

PROFILE OF POVERTY IN
NOVA SCOTIA

HC
117
N8
W65

Reproduced by permission of The Cope Clark Publishing Company from Poverty and Social Policy in Canada, edited by W.E. Mann (Toronto: 1970, pp. 226-39.

PROFILE OF POVERTY IN NOVA SCOTIA

K. Scott Wood

The Canadian "war on poverty" is not one single program but rather the co-ordination of five important federal government efforts to alleviate the problems of low income, unemployment and social disadvantage which exist in pockets across the country. These programs are five in number:

- 1) Area Development Program
- 2) Manpower Mobility Program
- 3) Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Administration [since changed to Agricultural and Rural Development Administration]
- 4) Canadian Assistance Plan
- 5) Company of Young Canadians

POVERTY CRITERIA

No clear definition of what poverty is has been made explicit in the announcements concerning the "War on Poverty." Moreover, Mr. MacEachen in a speech to the Canadian Club at Niagara Falls brushed aside the

Abridged from a paper presented by Prof. K. Scott Wood, Economic Research Associate, Institute of Public Affairs, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, to the Institute on November 22, 1965. Reprinted with the permission of the Institute and Prof. Wood.

need for a definition by saying "that only the most insensitive can fail to recognize poverty when he sees it—poverty in material needs, poverty in needs of the spirit." Mr. MacEachen backed up his statement by referring to John K. Galbraith's contention that "there is no firm definition of this phenomenon and again, save as a tactic for countering the intellectual obstructionist, no precise definition is needed."

Some operational definition of poverty is needed, however, in order to make some judgments about the scope and character of poverty in Canada. In fact there are some definitions of poverty which are implicit in the "War on Poverty" in so much as individual programs have made use of various measures to indicate social and economic disadvantages. It has been particularly ARDA and ADA which have supplied us with the criteria for measuring poverty which seem most useful. . . .

Under ARDA a series of maps were issued indicating the incidence of economic and social disadvantage across Canada.¹ In the case of farm areas an operator was considered disadvantaged if his farm had a capital value of less than \$24,950 and gross sales of less than \$2,500 a year, and if the operator had off-farm work of less than one month. In broad terms, then, a farm family with less than \$2,500 is considered disadvantaged. This definition excludes residential and institutional farms.

Non-farm families, excluding those in urban centres of 10,000 or more, whose income from all members of the household over 15 years of age did not exceed \$3,000 are also considered disadvantaged.

Another definition of poverty which is used pertains to the individual male non-farm wage earner (either urban or rural) who is 15 years or older and who has less than \$2,000 annual income.

ARDA has also made use of high unemployment, low levels of education and high infant mortality rates as indications of economic and social disadvantage.

ADA uses a set of criteria for designating areas in need of assistance which includes both unemployment and income as measures. As far as the income criteria are concerned, a National Employment Service area may be designated if, in addition to the problem of unemployment, it has 1) an average annual family income below \$4,250 and/or 2) 40% or more of all families with an average annual income below \$3,000.

Three basic income criteria for poverty seem to emerge from our foregoing discussion.

- 1) non-farm family incomes below \$3,000
- 2) farm family incomes below \$2,500
- 3) non-farm individual male wage earner incomes below \$2,000

These criteria would seem to be the most available measures of poverty, and they probably reflect a level of income which can be considered as providing a minimum standard of living. One would assume that they were

chosen . . . as a result of investigations into the minimum level of income required for an average Canadian family or individual to just get by.

One test we can apply to the choice of non-farm family incomes is to look at the distribution of major income sources as between employment income and other sources for various income classes. Employment income includes wages and salaries or income earned from self-employment, the operation of a business or from professional practice. Other sources include investment incomes, pensions and/or government transfer payments.

An examination of Table I will indicate that the number of families with their major income from "other sources" is highest both where total income is highest and where it is lowest. In the former case investment income is of large importance. In the case of lower income groups government transfer payments loom large.

It is interesting to note in the table that down to the \$3,000 income level, the percent of families with "other sources" of income as their major form of support grows only slowly to 5%—but under \$3,000 it jumps sharply to 10% or over. This suggests that this income level is a critical dividing point, below which an increasing number of families are not able to support themselves from employment income and thus derive their major source of income from government transfer payments.

It is this criteria of family income on which we will rely, for the most part, in the following discussion of characteristics and location of poverty.

