statistics (probably a discordance between the numerator and the denominator of the calculated rate) are the cause. Even though the number of older single mothers is increasing, the increase is probably not as large as the change in rates would lead us to believe. The next section clarifies this issue.

Table 2. Age Distribution of Single Women 15-30 Years Old, Canada, 1977 and 1984

| Age | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1977 |  |  |  | 1984 |  |  |  |
|  | Number | \% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & \text { Age } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & 15-30 \end{aligned}$ | Number | \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ \text { Age } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & 15-30 \end{aligned}$ |
| 15 | 227,900 | 21.4 |  |  | 184,400 | 19.1 |  |  |
| 16 | 233,100 | 21.9 |  |  | 186,400 | 19.3 |  |  |
| 17 | 222,700 | 20.9 |  |  | 191,000 | 19.8 |  |  |
| 18 | 202,900 | 19.1 |  |  | 199,300 | 20.6 |  |  |
| 19 | 178,300 | 16.7 |  |  | 204,300 | 21.2 |  |  |
| 15-19 | 1,064,800 | 100.0 | 17.4 | 61 | 965,400 | 100.0 | 17.6 | 50 |
| 20 | 150,800 | 29.7 |  |  | 191,800 | 27.0 |  |  |
| 21 | 122,000 | 24.0 |  |  | 168,900 | 23.8 |  |  |
| 22 | 98,900 | 19.5 |  |  | 138,800 | 19.5 |  |  |
| 23 | 76,500 | 15.0 |  |  | 116,800 | 16.4 |  |  |
| 24 | 60,600 | 11.9 |  |  | 94,500 | 13.3 |  |  |
| 20-24 | 508,600 | 100.0 | 22.1 | 29 | 710,800 | 100.0 | 22.2 | 37 |
| 25 | 48,500 | 28.4 |  |  | 75,700 | 28.4 |  |  |
| 26 | 39,000 | 22.8 |  |  | 61,900 | 23.2 |  |  |
| 27 | 31,900 | 18.7 |  |  | 51,000 | 19.1 |  |  |
| 28 | 27,400 | 16.1 |  |  | 41,500 | 15.6 |  |  |
| 29 | 24,100 | 14.1 |  |  | 36,700 | 13.8 |  |  |
| 25-29 | 170,900 | 100.0 | 27.2 | 10 | 266,800 | 100.0 | 27.1 | 14 |
| 15-29 | 1,744,300 | $\cdots$ | ... | 100 | 1,943,000 | ... | ... | 100 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Catalogue 91-210 annual.

Table 3. Adjusted and Unadjusted (for Common-law Unions), and Estimated Age-specific Fertility Rates of Single Women (per 1,000), Canada, 1981

| Rate | Age |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $15-19$ | $20-24$ | $25-29$ | $30-34$ | $35-39$ |
| Unadjusted Rate | 16.3 | 29.6 | 32.6 | 24.0 | 10.4 |
| Adjusted Rate <br> Estimated <br> Fertility Rate <br> for Single Women | 15.8 | 24.8 | 23.7 | 16.3 | 6.8 |

Source: Jean Dumas and Louise Boyer "Mise au point sur la fécondité des célibataires" in Les Cahiers québécois de démographie, Vol. 13, No. 2, October, 1984.

## The Impact of Common-law Unions on Fertility Rates

A fact gleaned from the 1981 Census ${ }^{4}$ about persons living in common-law unions provides a means of adjusting fertility rates in an approximate fashion so that they probably give a more accurate picture of social reality. By adjusting the denominator for the number of single women living common-law, one obtains appreciably lower estimated fertility rates for women who are neither married, nor living in a common-law union. It is these women who are the focus of our attention (Table 3).

The age groups in which the unadjusted rates of fertility have risen most (ages 20-34) are also those in which non-marital cohabitation is frequent. Once the number of women living common-law has been subtracted, the rates for non-cohabiting single adolescents in these groups are much lower (Table 3). Nevertheless, analysis of a long time-series reveals a virtually indisputable increase in the fertility of single adolescents.

## Regional Variations

Of particular interest are the regional variations in the fertility rates of single women (Table 4). The rates for the Yukon and Northwest Territories are substantially above the national average, but there are also marked differences among the provinces. Regardless of the year, Saskatchewan's rate is roughly two and a half times higher than Ontario's. Note that the rates have been standardized to eliminate distortions caused by differences in age structure between provinces and between years. The factors underlying interprovincial variations in "out-of-wedlock" fertility are difficult to pin-down. They can range from sexual freedom to level of education, religious conviction and access to contraception and abortion facilities. One important factor is ethnic composition. For example, the fertility rates for single women are generally highest in the Prairie Provinces, and it is in these populations that the highest percentage of Indians and Métis are found (Table 5).

It is not simply that Native women have a higher overall fertility rate than non-Native women. The out-of-wedlock fertility rate may have also been artificially inflated as the unintentional result of legislation which affected the status of Indian women. Until 1986 (when the legislation was changed), status Indian women lost their status when they married a non-Indian man. As a result, Indian women were probably less willing to marry, preferring instead to enter into a common-law union, with the result that more births are credited to single women in Vital Statistics.

[^31]Table 4. Standardized Fertility Rates ${ }^{1}$ of Single Women (per $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0 ) ,}$ Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1977-1982, 1984

| Province | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1984 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Prince Edward Island | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 25.2 | 24.4 | 26.9 |
| Nova Scotia | 23.5 | 24.5 | 24.2 | 24.4 | 25.5 | 26.4 | 25.9 |
| New Brunswick | 25.6 | 24.6 | 24.8 | 27.1 | 27.4 | 29.4 | 27.6 |
| Quebec | 15.5 | 15.9 | 17.9 | 18.8 | 20.3 | 21.8 | 24.1 |
| Ontario | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.2 | 14.8 | 15.1 | 16.6 | 17.4 |
| Manitoba | 28.9 | 28.9 | 28.7 | 29.5 | 31.2 | 31.6 | 32.5 |
| Saskatchewan | 37.0 | 37.5 | 37.6 | 39.4 | 41.4 | 42.4 | 42.5 |
| Alberta | 21.2 | 22.0 | 22.4 | 24.7 | 27.7 | 32.1 | 29.0 |
| British Columbia | 20.5 | 20.2 | 21.5 | 23.1 | 24.5 | 24.8 | 25.0 |
| Yukon | 55.8 | 52.8 | 57.0 | 55.1 | 67.2 | 68.5 | 78.0 |
| Northwest Territories | 94.9 | 92.7 | 94.8 | 112.0 | 116.4 | 122.3 | 178.2 |
| Canada | 17.9 | 18.2 | 18.9 | 20.0 | 21.1 | 22.7 | 23.2 |

${ }^{1}$ Age structure of 1976 Canadian population used as standard.
Source: Statistics Canada, Vital Statistics.

Table 5. Distribution of the Native Female Population Aged 20 to 34 and Percentage in Relation to the Total Female Population of the Same Age, Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1981

| Province | Total Number <br> of Natives <br> Females | Native <br> Females Aged <br> 20 to 34 | Total <br> Females Aged <br> 20 to 34 | $\%$ of Native Females in <br> Total Female Population <br> Aged 20 to 34 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(2) \div(3)$ |
| Canada | 248,815 | 66,635 | $3,279,303$ | 2.0 |
| Newfoundland | 2,085 | 580 | 73,299 | 0.8 |
| Prince Edward Island | 315 | 125 | 14,938 | 0.8 |
| Nova Scotia | 4,060 | 1,170 | 109,217 | 1.1 |
| New Brunswick | 2,795 | 790 | 90,627 | 0.9 |
| Quebec | 26,050 | 7,730 | 890,859 | 0.9 |
| Ontario | 56,255 | 15,950 | $1,137,287$ | 1.4 |
| Manitoba | 33,625 | 8,270 | 129,781 | 6.4 |
| Saskatchewan | 30,310 | 7,075 | 116,827 | 6.1 |
| Alberta | 36,610 | 9,680 | 335,063 | 2.9 |
| British Columbia | 41,710 | 11,780 | 370,955 | 3.2 |
| Yukon | 2,065 | 560 | 3,933 | 14.2 |
| Northwest Territcries | 12,940 | 2,950 | 6,517 | 45.3 |

[^32]
# THE STRENGTHENING OF MAJORITY POSITIONS 

Recent Developments in the Language Situation

Réjean Lachapelle ${ }^{1}$

In 1981, the population of Canada was $68 \%$ Anglophone and $25 \%$ Francophone. Those who spoke a language at home other than French or English accounted for the remaining $7 \%$ of the population. Geographically, this distribution is far from uniform: the two official language communities are heavily concentrated. As a result, Anglophones and Francophones, through their daily experiences, form different images of the country's linguistic reality.

Recent changes in linguistic composition among regions stem from differences between the Anglophone or Francophone groups in mortality, fertility, migration and linguistic mobility. Some of the effects of these phenomena on linguistic composition can be determined from census information.

Until quite recently, analysis of demographic changes in language groups had to be based on census for mother tongue (the first language learned, or spoken, and still understood) which was collected in every decennial census from 1921. From an analytical point of view, however, this was a makeshift approach: as pointed out by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, mother tongue data may be as much as a generation out of date. Accordingly, in the two most recent decennial censuses, 1971 and 1981, the respondent was asked to identify the language most often spoken at home.

Statistics are never perfect, and the data on mother tongue and home language are no exception. While most Canadians can answer the questions relating to these variables without difficulty, some have trouble because they use, or have used, more than one language at home. In both 1971 and 1981, Statistics Canada assigned one (and only one) language to these people. Because their numbers were small, this imputation had little effect on the distributions of the individual language variables; but the effects on individual cells in the joint distributions may be much more serious. Moreover, the mother tongue question was asked of the entire population, while home language data are based on a sample (one-third of the population in 1971 and one-fifth in 1981). (In addition), the statistics on home language do not apply to the total population in 1981 since inmates of institutions were excluded. This omission has virtually no effect on the percentage distributions, but it causes an understatement of about $1 \%$ in the population figures.

[^33]

## Heavy Regional Concentration

Most Francophones live in Quebec, where they are in the majority, whereas Anglophones reside primarily in the other provinces. Within each of these two large geographic areas, however, the distribution of Francophone and Anglophone communities is far from uniform. How can this diversity be taken into account without drastically expanding the regional reference framework and complicating the description and analysis? Based on a geographic breakdown proposed by $\mathrm{Joy}^{2}$ - and updated by Lachapelle and Henripin ${ }^{3}$, the country is divided into five major linguistic regions, two in Quebec and three in the rest of the country.

In Quebec, there is a vast expanse to the north and east of the Montreal area that is mostly Francophone (MFR). 2,600,000 people lived there in 1981 (Table 1) - about $11 \%$ of the national population and $40 \%$ of the population of Quebec. French was spoken at home by $96 \%$ of this group, while some 70,000 people, or $3 \%$ of the population, spoke English.

The second regional grouping encompasses the entire southwestern part of the province (the Eastern Townships, Montreal and the Ottawa Valley). Its population is more heterogeneous, although Francophones hold a large majority (RFM + ). Nearly 4,000,000 people lived there; $73 \%$ of them were French speakers and $20 \%$ English speakers. This region accounted for $16 \%$ of the national population and $60 \%$ of the population of Quebec. More than $90 \%$ of Quebec's Anglophones reside there.

The third region is a small one located to the east of Quebec, consisting of the northern and eastern parts of New Brunswick (RFM-). From a language standpoint, it is heterogeneous, with Francophones (home language French) accounting for $56 \%$ of the population and Anglophones (home language English) $43 \%$. This region contains roughly 400,000 people, just over half of New Brunswick's population.

The fourth grouping is made up of two areas in Ontario, one in the eastern part of the province and the other in the northeast, where the majority of the population is anglophone (RAM + ) . There are slightly over 1 million people living in this region, or $13 \%$ of Ontario's population. Seventy-two percent of them reported that their home language was English while $24 \%$ reported French. This grouping, which embraces the National Capital, has a linguistic composition much like that of Canada as a whole.

[^34]Table 1. Population ${ }^{1}$ by Language Used in the Home, Canada and Major Regions, 1981

| Region | Total | English | French | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population |  |  |  |
| Canada | $\begin{gathered} 24,083,500 \\ (24,343,190)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 16,425,905 | 5,923,010 | 1,734,585 |
| Quebec | $\begin{gathered} 6,369,065 \\ (6,438,395)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 809,145 | 5,256,830 | 303,090 |
| Mostly Francophone (MFR) | $\begin{gathered} 2,582,665 \\ (2,611,515)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 69,345 | 2,484,070 | 29,250 |
| Large Francophone majority (RFM ${ }^{+}$) | $\begin{gathered} 3,786,400 \\ (3,826,880)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 739,800 | 2,272,760 | 273,840 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | $\begin{gathered} 17,714,435 \\ (17,904,795)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 15,616,760 | 666,180 | 1,431,495 |
| Small Francophone majority ( $\mathrm{RFM}^{-}$) | $\begin{gathered} 372,570 \\ (376,575)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 161,850 | 208,750 | 1,970 |
| Large Anglophone majority (RAM ${ }^{+}$) | $\begin{gathered} 1,076,160 \\ (1,087,075)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 770,880 | 255,150 | 50,130 |
| Mostly Anglophone (MAR) | $\begin{gathered} 16,265,705 \\ (16,441,145)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 14,684,030 | 202,280 | 1,379,395 |
|  | Composition (\%) |  |  |  |
| Canada | 100.0 | 68.2 | 24.6 | 7.2 |
| Quebec | 100.0 | 12.7 | 82.5 | 4.8 |
| MRF | 100.0 | 2.7 | 96.2 | 1.1 |
| RFM ${ }^{+}$ | 100.0 | 19.5 | 73.2 | 7.2 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | 100.0 | 88.2 | 3.8 | 8.1 |
| RFM ${ }^{-}$ | 100.0 | 43.4 | 56.0 | 0.5 |
| RAM ${ }^{+}$ | 100.0 | 71.6 | 23.7 | 4.7 |
| MAR | 100.0 | 90.3 | 1.2 | 8.5 |
|  | Regional distribution (\%) |  |  |  |
| Canada | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Quebec | 26.4 | 4.9 | 88.8 | 17.5 |
| MFR | 10.7 | 0.4 | 41.9 | 1.7 |
| RFM ${ }^{+}$ | 15.7 | 4.5 | 46.8 | 15.8 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | 73.6 | 95.1 | 11.2 | 82.5 |
| RFM ${ }^{-}$ | 1.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 0.1 |
| RAM ${ }^{+}$ | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| MAR | 67.5 | 89.4 | 3.4 | 79.5 |

[^35]The rest of Canada (the fifth grouping) forms an immense English-speaking territory (MAR). Just over two-thirds of the country's population lives in this region $(16,500,000)$. Nine out of ten people speak English at home; French speakers $(200,000)$ make up little more than $1 \%$ of the population. There is not much variation in the linguistic composition of this grouping. In all the provinces and subprovincial areas that comprise it, at most $4 \%$ of the population is Francophone (less than $2 \%$ everywhere west of Ottawa except in Manitoba) (Table C5). The proportion of Anglophones exceeds $95 \%$ in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, the Yukon and southern New Brunswick, and falls somewhere between $90 \%$ and $95 \%$ in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. In Manitoba, those who speak English at home account for $86 \%$ of the population; and in all parts of Ontario except the east and northeast, those who speak English at home account for $88 \%$. The concentration of Anglophones is much lower in the Northwest Territories (64\%) because of the high percentage of people ( $35 \%$ ) who speak a third language at home, in most cases the Native language Inuktitut.

To sum up, close to $90 \%$ of Canada's population who speak English at home live in the mostly Anglophone region, which contains, all languages combined, more than two-thirds of the country's population.

The geographic concentration of French speakers is less pronounced. While $42 \%$ of them reside in the mostly Francophone region, $50 \%$ are located in regions with only a Francophone majority. A small proportion (3\%) live in the primarily Anglophone region.

Contact between the two official language communities takes place mostly in heterogeneous regions, which contain slightly over $20 \%$ of Canada's population. These heterogeneous regions form a sort of zone of transition between two linguistically homogeneous areas. According to Joy, they constitute a bilingual belt around the heartland of French Canada.

## Two Majority Perceptions

Very few Canadians (slightly over 1 million) live in areas where the percentage distribution of the language communities is similar to the national profile. As a result, Canada's linguistic composition is probably perceived in very different ways by the average Anglophone or Francophone. It may be assumed that their perceptions of linguistic reality are formed chiefly through their daily contact with members of the various language communities in their immediate surroundings.

How can the impressions that the members of each community have of the country's linguistic reality be quantified? Let us suppose that it is possible to identify a set of regions within which contact between residents occurs randomly, regardless of language characteristics. In each of these regions, perceptions are identical with reality. Let us also suppose that contact between
inhabitants of two regions is minimal. Each community's impression of linguistic reality could then be represented by a specific weighting of the linguistic composition in each region, where the weighting coefficients are derived from the percentage distribution of the reference community's members. This is equivalent, for example, to selecting a Francophone at random somewhere in the country and then choosing another person at random in the region where the Francophone lives. The probability that the second person selected speaks one or another of the different languages at home is an approximate measure of the linguistic composition perceived by Francophones. This composition can also be interpreted as a set of potential contact indices ${ }^{4}$.

Using the five geographic regions defined above, we estimated the images that the various language communities had of Canada's linguistic reality in 1981 (Table 2). For the average English speaker, the country was made up of slightly less than $7 \%$ Francophones, $8 \%$ Allophones and $85 \%$ Anglophones. His image of Canada is essentially the same as the linguistic composition found in the mostly Anglophone region. Conversely, for the average French speaker, Canada consists of $18 \%$ Anglophones, $78 \%$ Francophones and $4 \%$ Allophones. The contrast would be even sharper if the calculations had been based on a finer geographic breakdown ${ }^{5}$. But even then, the values calculated in this fashion constitute only a crude approximation of the perceptions that the members of different communities have of the linguistic reality of the country.