TABLE I—RURAL NON-FARM AND URBAN FAMILIES BY SIZE OF TOTAL INCOME AND BY MAJOR SOURCE OF INCOME IN NOVA SCOTIA, 1961

Income Group	Employment Income	Other Sources	Total	Employment Income As % of Total	Other Sources As % of Total
\$15,000 or more	1,822	208	2,030	89.8	10.2
10,000-14,999	3,636	194	3,830	94.9	5.1
8,000- 9,999	5,710	151	5,861	97.4	2.6
7,000- 7,999	5,802	102	5,904	98.3	1.7
6,000- 6,999	9,280	169	9,449	98.2	1.8
5,500- 5,999	6,371	156	6,527	97.6	2.4
5,000- 5,499	9,229	233	9,462	97.5	2.5
4,500- 4,999	10,099	256	10,355	97.5	2.5
4,000- 4,999	12,048	413	12,461	96.7	3.3
3,500- 3,999	12,419	500	12,919	96.1	3.9
3,000- 3,499	12,458	640	13,098	95.1	4.9
2,500- 2,999	11,040	1,284	12,324	89.5	10.5
2,000- 2,499	9,788	2,132	11,920	82.1	17.9
1,500- 1,999	6,368	3,526	9,894	64.4	35.6
1,000- 1,499	4,852	5,530	10,382	46.7	53.3
Under \$1,000	3,409	6,582	9,991	34.1	65.9
TOTAL	124,331	22,076	146,407	84.9	15.1
AVERAGE	\$4,670	\$2,033			

Source: DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue no. 98-503, table C12.

THE NUMBER OF POOR IN NOVA SCOTIA

First of all we may examine the number of non-farm families with incomes below \$3,000 in order to assess the number of poor in our Province. A family for census purposes, consists of a husband and wife or a husband and wife and any children who have never married, or a parent with any children who have never married, living together in the same dwelling. Adopted children, step-children and guardianship children under 21 are counted as own children."²

... The number of rural non-farm families in Nova Scotia included in the survey were 59,601. Of this total, however, 31,863 or over 52% of the families had incomes below \$3,000. The percentage of poor families in urban areas (incorporated or unincorporated centers of 1,000 or more) was slightly more than 27% of the 87,224 urban families reporting, or 23,866. The total number of poor non-farm families in the province amounted to 54,929 or 7.46% of the total.

This gives some basic indication of the poverty dimension as based on this particular criterion, non-farm families with incomes below \$3,000. It also points out that poverty is both relatively and absolutely greater among rural non-farm families than among urban families.

One indication of the probable degree of poverty among farm families is provided in Table III. There the number of commercial farms is listed by the value of product sold. Those farms with a sales level of \$2,500 or below amounted to 38.9% or 1,923 of the 4,939 commercial farms in the province. This suggests that an equal number of farm families fell under the poverty line. It should be noted that consideration has not been given to the capital value of the farm or the amount of off-farm work.

The third definition of poverty was related to the income levels of individual, male non-farm wage earners. There it was suggested that anyone below \$2,000 be considered in the ranks of the poor. Table IV gives some indication of the dimension of poverty among the group. Of the 50,697 rural non-farm wage earners, 20,523, or 40.5% of them have annual incomes below \$2,000. The incidence of poverty among urban wage earners is lower, both absolutely and as a percent of the total. In this group 21.3% or 18,781 wage earners fall below the poverty line. One might note that this does not differ much from the results one obtains from an examination of family incomes. For this reason the description of the poor will be focussed on family units. The justification for ignoring farm families is that they are relatively few and that their standard of living cannot be so easily judged by the size of monetary incomes, because they receive income-in-kind in the form of food products from their own farms.

TABLE III—COMMERCIAL CENSUS FARMS BY ECONOMIC CLASS OF FARM IN NOVA SCOTIA, 1961

Value of Product Sold by Commercial Farms	Number	% of Total
\$25,000 and over	160	3.2%
15,000-24,999	191	3.9
10,000-14,099	282	5.7
5,000- 9,999	936	19.0
3,750- 4,999	525	10.6
2,500- 3,749	922	18.7
1,200- 2,499	1,923	38.9
Commercial Farms	4,939	100.0
Total Census Farms	12,518	
Commercial Farms as % of Census Farms		39.4

Source: DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue No. 96-533, Table 14.