By virtue of its heavy geographic concentration, each official language community tends to perceive itself as the majority. These perceptions of majority have become more pronounced since 1971 (Table 2). The day-to-day contacts among Francophones are chiefly with members of their own community even though they are a minority in the country. These discrepancies between perception and reality have become more pronounced even as the percentage of the national population that is Francophone has been falling (from $25.7 \%$ in 1971 to $24.6 \%$ in 1981).

## Shrinking Minorities

The decline in the percentage of Francophones in the population between 1971 and 1981 protracts a trend that began some 30 years ago. The relative size of the French group ${ }^{6}$ dropped from $29.0 \%$ in 1951 to $26.9 \%$ in 1971 and $25.7 \%$ in 1981, while the English group expanded from $59.1 \%$ to $61.3 \%$ between 1951 and 1981. The third group's share rose from $11.8 \%$ in 1951 to $13.5 \%$

[^36]Table 2. Perception by Language Community of Home-language Composition, Canada, 1971 and 1981 (\%)

| Community | Total |  | English |  | French |  | Other |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1971 | 1981 | 1971 | 1981 | 1971 | 1981 | 1971 | 1981 |
| Anglophone | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.9 | 85.4 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 8.4 | 8.1 |
| Francophone | 100.0 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 18.0 | 75.9 | 77.6 | 4.1 | 4.4 |
| Allophone | 100.0 | 100.0 | 77.2 | 77.0 | 14.5 | 14.9 | 8.3 | 8.1 |
| All communities | 100.0 | 100.0 | 67.0 | 68.2 | 25.7 | 24.6 | 7.3 | 7.2 |

Source: Tables 1 and C4. Calculations by the author.
in 1961 as a result of a decade of heavy immigration, but has shown no significant change since 1961. While $13 \%$ of Canadians reported a third language as their mother tongue in 1981, these languages are spoken at home by only $7 \%$ of the population, owing to the high level of linguistic mobility affecting them ${ }^{7}$.

The general overall pattern of decline of the Francophone community and expansion of the Anglophone is not typical of all regions. Whether we classify the population by home language or by mother tongue, the pattern of change that has developed over the last few years is very clear (Table 3). In every major linguistic region in the country, the majority group is growing larger, while the minority group is shrinking. For the English group in Quebec, whose proportion has been falling slowly for a century, the downward trend accelerated between 1971 and 1981, particularly in the heterogeneous regions with a Francophone majority (RFM + ). In fact, the decline in the English speaking population in this region was absolute as well as relative - from 811,000 in 1971 to under 750,000 in 1981. In the mostly Francophone region (MFR), the percentage of Anglophones, already very low in 1971 ( $3.2 \%$ ), continued to shrink. Even their population count decreased from 76,000 in 1971 to about 70,000 in 1981.

In the rest of Canada the pattern of change is in the opposite direction. The relative size of the French speaking population has been falling steadily since the early 1940s. The decline continued between 1971 ( $4.3 \%$ ) and 1981 $(3.8 \%)$, in both the mostly Anglophone area (MAR) and the region with a large Anglophone majority (RAM + ). In the former, the number of Francophones edged down from almost 215,000 in 1971 to about 205,000 in 1981, and in the latter, from 270,000 to less than 260,000 . The one exception to the

[^37]general trend was in the region with a small Francophone majority comprising northern and eastern New Brunswick (RFM-). The linguistic composition of this region, which contains less than $2 \%$ of the national population, changed very little between 1971 and 1981.

The downward trend (both relatively and often absolutely) in the size of the minority language group in each region means that the geographic concentration of the official language communities is becoming more pronounced. This further implies that opportunities for contact between Anglophones and Francophones are diminishing. In each region the proportion of population that is accounted for by the majority language group is increasing. How can this tendency be explained?

Table 3. Mother-Tongue and Home-language Composition of Population (\%) ${ }^{1}$, Canada and Major Linguistic Regions, 1971 and 1981

| Region and year |  | Mother tongue |  |  | Home language |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | English | French | Other | English | French | Other |
| Canada | 1971 | 60.2 | 26.9 | 13.0 | 67.0 | 25.7 | 7.3 |
|  | 1981 | 61.3 | 25.7 | 13.0 | 68.2 | 24.6 | 7.2 |
| Quebec | 1971 | 13.1 | 80.7 | 6.2 | 14.7 | 80.8 | 4.5 |
|  | 1981 | 11.0 | 82.4 | 6.6 | 12.7 | 82.5 | 4.8 |
| Mostly Francophone (MFR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1971 | 3.1 | 95.6 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 95.9 | 0.9 |
|  | 1981 | 2.5 | 96.1 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 96.2 | 1.1 |
| Large Francophone Majority (RFM+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 70.8 | 9.5 |  |  |  |
|  | $1981$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.8 \\ & 16.7 \end{aligned}$ | 73.1 | 10.2 | 19.5 | 73.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 6.9 \\ & 7.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Canada excludingQuebec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1971 | 78.4 | 6.0 | 15.6 | 87.2 | 4.3 | 8.4 |
|  | 1981 | 79.4 | 5.3 | 15.4 | 88.2 | 3.8 | 8.1 |
| Small Francophone Majority (RFM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1971 | 40.8 | 58.0 | 1.2 | 43.7 | 55.4 | 0.9 |
|  | 1981 | 40.7 | 58.3 | 1.0 | 43.4 | 56.0 | 0.5 |
| Large Anglophone Majority (RAM ${ }^{+}$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1971 \\ & 1981 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60.8 \\ & 62.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.8 \\ & 28.4 \end{aligned}$ | 8.4 8.7 | 68.8 71.6 | 26.6 23.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.6 \\ & 4.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mostly Anglophone (MAR) | 1971 | 80.6 | 2.9 | 16.5 | 89.6 | 1.5 | 8.9 |
|  | 1981 | 81.4 | 2.5 | 16.1 | 90.3 | 1.2 | 8.5 |

[^38]Changes in linguistic composition are governed by four phenomena: mortality, fertility, linguistic mobility and migration, each of which has some effect on linguistic composition. Because of low mortality levels, the differences between the groups now have a negligible impact on linguistic composition. ${ }^{8}$ The effects of the other three phenomena, however, are appreciable. In the following, we endeavour to measure the effects that these factors have had on the changes in linguistic composition.

## The Fertility Effect: A Paradox

The high fertility rates that characterized French Canadian women are almost legendary. Yet, they did not always bear more children than other Canadian women! In about 1870, their fertility rate was close to the national average rate ${ }^{9}$. In the ensuing decades, however, the fertility rate for non-francophone women declined while that for the French Canadian women did not. Accordingly, by 1931, the fertility rate of French Canadian women was $70 \%$ higher than that of other Canadian women ${ }^{10}$. After 1931, the gap began to narrow and finally disappeared in the mid-1960s. A lower fertility rate is now observable throughout the country as a whole, irrespective of language group affiliation ${ }^{11}$.

The 1981 Census format permits the estimation of differences in fertility between the different language groups in each of the regions under consideration. All "non-single" women (which includes women living common-law) were asked how many children they had ever borne. By assuming the fertility of single women to be zero, an "underestimate" of the average number of children per woman (i.e. regardless of marital status) can be obtained. The error in this estimate is probably quite small for women 35 years of age and over, since most of those who had children when they were single later got married or are living common-law. Furthermore, as the "underestimate" affects all language groups, it seems reasonable to conclude that the assumption has little impact on differential fertility.

Two age groups of women were chosen - those who were in the 45-54 age bracket and those aged 35-44 (Table 4). For all practical purposes, the figures for the latter group represent completed fertility, since women today have very few children after the age of 35 . Canadian women in this age group averaged 24 children per woman. Using this as a reference level and assigning it a value of 100, we find that Francophones had fewer children than Anglophones (their

[^39]index was 94, compared with 100 for Anglophones). This reversal of the secular trend is recent since the fertility rate of the Francophone women who were $45-54$ years of age in 1981 is still higher than the rate for non-Francophone women.

As to the recently observed differences at the national level, the fertility rate of Francophones tends always to be higher than that of Anglophones in most of the broad linguistic regions, although the differences do have a tendency to become less pronounced among younger women. At first glance there appears to be something paradoxical about this. It results from what may be termed an effect of aggregation. The signs of difference in fertility change (from plus to minus and vice versa) when one passes from the regional level of analysis to the national level. This is attributable to the fact that the fertility rate among recent Francophone cohorts in Quebec has been lower than that of Anglophones living outside this province.

For Canada as a whole, recent fertility levels are slightly higher for English speakers, depressing the percentage for French speakers. Yet fertility has the opposite effect on the linguistic composition in Quebec as well as in the rest of the country. Moreover, the influence of fertility is long-lasting. Because of the high fertility of French Canadians in the past, not only is the average

Table 4. Index of the Average Number of Children per Woman ${ }^{1}$ in Selected Age Groups, by Language Used in the Home, Canada and Major Linguistic Regions, 1981

| Region | $35-44$ |  |  |  |  | $45-54$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | English | French | Other | Total | English | French | Other |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 4}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quebec | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 5}$ |  |
| MFR | 99 | 107 | 98 | 181 | 116 | 114 | 116 | 159 |  |
| RFM $^{+}$ | 88 | 85 | 87 | 98 | 90 | 81 | 93 | 80 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canada $_{\text {excluding }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quebec | $\mathbf{1 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 6}$ |  |
| RFM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RAM + | 119 | 118 | 121 | 132 | 138 | 118 | 154 | 206 |  |
| MAR | 103 | 98 | 110 | 107 | 104 | 98 | 121 | 93 |  |

[^40]age of the Francophone population lower than the average age of the Anglophone population, but it also has a larger proportion of adults. This age structure helped the growth of Francophones in all the regions, as well as at the national level. It has been at work during the past decade, offsetting the adverse effect of recent fertility levels. However, these differences will gradually fade over the next 15 years.

Women aged 35 to 44 who speak a language at home other than English or French have a greater number of children than other Canadians. Their higher fertility, therefore, tends to push up the proportion of the "other language" group in the population. The other factors, however, tend to work in the other direction - particularly, the linguistic mobility factor.

## Linguistic Mobility Favours English in All Regions

Some Canadians speak a language at home other than their mother tongue. These transfers from one language to another are the outcome of a process known as linguistic mobility, a process that particularly affects the French and the third language group minorities. Assessments of the strength of this phenomenon and of its impact on linguistic composition are usually based on census data. However, the multi-purpose design of the Census questionnaire does not allow a level of detail that is adequate for an analysis of the successive steps of the linguistic mobility process. The definition used in the Census for mother tongue (first language learned and still understood) leads to underestimating the strength of linguistic mobility among minorities, since those who no longer understand their original language are not included in that category. The information on home language (i.e. language most often spoken at home) was also clouded by a reducing process as only one language was selected. Therefore, it is important to not confuse linguistic mobility with linguistic assimilation.

We are interested only in the effects of linguistic mobility on linguistic composition. It has been shown that the index of linguistic continuity is well-suited for this purpose ${ }^{12}$. This index is the ratio of the number of people speaking a particular language at home to the number reporting the same language as their mother tongue. Where it exceeds 100 (assuming it is expressed as a percentage), it means that the language in question is making a net gain through language transfers. Conversely, a reading of under 100 indicates that the language is losing as a result of linguistic mobility.

In all regions, even in the mostly Francophone ones (Table 5) the net transfer is to English. The exact opposite is true for the third languages, which sustain large losses in all regions. As for the French language, it is just holding its own in the two Quebec regions; elsewhere in Canada, the lower its percentage of

[^41]the region's population, the greater the rate of transfer to English. In the mostly Anglophone areas, half the French-mother-tongue population speaks English at home. Among French Canadian women between the ages of 35 and 44, (who reflect the phenomenon's recent trends), over $60 \%$ have transferred to English as their home language (Table 5). The linguistic mobility rate of the French Canadian women in this age group exceeds the rate of linguistic mobility of women in the third group, probably because the majority of the latter were born in other countries.

It would seem reasonable to suppose that a child's mother tongue would be the mother's home language. On the basis of this assumption, it is possible to construct a linguistic reproduction index, which measures the joint effect of differential fertility and linguistic mobility on linguistic composition. It is the ratio (multiplied by 100) of a particular mother tongue's proportion in the children's birth cohort to the corresponding proportion in the mother's cohort. In most of the regions the higher fertility of Francophones attenuates the impact of language transfers (Table 6).

Table 5. Continuity Index ${ }^{1}$ (\%) for the Total Population ${ }^{2}$ and Women Aged 35 to 44, by Mother Tongue, Canada and Major Linguistic Regions, 1981

| Region | Total population (\%) |  |  | Women aged 35 to 44 (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | English | French | Other | English | French | Other |
| Canada | 111 | 96 | 55 | 117 | 94 | 53 |
| Quebec | 116 | 100 | 71 | 122 | 100 | 74 |
| MFR | 106 | 100 | 82 | 107 | 100 | 81 |
| RFM ${ }^{+}$ | 118 | 100 | 70 | 124 | 99 | 74 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | 111 | 72 | 52 | 116 | 61 | 51 |
| RMF- | 107 | 96 | 55 | 110 | 94 | 70 |
| RAM ${ }^{+}$ | 114 | 84 | 52 | 121 | 78 | 50 |
| MAR | 111 | 50 | 52 | 116 | 38 | 51 |

[^42]Table 6. Linguistic Reproduction Index for Women Aged ${ }^{1} 35$ to 44, by Mother Tongue, Canada and Major Linguistic Regions, 1981

| Region | Total | English | French | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canada | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ |
| Quebec | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 3}$ |
| MFR | 100 | 117 | 99 | 148 |
| RFM $^{+}$ | 100 | 119 | 99 | 82 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ |
| RFM- $^{+}$ | 100 | 109 | 94 | 77 |
| RAM + |  |  |  |  |
| MAR | 100 | 117 | 84 | 53 |

${ }^{1}$ Excluding inmates of institutions.
Source: Statistics Canada, 1981 Census of Canada, special tabulations.

## Internal Migration Consistently Benefits the Francophone Group

During each of the last three five-year periods, the propensity of Anglophones to move from Quebec to elsewhere in Canada was invariably ten times greater than that of Francophones. Conversely, the tendency to move to Quebec from other parts of Canada was much stronger for Francophones than for Anglophones ${ }^{13}$. However, these propensities do not measure the actual effect of migration on linguistic composition.

One of the questions the 1981 Census asked was the place of residence five years before (in 1976). Given these data, it is easy to compute the migration balance for each region and to compile it by language group (Table 7). Among the five major regions only the mostly Anglophone area posted a net gain. This finding applies to all language groups except the French group, which showed a slight migration gain in the region with a larger Francophone majority in Quebec.

To measure the impact of internal migration on linguistic composition, account must be taken of the populations of the various language groups in each region. To this end, we calculated linguistic net in-migration by taking the internal linguistic migration balances and dividing them by the corresponding number of persons of the mother tongue concerned who were residents of Canada in 1981 and lived in the region in 1976 (Table 7).

[^43]The net in-migration ratio for the French group was invariably higher than that for the English group. The pattern of change in the 1966-71 and 1971-76 periods was similar ${ }^{14}$. The explanation for this is that Francophones are concentrated in regions with negative migration balances. They leave these regions less than Anglophones, which raises their proportion of the population. Furthermore, although in the mostly Anglophone region the migration balance for the English group is far larger than for the French group ( 131,000 English to 25,000 French), proportionally the migration balance favours the French group. This tends to push the proportion of Francophones upward, but is insufficient to offset the adverse effect of linguistic mobility.

> Table 7. Internal Migration Balance and Net In-Migration Ratio by Mother Tongue, Canada and Major Linguistic Regions, 1976-1981 ${ }^{1}$

| Region | Total | English | French | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Internal migration balance (in thousands) |  |  |  |
| Quebec | -141.7 | -106.3 | -18.1 | -17.3 |
| MFR | -37.3 | -13.4 | -22.0 | -1.9 |
| RFM | -104.4 | -92.9 | +3.9 | -15.4 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | +141.7 | +106.3 | +18.1 | +17.3 |
| RFM | -4.7 | -4.0 | -0.6 | -0.1 |
| RAM | -29.0 | -20.8 | -6.6 | -1.6 |
| MAR | + 175.4 | +131.1 | +25.3 | +19.0 |
|  | Net In-Migration Ratio ${ }^{2}$ (\%) |  |  |  |
| Quebec | -2.4 | -14.3 | -0.4 | -4.6 |
| MFR | -1.6 | -18.2 | -1.0 | -6.5 |
| RFM ${ }^{+}$ | -2.9 | -13.9 | +0.2 | -4.4 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | + 0.9 | + 0.9 | +2.1 | + 0.7 |
| RFM ${ }^{-}$ | -1.4 | -2.8 | -0.3 | -3.9 |
| RAM ${ }^{+}$ | -2.9 | -3.3 | -2.3 | -1.8 |
| MAR | + 1.2 | +1.1 | + 7.1 | +0.8 |

[^44]It may seem surprising that internal migrations could cause a rise in the relative importance of Francophones. The ways in which internal migration affect linguistic composition may best be illustrated as follows. Let us consider a territory consisting of two small regions. In the first reside 1,000 persons, 800 of whom speak language $A$, and 200 language $B$; in the second region, which is more populous, only 150 people speak A , but 2,850 speak B . Let us now suppose that no deaths or births occur over a five-year period, the only source of population growth or decline being confined to internal migration. In the fifth year a census count reveals that there was a net movement of 30 persons from the first region to the second, 5 of language $A$ and 25 of language $B$. There are still 4,000 persons living in the territory and the number speaking language A $(950)$, and language $B(3,050)$ is unchanged. However, the weight of language A has advanced in both of the two constituent regions. In the first region, it has gone from $80 \%(800 / 1,000)$ to $82 \%(795 / 970)$ and in the second, from $5.0 \%(150 / 3,000)$ to $5.1 \%(155 / 3,030)$. This is analogous to the situation observed in Canada.