TABLE IV—RURAL NON-FARM AND URBAN MALE WAGE EARNERS 15 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER, BY AMOUNT OF EARNINGS, IN NOVA SCOTIA, 1961

	Rural Non-Farm	Rural NF As % Total	Urban	Urban as % Total
\$6,000 or more	1,822	3.6%	8,296	9.4%
4,000-5,999	7,528	14.9	22,626	25.6
3,000-3,999	9,346	18.4	20,993	23.7
2,000-2,999	11,478	22.6	17,723	20.0
1,000-1,999	11,167	22.0	10,900	12.3
Less than \$1,000	9,356	18.5	7,881	8.9
Total	50,697	100.0	88,409	100.0
Under \$2,000	20,523	40.5	18,781	21.3

Source: DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue No. 94-535, Table 14.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF POOR FAMILIES

Family Size

When one assumes the poverty level to be \$3,000 for a family, no consideration is usually given to the important variable of family size. A family with six members is manifestly worse off with an income of only \$3,000 than is one with two members. . . . 52.8% of two-member families are earning less than \$3,000. The figure is 38.4% for three-member families and 29.9%, 27.8% and 27.9% for four, five and six-member families respectively.

What do these figures mean? In the case of a two-member family which just falls under the poverty line, the per capita income is \$1,500. On the other hand a six-member family in the same situation will only have \$500 per person. Therefore, in assessing the level of impoverishment of two-member families it is important to note that 36.1% of them were earning

under \$2,000 and 25.9% were under \$1,500. Those families with four, five or six members had roughly the same percentage in the under \$3,000 group: 7-29%. This would suggest that they were at least as badly off, if not worse, than the two-member families under \$3,000.

The fact that average income for four, five and six-member families is almost the same, \$4,671, \$4,688 and \$4,699 respectively, is a further indication that while there are relatively more families in the above \$3,000 group, they are not much above it and that as the size of the family increases they become worse off in terms of per capita income.

Family Organization

Another important aspect of family life which has a bearing on its income level seems to be family organization. The figures . . . show very clearly that husband and wife families—i.e. a family that is together—has fewer units in the below \$3,000 group than a broken home.

Of the 146,825 families in Nova Scotia, 37.4% were in the poverty group. Families with a husband and a wife living together comprised 33.9% of this category, or 44,563 out of 131,311 families. In the case of broken homes, however, 10,396 out of 15,514 families had incomes below \$3,000 a year. This amounts to over 67%.

Where a broken home exists, the level of living of the family will be even more critical where there is a female household head. There were 12,560 such families in Nova Scotia in 1961 and 71.6% or 8,999, were in the poverty group. For 3,933 broken families with female heads, or 31.3%, the situation was even more serious in that they had under \$1,000 in income.

There were only 2,954 broken families with male heads in Nova Scotia, and they fared only somewhat better than those with female heads. In this group were 1,397 families or 47.3% who fell into the poverty category.

Age and Sex of Family Head

Over 91% of Nova Scotia families have a male head. This is 134,265 families out of 146,825. There are 12,560 families with a female head, or about 9%.

The number of families with a male head which fall under the \$3,000 poverty line is greatest where the head of the family is either under 25 or over 65. There were 45,930 families with male heads under \$3,000, or 32%. However, in families where the male head was under 25, 44.5% were poor. In the case of families with a male head in the 65-69 group, 66% of them were under \$3,000 and for the group over 70 years of age 60% were in this income category. For families with a male head between 55 and 64 years of age, the group which had the fewest units under \$3,000 was the 35-44 age group. There were only 24.3% under the poverty line.

Average income for families with male heads was over \$3,000 for all age groups, but it was lowest for the youngest and two oldest groups—the same ones which had the highest percentage of families under \$3,000. The middle group from 35-65, or those who were in their most productive working years, provided average family incomes at or close to \$5,000.

In the case of families with a female head the situation was much more critical for all age groups than in the case of male heads of families with the exception of the group over 70 years. Seventy-two per cent (approx.) of the 12,560 families with female heads in Nova Scotia, or 8,999, were in the under \$3,000 income group. One interesting characteristic revealed is that the number of families in the poverty group declines as the age of the female head of house increases. Over 92% of families where the female head is under 35 are poor. The figure drops off from 35 years of age to 70 or over and it is lowest in the over 70 group, although it remains very high compared to the average rate for all families in the province. There are 55.4% of families with a female head over 70 which have under \$3,000 income. This would suggest that female heads of families have been somewhat better provided for in the case of older groups, but in the case of the youngest group, being alone with a family would seem to be synonymous with being poor.