Conventionally, one does not consider the effects of migration on the linguistic composition of regions, but on the regional distribution of the population. If regions composed of a high proportion of Francophones lose importance in the country as a result of internal migratory movements, one may conclude that migration is unfavourable to Francophones. This reasoning is perhaps not false, but what can be affirmed is that it doesn't apply to the influence of internal migration on the linguistic make up.

## The Third Group Gains Through Immigration

The impact of international migration cannot be measured with available data. While there are estimates of the total number of emigrants, there is no information on their linguistic composition. Accordingly, we decided to confine this discussion to immigration, with only a few observations about emigration in the conclusion.

In 1981, over 550,000 people reported that they had been living abroad five years before (Table 8). This figure includes not only those people who had immigrated in the five-year period since 1976 and who were still resident in Canada in 1981, but it includes also Canadians who were residing in other countries in 1976 but had returned by 1981 . About $80 \%$ of those 550,000 people had taken up residence in the mostly Anglophone region of the country. This is a far larger proportion than the proportion of the Canadian population living in this region $(67.5 \%$ in 1981). The opposite is true in the other regions (Tables 1 and 8 ). Most of the immigrants settled in the same regions that experienced growth through internal population exchanges.

The language characteristics of immigrants influence their choice of geographical destination. Quebec is much more attractive to immigrants who
report French as their mother tongue (76\%) than those who report English $(6 \%)$. This situation is reversed in the rest of Canada. Thus, there is a very sharp division in the geographic allocation of immigrants by mother tongue, which has remained almost unchanged during the past three five-year periods ${ }^{15}$.

Table 8. Population ${ }^{1}$ Reporting Having Resided in Another Country in 1976, by Mother Tongue, Canada and Major Linguistic Regions, 1981

| Region | Total ${ }^{2}$ | English | French | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number (in thousands) |  |  |  |
| Canada | 56.2 | 251.2 | 39.5 | 265.5 |
| Quebec | 84.7 | 15.4 | 30.1 | 39.2 |
| MFR | 12.4 | 1.1 | 7.3 | 4.0 |
| RFM ${ }^{+}$ | 72.3 | 14.3 | 22.8 | 35.2 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | 471.5 | 235.7 | 9.4 | 226.3 |
| RFM ${ }^{-}$ | 3.1 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.3 |
| RAM ${ }^{+}$ | 20.9 | 11.0 | 1.6 | 8.3 |
| MAR | 447.4 | 223.3 | 6.3 | 217.8 |
|  | Composition (\%) |  |  |  |
| Canada | 100.0 | 45.2 | 7.1 | 47.7 |
| Quebec | 100.0 | 18.2 | 35.5 | 46.3 |
| MFR | 100.0 | 8.9 | 58.8 | 32.4 |
| RFM ${ }^{+}$ | 100.0 | 19.8 | 31.5 | 48.7 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | 100.0 | 50.0 | 2.0 | 48.0 |
| RFM ${ }^{-}$ | 100.0 | 43.9 | 46.9 | 9.2 |
| RAM ${ }^{+}$ | 100.0 | 52.7 | 7.8 | 39.5 |
| MAR | 100.0 | 49.9 | 1.4 | 48.7 |
|  | Regional distribution (\%) |  |  |  |
| Canada | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Quebec | 15.2 | 6.1 | 76.1 | 14.8 |
| REF | 2.2 | 0.4 | 18.4 | 1.5 |
| RMF ${ }^{+}$ | 13.0 | 5.7 | 57.7 | 13.3 |
| Canada excluding Quebec | 84.8 | 93.9 | 23.9 | 85.2 |
| RMF- | 0.6 | 0.5 | 3.7 | 0.1 |
| RMA ${ }^{+}$ | 3.8 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 3.1 |
| MAR | 80.4 | 88.9 | 16.0 | 82.0 |

[^45][^46]Nearly half of all immigrants belong to the third group (home language other than French or English), which exceeds by far the percentage of that group in the national population ( $13 \%$ ). The picture is much the same in all regions (Tables 3 and 8). In other words, immigration favours the third group and pushes its proportion upward in all areas. Conversely, the effect of immigration on the French share of total population is negative in all regions while the effect of immigration on the English share varies from region to region. The English group benefits from immigration where it is a minority, and loses where it constitutes the majority. These results relate solely to immigration. If the impact of both phenomena (immigration and emigration) could be taken into account, both the English and the French groups in most regions would probably be adversely affected.

## Synopsis

In the course of the last decade, the majority positions of the two official language communities strengthened. In all regions where Anglophones constitute the majority, including the country as a whole, their proportion of the population increased. The same was true of Francophones in regions where they were in the majority. As a result, there was a decline in the relative sizes and even in the population counts of official language minorities. This trend also intensified the regional concentration of Anglophones and Francophones.

Most of the members of the two official language communities do not reside in the same regions. They therefore seldom encounter each other in their day-to-day lives. They have regular contact chiefly with members of their own community. Consequently, the country's linguistic reality has only an abstract meaning for English and French speakers alike. Very few Canadians live in areas where the linguistic composition is similar to that of the country as a whole. Because of their heavy regional concentration, both Anglophones and Francophones tend to perceive themselves as members of a majority group.

Appendix C

Table C1. Distribution of Census Divisions in Linguistic Regions, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec

| 1971 | 1981 |
| :---: | :---: |
| NEW BRUNSWICK |  |
| North and East (Region With Small Francophone Majority (RFM-)) |  |
| Gloucester Kent <br> Madawaska Northumberland <br> Restigouche Victoria Westmorland | Same |
| South (Mostly Anglophone Region (MAR)) |  |
| All Other Census Divisions | Same |
| ONTARIO |  |
| East (Region With Large Anglophone Majority (RAM + )) |  |
| Glengarry Ottawa-Carleton Prescott Russel Stormont | Same |
| Northeast (Region With Large Anglophone Majority (RAM + )) |  |
| Cochrane <br> Nipissing <br> Sudbury Timiskaming | Same plus <br> Sudbury Regional |
| Rest of the Province (Mostly Anglophone Region (MAR)) |  |
| All Other Census Divisions | All Other Census Divisions |

Table C1. Distribution of Census Divisions in Linguistic Regions, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec - Concluded

| 1971 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| QUEBEC |  |
| Ottawa Valley (Region With Large Francophone Majority (RFM+)) |  |
| Gatineau |  |
| Hull |  |
| Papineau |  |
| Pontiac | Same |
| Central Montreal: (Region With Large Francophone Majority (RFM+)) |  |
| Ile-de-Montréal | Same |
| Ile-Jesus |  |

Table C2. Population by Mother Tongue, Canada and Regions ${ }^{1}$, 1971 and 1981

| Region | 1971 |  |  |  | 1981 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | English | French | Other | Total | English | French | Other |
| Canada | 21,568,310 | 12,973,805 | 5,793,650 | 2,800,855 | 24,343,190 | 14,918,465 | 6,249,100 | 3,175,625 |
| Quebec | 6,027,760 | 789,185 | 4,867,250 | 371,325 | 6,438,395 | 706,110 | 5,307,010 | 425,275 |
| Ottawa Valley | 217,040 | 40,830 | 172,050 | 4,160 | 243,700 | 42,195 | 195,190 | 6,315 |
| Montreal | 3,080,915 | 625,870 | 2,121,395 | 333,650 | 3,243,270 | 553,615 | 2,311,680 | 377,975 |
| Centre | 2,187,145 | 494,945 | 1,382,320 | 309,880 | 2,028,455 | 421,795 | 1,271,765 | 334,895 |
| Outskirts | 893,770 | 130,925 | 739,075 | 23,770 | 1,214,815 | 131,820 | 1,039,915 | 43,080 |
| Eastern Townships | 311,770 | 46,980 | 261,285 | 3,505 | 339,910 | 44,185 | 291,215 | 4,510 |
| Rest of Quebec | 2,418,035 | 75,505 | 2,312,520 | 30,010 | 2,611,515 | 66,115 | 2,508,925 | 36,475 |
| Canada Excluding Quebec | 15,540,555 | 12,184,630 | 926,405 | 2,429,520 | 17,904,780 | 14,212,345 | 942,085 | 2,750,350 |
| Newfoundland | 522,100 | 514,515 | 3,640 | 3,945 | 567,685 | 560,465 | 2,655 | 4,565 |
| Prince Edward Island | 111,645 | 103,105 | 7,365 | 1,175 | 122,505 | 115,045 | 6,080 | 1,380 |
| Nova Scotia | 788,960 | 733,555 | 39,335 | 16,070 | 847,440 | 793,165 | 36,030 | 18,245 |
| New Brunswick | 634,555 | 410,400 | 215,725 | 8,430 | 696,405 | 453,315 | 234,030 | 9,060 |
| North and East | 345,940 | 141,130 | 200,620 | 4,190 | 376575 | 153,295 | 219,365 | 3,915 |
| South | 288,615 | 269,270 | 15,105 | 4,240 | 319,835 | 300,020 | 14,665 | 5,150 |
| Ontario | 7,703,110 | 5,971,570 | 482,045 | 1,249,495 | 8,625,105 | 6,678,765 | 475,605 | 1,470,735 |
| East | 595,835 | 389,705 | 162,980 | 43,150 | 681,805 | 449,370 | 171,410 | 61,025 |
| Northeast | 419,270 | 227,425 | 149,850 | 41,995 | 405,270 | 233,640 | 137,540 | 34,090 |
| Rest of Ontario | 6,688,005 | 5,354,440 | 169,215 | 1,164,350 | 7,538,030 | 5,995,755 | 166,655 | 1,375,620 |
| Manitoba | 988,245 | 662,720 | 60,545 | 264,980 | 1,026,245 | 735,920 | 52,560 | 237,765 |
| Saskatchewan | 926,240 | 685,915 | 31,605 | 208,720 | 968,310 | 770,815 | 25,540 | 171,955 |
| Alberta | 1,627,875 | 1,263,935 | 46,500 | 317,440 | 2,237,725 | 1,810,545 | 62,145 | 365,035 |
| British Columbia | 2,184,620 | 1,807,255 | 38,030 | 339,335 | 2,744,470 | 2,249,310 | 45,620 | 449,540 |
| Yukon | 18,390 | 15,350 | 450 | 2,590 | 23,150 | 20,240 | 585 | 2,325 |
| Northwest Territories | 34,815 | 16,310 | 1,165 | 17,340 | 45,740 | 24,760 | 1,235 | 19,745 |

[^47]Table C3. Composition (\%) of the Population by Mother Tongue, Canada and Regions ${ }^{1}$, 1971 and 1981

| Region | 1971 |  |  |  | 1981 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total ${ }^{2}$ | English | French | Other | Total ${ }^{2}$ | English | French | Other |
| Canada | 100.0 | 60.2 | 26.9 | 13.0 | 100.0 | 61.3 | 25.7 | 13.0 |
| Quebec | 100.0 | 13.1 | 80.7 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 82.4 | 6.6 |
| Ottawa Valley | 100.0 | 18.8 | 79.3 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 17.3 | 80.1 | 2.6 |
| Montreal | 100.0 | 20.3 | 68.9 | 10.8 | 100.0 | 17.1 | 71.3 | 11.7 |
| Centre | 100.0 | 22.6 | 63.2 | 14.2 | 100.0 | 20.8 | 62.7 | 16.5 |
| Outskirts | 100.0 | 14.6 | 82.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 10.9 | 85.6 | 3.5 |
| Eastern Townships | 100.0 | 15.1 | 83.8 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 85.7 | 1.3 |
| Rest of Quebec | 100.0 | 3.1 | 95.6 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 96.1 | 1.4 |
| Canada Excluding Quebec | 100.0 | 78.4 | 6.0 | 15.6 | 100.0 | 79.4 | 5.3 | 15.4 |
| Newfoundland | 100.0 | 98.5 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 | 98.7 | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| Prince Edward Island | 100.0 | 92.4 | 6.6 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 93.9 | 5.0 | 1.1 |
| Nova Scotia | 100.0 | 93.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 | 93.6 | 4.3 | 2.2 |
| New Brunswick | 100.0 | 64.7 | 34.0 | 1.3 | 100.0 | 65.1 | 33.6 | 1.3 |
| North and East | 100.0 | 40.8 | 58.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 | 40.7 | 58.3 | 1.0 |
| South | 100.0 | 93.3 | 5.2 | 1.5 | 100.0 | 93.8 | 4.6 | 1.6 |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 77.5 | 6.3 | 16.2 | 100.0 | 77.4 | 5.5 | 17.1 |
| East | 100.0 | 65.4 | 27.4 | 7.2 | 100.0 | 65.9 | 25.1 | 9.0 |
| Northeast | 100.0 | 54.2 | 35.7 | 10.0 | 100.0 | 57.7 | 33.9 | 8.4 |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 80.1 | 2.5 | 17.4 | 100.0 | 79.5 | 2.2 | 18.2 |
| Manitoba | 100.0 | 67.1 | 6.1 | 26.8 | 100.0 | 71.7 | 5.1 | 23.2 |
| Saskatchewan | 100.0 | 74.1 | 3.4 | 22.5 | 100.0 | 79.6 | 2.6 | 17.8 |
| Alberta | 100.0 | 77.6 | 2.9 | 19.5 | 100.0 | 80.9 | 2.8 | 16.3 |
| British Columbia | 100.0 | 82.7 | 1.7 | 15.5 | 100.0 | 82.0 | 1.7 | 16.4 |
| Yukon | 100.0 | 83.5 | 2.4 | 14.1 | 100.0 | 87.4 | 2.5 | 10.0 |
| Northwest Territories | 100.0 | 46.8 | 3.3 | 49.8 | 100.0 | 54.1 | 2.7 | 43.2 |

[^48]Table C4. Population by Language Used in the Home, Canada and Regions ${ }^{1}$, 1971 and 1981

| Region | 1971 |  |  |  | $1981^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | English | French | Other | Total | English | French | Other |
| Canada | 21,568,315 | $\mathbf{1 4 , 4 4 6 , 2 4 0}$ | 5,546,025 | 1,576,050 | 24,083,500 | 16,425,905 | 5,923,010 | 1,734,585 |
| Quebec | 6,027,760 | 887,875 | 4,870,100 | 269,785 | 6,369,065 | 809,145 | 5,256,830 | 303,090 |
| Ottawa Valley | 217,040 | 45,595 | 168,960 | 2,485 | 242,165 | 46,505 | 191,665 | 3,995 |
| Montreal | 3,080,930 | 716,890 | 2,120,785 | 243,255 | 3,208,965 | 648,365 | 2,293,370 | 267,230 |
| Centre | 2,187,155 | 572,680 | 1,383,785 | 230,690 | 2,002,605 | 501,665 | 1,258,365 | 242,575 |
| Outskirts | 893,775 | 144,210 | 737,000 | 12,565 | 1,206,360 | 146,700 | 1,035,005 | 24,655 |
| Eastern townships | 311,775 | 48,985 | 261,050 | 1,740 | 335,270 | 44,930 | 287,725 | 2,615 |
| Rest of Quebec | 2,418,015 | 76,405 | 2,319,305 | 22,305 | 2,582,665 | 69,345 | 2,484,070 | 29,250 |
| Canada Excluding Quebec | 15,540,550 | 13,558,370 | 675,920 | 1,306,260 | 17,714,435 | 15,616,760 | 666,185 | 1,431,490 |
| Newfoundland | 522,105 | 517,210 | 2,295 | 2,600 | 563,740 | 559,520 | 1,810 | 2,410 |
| Prince Edward Island | 111,645 | 106,795 | 4,405 | 445 | 121,230 | 117,080 | 3,730 | 420 |
| Nova Scotia | 788,965 | 753,730 | 27,220 | 8,015 | 839,810 | 806,950 | 24,450 | 8,410 |
| New Brunswick | 634,565 | 430,725 | 199,085 | 4,755 | 689,375 | 468,545 | 216,585 | 4,245 |
| North and East | 345,945 | 151,185 | 191,750 | 3,010 | 372,570 | 161,850 | 208,750 | 1,970 |
| South | 288,620 | 279,540 | 7,335 | 1,745 | 316,805 | 306,695 | 7,835 | 2,275 |
| Ontario | 7,703,100 | 6,558,065 | 352,460 | 792,575 | 8,534,265 | 7,337,255 | 332,945 | 864,065 |
| East | 595,830 | 428,355 | 142,870 | 24,605 | 674,555 | 497,855 | 143,210 | 33,490 |
| Northeast | 419,265 | 270,075 | 127,130 | 22,060 | 401,605 | 273,025 | 111,940 | 16,640 |
| Rest of Ontario | 6,688,005 | 5,859,635 | 82,460 | 745,910 | 7,458,105 | 6,566,375 | 77,795 | 813,935 |
| Manitoba | 988,245 | 816,555 | 39,600 | 132,090 | 1,013,705 | 872,075 | 31,045 | 110,585 |
| Saskatchewan | 926,235 | 832,515 | 15,930 | 77,790 | 956,435 | 887,385 | 10,085 | 58,965 |
| Alberta | 1,627,870 | 1,477,960 | 22,695 | 127,215 | 2,213,660 | 2,029,505 | 29,555 | 154,600 |
| British Columbia | 2,184,620 | 2,027,120 | 11,505 | 145,995 | 2,713,610 | 2,487,330 | 15,120 | 211,160 |
| Yukon | 18,390 | 17,465 | 135 | 790 | 23,070 | 22,170 | 230 | 670 |
| Northwest Territories | 34,810 | 20,230 | 590 | 13,990 | 45,535 | 28,945 | 630 | 15,960 |

${ }_{1}$ The regions are defined in Table C1.
${ }^{2}$ Excluding inmates of institutions.
Source: Statistics Canada, 1971 and 1981 Censuses of Canada, special tabulations