The average income for families with female heads is under \$2,900 and is only over \$3,000 for the group over 65 years old. The under 25 group has an average income of \$729 while all families with a female head under 45 have less than \$2,000. This is in sharp contrast to the higher average incomes reported for families with a male head of family.

Education of Male Heads of Families

It is well known that the level of income is positively correlated with the level of education of a worker. Table IX shows the level of family income achieved with respect to the level of education attained by male heads of families. Just about the same number reported elementary education only as reported secondary education, 60,889 and 63,693 respectively. Only 9,683 reported a university education. More than twice as many of the families with an elementary educated male head of family were under \$3,000 in income as compared to the secondary educated group. In the first group 50.3% fell into the poverty group while only 23% were poor in the second group. A university education seems to insure that a family will have over \$3,000 in annual income. Only 7.6% fell under this line.

Average incomes for a family with a university educated family head was \$8,232 compared to \$4,843 and \$3,400 for the secondary and elementary groups respectively.

TABLE IX—MALE HEADS OF FAMILIES BY SCHOOLING AND SIZE OF TOTAL FAMILY, INCOME FOR NOVA SCOTIA, 1961

	Elementary ¹	As % of Total	Secondary	As % of Total	University ²	As % of Total
Above \$3,000	30,353	49.8%	49,050	77.0%	8,932	92.2%
\$2,500- 2,999	6,621	10.9	4,604	7.2	204	2.1
2,000- 2,499	6,865	11.3	3,682	5.8	198	2.0
1,500- 1,999	5,883	9.7	2,550	4.0	149	1.5
1,000- 1,499	6,617	10.9	2,020	3.2	61	.6
UNDER \$1,000	4,550	7.5	1,787	2.8	139	1.4
TOTAL	60,889	100.0	63,693	100.0	9,683	100.0
UNDER \$3,000	30,536	50.2	14,643	23.0	751	7.8
AVERAGE	\$ 3,400		\$ 4,843		\$8,232	

Source: DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue No. 98-504, Table D5.

¹Elementary includes heads of families reporting no schooling.

²University includes heads of families reporting some university education.

Occupation of Male Heads of Families

Table X provides two sets of measures of poverty in relation to income. The first is the occupational distribution of the poor and the second is the number of poor in each occupation. A close examination of the table will show that these two sets of figures are different.

The first set of columns shows the occupational distribution of the male family heads in the current labour force while the second set of columns indicates how the male heads of the 30,382 families with under \$3,000 were distributed between occupations. The three largest groups, which accounted for 54.7% of the poor, were Craftsmen, Production Process and Related Workers, 30.9%; Labourers, 12.7% and Transport and Communications Occupations, 11.1%. The rest of the sectors had under 10% each.

It should be noted, however, that the sectors with the largest percentage of the poor families were not necessarily sectors which had a large percentage of poor compared to the total participation in that sector. Craftsmen, Production Process and Related Workers had 30.9% of the male heads of families with under \$3,000—but only 27.7% of the total number working in that sector were under \$3,000. Compare this to Farm Workers, Loggers and Related Workers, and Fisherman, Trappers and Hunters who only had 2.9%, 3.9% and 9.7% of the total number of male heads of poor families. In each sector, however, 71.9%, 79.9% and 65.7% respectively of the total number of workers in the sector had family incomes under \$3,000. The only other sectors with over 30% under \$3,000 were Labourers, 58.8% and Transport and Communications Occupations, 31.8%.

THE GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY

Tables XI and XII provide some information as to the way poverty is distributed as between counties and cities of 10,000 or more.

In the case of Table XI there are two ways it can be read. One can determine the geographic distribution of the 54,929 families under \$3,000 and one can obtain an indication of what percentage of the families in each county are under \$3,000.

Let us examine first the way poverty is distributed. Cape Breton and Halifax Counties together have 32.9% of the families under \$3,000, or 14.9% and 18.0% respectively. Other marked concentrations are in Cumberland, Kings, Lunenburg, and Pictou Counties which have 7.9%, 5.8%, 7.2% and 7.2% respectively. The rest of the counties account for less than 5% of the province's poor. This distribution does not correspond however, to the counties with the highest number of families below the poverty line. It only tells us where the greatest number of poor are located.