Table C5. Composition (\%) of the Population by Language Used in the Home, Canada and Regions ${ }^{1}$, 1971 and 1981

| Region | 1971 |  |  |  | 1981 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total ${ }^{3}$ | English | French | Other | Total ${ }^{3}$ | English | French | Other |
| Canada | 100.0 | 67.0 | 25.7 | 7.3 | 100.0 | 68.2 | 24.6 | 7.2 |
| Quebec | 100.0 | 14.7 | 80.8 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 12.7 | 82.5 | 4.8 |
| Ottawa Valley | 100.0 | 21.0 | 77.8 | 1.1 | 100.0 | 19.2 | 79.1 | 1.6 |
| Montreal | 100.0 | 23.3 | 68.8 | 7.9 | 100.0 | 20.2 | 71.5 | 8.3 |
| Centre | 100.0 | 26.2 | 63.3 | 10.5 | 100.0 | 25.1 | 62.8 | 12.1 |
| Outskirts | 100.0 | 16.1 | 82.5 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 12.2 | 85.8 | 2.0 |
| Eastern townships | 100.0 | 15.7 | 83.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 13.4 | 85.8 | 0.8 |
| Rest of Quebec | 100.0 | 3.2 | 95.9 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 2.7 | 96.2 | 1.1 |
| Canada Excluding Quebec | 100.0 | 87.2 | 4.3 | 8.4 | 100.0 | 88.2 | 3.8 | 8.1 |
| Newfoundland | 100.0 | 99.1 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 99.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Prince Edward Island | 100.0 | 95.7 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 100.0 | 96.6 | 3.1 | 0.3 |
| Nova Scotia | 100.0 | 95.5 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 100.0 | 96.1 | 2.9 | 1.0 |
| New Brunswick | 100.0 | 67.9 | 31.4 | 0.7 | 100.0 | 68.0 | 31.4 | 0.6 |
| North and East | 100.0 | 43.7 | 55.4 | 0.9 | 100.0 | 43.4 | 56.0 | 0.5 |
| South | 100.0 | 96.9 | 2.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 | 96.8 | 2.5 | 0.7 |
| Ontario | 100.0 | 85.1 | 4.6 | 10.3 | 100.0 | 86.0 | 3.9 | 10.1 |
| East | 100.0 | 71.9 | 24.0 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 73.8 | 21.2 | 5.0 |
| Northeast | 100.0 | 64.4 | 30.3 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 68.0 | 27.9 | 4.1 |
| Rest of Ontario | 100.0 | 87.6 | 1.2 | 11.2 | 100.0 | 88.0 | 1.0 | 10.9 |
| Manitoba | 100.0 | 82.6 | 4.0 | 13.4 | 100.0 | 86.0 | 3.1 | 10.9 |
| Saskatchewan | 100.0 | 89.9 | 1.7 | 8.4 | 100.0 | 92.8 | 1.1 | 6.2 |
| Alberta | 100.0 | 90.8 | 1.4 | 7.8 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 1.3 | 7.0 |
| British Columbia | 100.0 | 92.8 | 0.5 | 6.7 | 100.0 | 91.7 | 0.6 | 7.8 |
| Yukon | 100.0 | 95.0 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 96.1 | 1.0 | 2.9 |
| Northwest Territories | 100.0 | 58.1 | 1.7 | 40.2 | 100.0 | 63.6 | 1.4 | 35.0 |

[^49]
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## Glossary ${ }^{1}$

Census year: A neologism patterned after "fiscal year". In Canada, it refers to the 12 -month period between June 1 of one year to May 31 of the following year. It can equally designate the year during which a census is held.
Cohort: A group of individuals or couples who experience the same event during a specified period. For example, there are birth cohorts and marriage cohorts.
Cohort, fictitious: An artificial cohort created from portions of actual cohorts present at different successive ages in the same year.
Crude rate: Relates certain events to the size of the entire population. For example, the crude birth rate for Canada is the ratio of the number of births in Canada in a year to the size of the Canadian population at mid-year. Crude death rates and crude divorce rates are calculated in the same way.
Current index: An index constructed from measurements of demographic phenomena and based on the events reflecting those phenomena during a given period, usually a year. For example, life expectancy in 1981 is a current index in the sense that it indicates the average number of years a person would live if he or she experienced 1981 conditions throughout his or her life.
Dependency ratio: Ratio denoting the dependency on the working population of some or all of the non-working population.
Depopulation: The decline in the population of an area through an excess of deaths over births (not to be confused with the depletion of an area through emigration).
Endogenous: Influences from inside the system.
Exogenous: Influences from outside the system.
Fertility: Relates the number of live births to the number of women, couples or, very rarely, men.
Frequency: Frequency of occurence within a cohort of the events characterizing a paticular phenomenon.
Infant mortality: Mortality of children less than a year old.
Life expectancy: A statistical measure derived from the life table indicating the average years of life remaining for a person at the specified age, if the current age-specific mortality rates prevail for the remainder of that person's life.
Life table: A detailed description of the mortality of a population giving the probability of dying and various other statistics at each age.
Natural increase: A change in population size over a given period as a result of the difference between the number of births and deaths.

[^50]Neonatal mortality: Mortality in the first month after birth (part of infant mortality.
Net migration: Difference between immigration and emigration for a given area and period of time.
Nulliparous: Pertaining to a woman or a marriage of zero parity (has not produced a child).

Parity: A term used in reference to a woman or a marriage to denote the number of births or deliveries by the woman or in the marriage. A two-parity woman is a woman who has given birth to a second-order child.

Population growth: A change, either positive or negative, in population size over a given period.
Population movement: Gradual change in population status over a given period attribuable to the demographic events occurring during the period. Movement here is not a synomyn for migration.
Post-neonatal mortality: Mortality between the ages of one month and one year.

Probability of survival: Probability at exact age x of surviving to not less than exact age $x+a$; denoted ${ }_{a} p_{x}$. It is the complement of the probability of death ( $1-{ }_{a} q_{x}$ ).

Quinquennial: Pertaining to a five-year period.
Rate: Ratio of the events occurring in a population in a given period to the average population during that period.
Sex ratio: Ratio of males to females in a given population. It is usually expressed as the number of males per 100 females.

Standardization: Procedure by which rates are corrected for the effect of the population structures under consideration in order to facilitate a comparison with other populations.

Structure: Composition of a population based on demographic characteristics such as age, sex, marital status, and so on.

Timing: Distribution over time of the events characterizing a particular phenomenon within a cohort. Its purpose is to indicate the rate at which the events occur. Mean or median age and mean or median duration are often used to measure the "timing" of events.
Total (fertility, divorce, nuptiality) rate: The sum of age-specific rates during a given period. It is one of the most commonly used current indices. It represents the behaviour of a fictitious cohort.

- Weak growth but one of the higheat in the Western World
- Ontario regains its pasition at the forefiont
of population dynamics
- Canada - still younger than Europe but aging more rupidly
For the three yeans rumning fewer divorces but still fewer marriages
Has the decline in fertititity stopped?
- The outcome of the battle against cancer remains uncertain
- Fewer and older immigrants
- Frumicophomes andit Anglophones - feet in the majority in their own environments...

These are the iouchtones of the cum situation revealed by Canodu's recen population data.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The analyses of demographic change in this report are based on the estimated population of Canada as of June 1, 1986 since these were the only detailed figures available at the time of writing.
    2 For definitions and explanations of the demographic terminology in this report, the reader may wish to consult, Peron, Yves and Claude Strohmenger, Demographic and Health Indicators: Presentation and Interpretation. Statistics Canada, Catalogue 82-543E.

[^1]:    Source: Table A1.

[^2]:    Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada.

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ In this discussion, the proportions referred to are the mid-point generation of a 5-year generation group.

[^4]:    Source: Table A6.

[^5]:    ${ }^{4}$ T.K. Burch and A.K. Madan. Union Formation and Dissolution in Canada: Results from the 1984 Family History Survey. Statistics Canada, Catalogue 99-963.

[^6]:    5 Pressat, R., "Treizième rapport sur la situation démographique de la France", Population, 1984 (July-October), pp. 669-732.

[^7]:    ${ }^{6}$ Burch and Madan, op. cit.

[^8]:    ${ }^{7}$ The standardized rate is an artificial summary index obtained by applying to a standard population the age-specific rates observed in the populations to be compared (which may be different populations or the same population at two different times). The differences observed can therefore not be ascribed to different age structures. This is important since some diseases affect certain age groups more than others.

[^9]:    ${ }_{2}^{1}$ Age structure of Canada in 1976 was used as standard.
    ${ }^{2}$ Because of the small numbers, the fluctuations may be random.
    ${ }^{3}$ Excluding the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.
    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

[^10]:    Age structure of Canada for 1976 was used as standard.
    2 Because of the small numbers, the fluctuations may be random.
    ${ }^{3}$ Excluding the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.
    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Age structure of Canada for 1976 was used as standard.
    ${ }^{2}$ Because of the small numbers, the fluctuations may be random.
    ${ }^{3}$ Excluding the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.
    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

[^12]:    ${ }_{2}^{1}$ Age structure of Canada in 1976 was used as standard.
    ${ }_{2}$ Because of the small numbers, the fluctuations may be random.
    ${ }^{3}$ Excluding the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.
    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

[^13]:    1 Age structure of Canada in 1976 was used as standard.
    2 Because of the small numbers, the fluctuations may be random.
    3 Excluding the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.
    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Averages for 1950 and 1951, 1975 and 1976, 1980 and 1981, 1983 and 1984, 1984 and 1985, respectively.
    2 Age structure of Canada in 1976 was used as standard.
    Source: Statistics Canada, Causes of Death, Catalogue 84-203.

[^15]:    ${ }_{2}^{1}$ Age structure of Canada in 1976 was used as standard.
    ${ }_{2}^{2}$ Because of the small numbers, the fluctuations may be random.
    ${ }^{3}$ Excluding the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.
    Source: Statistics Canada, unpublished data.

[^16]:    ${ }^{8}$ For a definition of these classes, see Current Demographic Analysis: Report on the Demographic Situation in Canada, 1983. Statistics Canada, Catalogue 91-209E.
    9 Origin refers to country of birth, not country of last residence.

[^17]:    10 November, 1984, Employment and Immigration Canada.

[^18]:    $113,867,160$ persons.
    12 Statistics Canada, Population Projections for Canada, Provinces and Territories: 1984-2006. May, 1985, Catalogue 91-520.
    ${ }^{13}$ Annual Report to Parliament on Future Immigration Levels. See footnote 10.

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ As of June 1st.
    ${ }^{2}$ From June 1st of the preceding year to May 31st of the year indicated.
    ${ }^{3}$ Difference between total growth and natural increase.
    ${ }^{4}$ Data from the Census of Canada.
    5 Average Annual Growth from June 1st 1951 to May 31st 1971.
    ${ }^{6}$ Intercensal Estimates.
    ${ }^{7}$ Postcensal Estimates.
    Source: Statistics Canada, Catalogues 91-201 and 91-210.

[^20]:    1 When age at immigration and period of immigration are taken into account, the fertility of foreign-born women has not been consistently similar to that of Canadian-born women. For this reason, this chapter deals only with the fertility experience of women who were born and currently reside in Canada, thereby allowing the reader to evaluate the impact of any eventual disparity in the total fertility experience attendant upon this strategy.

[^21]:    ${ }^{2}$ Includes divorced and widowed.
    ${ }^{3}$ For a detailed discussion of the related data see Appendix B.
    ${ }^{4}$ A woman's parity is the number of children she has borne or the number of deliveries she has had. For example, a woman who has borne two children is said to be "at parity two".
    5 The marriage durations are approximate. The Census provides the age and age at marriage of each respondent in complete years lived (age at last birthday), so that subtracting one figure from the other yields only the average length of time that the respondents have been married. Within the group married at age 19 and now aged 20, some have been married for only one day, while others have been married for two years less a day. As the durations become larger, the margin of error becomes proportionately smaller; the figures obtained by subtracting one age from the other have a greater probability of reflecting the true duration. Duration $0-$ for example, women married at age 19 and still aged 19 - is excluded.

[^22]:    ${ }^{6}$ However, the information collected on births does not differentiate between first and subsequent marriages.

[^23]:    ${ }^{7}$ The completed fertility of a marriage cohort is a weighted average of the fertility levels by age at marriage, for which the weighting factors are the ratios of the number of women married at a particular age to the total number of married women in the cohort. The higher the proportion in a cohort of women who marry late, the lower will be the average fertility rate of the cohort.

[^24]:    ${ }^{8}$ As early as 1934, the economic climate experienced some improvement, as registered by certain indices (e.g. unemployment, marriage rate, etc.).

[^25]:    9 This is an approximation. An exact measure involves the impact of mortality.

[^26]:    10 These ingenious relationships were first used by Louis Henry (France) and Norman Ryder (United States).

[^27]:    ${ }^{11}$ See first part of the report.
    12 Cahiers québécois de démographie, Vol. 13:2, Table 7.

[^28]:    13 In both cases, age at marriage was not supplied by the respondent, but was obtained by subtracting the date of birth from the date of marriage. However, in 1971 only the years were subtracted, whereas in 1981 the months were also taken into account. For full details, see Norland, Joseph, "A Statement on Comparability of Census Data on Age at First Marriage 1961, 1971, 1981", Demography Division, unpublished internal document, 1983.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ Births to widows and divorced women, which are infrequent and therefore less important as a social phenomenon, are disregarded here, but are reported in Vital Statistics.

[^30]:    ${ }^{2}$ In 1981, if they did not report themselves as such, the Edit and Imputation Unit assigned them to the "married" class.
    ${ }^{3}$ For a more detailed discussion, see Dumas, Jean and Louise Boyer, "Mise au point sur la fécondité des célibataires", Cahiers québécois de démographie, vol. 13, no. 2.

[^31]:    4 Norland, Joseph, Selected Characteristics of Cohabiting Persons in Canada 1981. Statistics Canada 1985, unpublished paper.

[^32]:    Source: 1981 Census of Canada. Microfiche SDN 81BB5

[^33]:    1 Social and Economic Studies Division, Statistics Canada.

[^34]:    2 Joy, Richard J., 1967, Languages in Conflict, the Canadian Experience, Ottawa. Published by the author.
    ${ }^{3}$ Lachapelle, Réjean and Jacques Henripin, La situation démolinguistique au Canada: évolution passé et prospective, Montréal, l'Institut de recherches politiques, 1980.

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ Excluding inmates of institutions. Because of rounding, the data do not always add up to the totals.
    2 Including inmates of institutions.
    Sources: Tables C2 and C4.

[^36]:    4 Lieberson, Stanley and Donna K. Carter, 1982, "Temporal Changes and Urban Differences in Residential Segregation: A Reconsideration", American Journal of Sociology, Vol 88, No. 2, pp 296-310.
    ${ }^{5}$ Lachapelle, Réjean, 1984, "Linguistic Composition: Perception and Reality", Statistics Canada, Social and Economic Studies Division, working paper.
    ${ }^{6}$ Persons whose mother tongue is French.

[^37]:    7 Devereaux, M.S. and Luc Albert, 1985, "Language in Canada", 1981 Census of Canada, Statistics Canada, Catalogue 99-935.

[^38]:    ${ }^{1}$ Due to rounding, the percentages do not always total 100 .
    Source: Tables C2 to C4.

[^39]:    ${ }^{8}$ Lachapelle and Henripin, op. cit., Chapter 3.
    9 Henripin, Jacques, Trends and Factors of Fertility in Canada, 1961 Census Monograph Programme, Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1968.
    10 Lieberson, Stanley, 1970, Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada, New York, John Wiley.
    11 Romaniuc, A, 1984, Fertility in Canada: From Baby-boom to Baby-bust, Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services, Catalogue 91-524E (Occasional).

[^40]:    1 Excluding inmates of institutions.
    2 For all languages combined, the average number of children per woman was 2.4 in the 35-44 group and 3.1 in the $45-54$ group.
    Source: Statistics Canada, 1981 Census of Canada, special tabulations.

[^41]:    ${ }^{12}$ Lachapelle, Réjean, 1984, "Analysis of Linguistic Mobility: Indexes, Observations and Models", Statistics Canada, Social and Economic Studies Division, working paper.

[^42]:    1 This index is the ratio of the number of persons speaking a particular language at home to the number reporting the same language as their mother tongue.
    2 Excluding inmates of institutions.
    Source: Statistics Canada, 1981 Census of Canada, special tabulations.

[^43]:    13 Baillargeon, Mireille, 1983, "Évolution et caractéristiques linguistiques des échanges migratoires interprovinciaux et internationaux du Québec depuis 1971", Québec, Conseil de la langue francaise (draft edition). Lachapelle et Henripin, op. cit.

[^44]:    ${ }^{1}$ Excluding population under five years of age in 1981 and inmates of institutions.
    ${ }^{2}$ The ratio of the internal migration balance to the corresponding number of persons who were residents of Canada in 1981 and lived in the region in question in 1976.
    Source: Statistics Canada, 1981 Census of Canada, special tabulations.

[^45]:    ${ }^{1}$ Excluding population under five years of age in 1981 and inmates of institutions.
    2 Because of rounding, the sum of the data does not always equal the total.
    Source: Statistics Canada, 1981 Census of Canada, special tabulations.

[^46]:    15 Lachappelle and Henripin, op. cit., p. 238 and 55.

[^47]:    ${ }^{1}$ The regions are defined in Table C1.
    Source: Statistics Canada, 1971 and 1981 Censuses of Canada, special tabluations.

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ The regions are defined in Table C1.
    ${ }^{2}$ Because of rounding, the data do not always total 100 .
    Source: Table C2.

[^49]:    1 The regions are defined in Table C4.
    ${ }_{2}$ Excluding inmates of institutions.
    3 Because of rounding, the data do not always total 100.
    Source: Table C4.

[^50]:    ${ }^{1}$ For further information consult the following: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Multilingual Demographic Dictionary, Ordina Editions, Liège 1980; Pressat, Roland. The Dictionary of Demography, ed. Christopher Wilson. Oxford, England: New York, NY, USA.