The following list shows the counties with more than 40% of the families in the under \$3,000 income group, ranked by the greatest incidence of poverty:

Digby	66.2%	Lunenburg	53.3%
Guysborough	63.7	Queens	48.1
Shelburne	63.3	Annapolis	46.3
Victoria	58.9	Hants	46.2
Cumberland	57.3	Pictou	45.8
Richmond	57.0	Kings	41.0
Inverness	56.1	Colchester	40.6
Yarmouth	55.1		

Only three counties had less than 40% of its families in the poverty group. They were Antigonish, Cape Breton and Halifax with 39.5%, 30.7% and 20.6% respectively. If one takes out of each of these counties the main urban center, the county would place very badly in relation to the rest of the province, especially in the case of Halifax and Cape Breton.

Some indication of the way in which towns of over 10,000 have weighted the incidence of poverty in counties can be obtained by examining Table XII.

None of the seven cities with 10,000 or more people in Nova Scotia had more than 36% of their families in the under \$3,000 group, this figure being reached by Glace Bay. Sydney, Halifax and Dartmouth were low with 20.0%, 18.8% and 12.2% of their families in this group. The other three, Amherst, New Waterford and Truro had 30% or slightly more of the communities in the poverty group.

Once again another geographic split is suggested, one between rural and urban locations; 52.1% of rural non-farm families are under \$3,000 in annual income while urban families under the poverty line amount to only 27.4% of the total.

SUMMARY

There seem to be three operational definitions of who is poor which emerge from various aspects of programs connected with the "war on poverty." They are: 1) non-farm families with incomes below \$3,000, 2) farm families with incomes below \$2,500, and 3) non-farm male wage earners with incomes below \$2,000.

Each of these definitions is applied in answering the question of how many poor there are in Nova Scotia. It was decided, however, that family incomes below \$3,000 provides the best measure, so it is this definition which is applied in examining some of the characteristics of the poor. A more complete and careful study of poverty in Nova Scotia would have to go into much more detail regarding individual and family characteristics.

It was shown that while the number of family members did not push families below \$3,000 it prevented them from rising much above it. As a result large families tended to be worse off in terms of average income per capita.

Broken homes result in high incidences of poverty, particularly where the

TABLE X—MALE HEADS OF FAMILIES IN THE CURRENT LABOUR FORCE, BY OCCUPATION DIVISION AND SIZE OF FAMILY INCOME, FOR NOVA SCOTIA, 1961

	Total	As % of Total	Under \$3000	As % of Total Under \$3000	Over \$3000	As % of Total Over \$3000	For Occupations	
							% Under \$3000	% Over \$3000
All Occupations	112,569	100.0%	30,382	100.0%	82,187	100.0%	%	%
Managerial	13,380	11.9	1,900	6.5	11,480	14.0	14.9	85.1
Professional and Technical	6,671	5.9	368	1.2	6,303	7.7	5.5	94.5
Clerical	6,080	5.4	868	2.6	5,212	6.3	14.3	85.7
Sales	5,527	4.9	1,166	3.8	4,361	5.3	21.1	78.9
Service and Recreation Occupations	15,259	13.6	2,198	7.2	13,061	15.9	14.4	85.6
Transport and Communications Occupations	10,654	9.5	3,386	11.1	7,268	8.8	31.8	68.2
Farm Workers	1,228	1.1	883	2.9	345	.4	71.9	28.1
Loggers and Related Workers	1,494	1.3	1,194	3.9	300	.4	79.9	20.1
Fishermen, Trappers, and Hunters	4,477	4.0	2,943	9.7	1,534	1.8	65.7	34.3
Miners, Quarrymen and Related Workers	5,816	5.2	1,565	5.6	4,251	5.2	26.9	73.1
Craftsmen, Production Process and Related Workers	33,860	30.1	9,390	30.9	24,470	29.8	27.7	72.3
Labourers	6,567	5.8	3,862	12.7	2,705	3.3	58.8	41.2
Occupation Not Stated	1,194	1.1	404	1.3	790	1.0	33.8	66.2

Source: DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue No. 98-504, Table D8.

TABLE XI—TOTAL INCOME OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE OF INCOME, FOR NOVA SCOTIA COUNTIES, 1961

	Total	Under \$3000	As a % of Total Under \$3000	% Under \$3000 in County	Above \$3000	% Above \$3000	Average
Annapolis	4,221	1,954	3.6%	46.3%	2,267	53.7%	\$3,793
Antigonish	1,793	708	1.3	39.5	1,085	60.5	4,064
Cape Breton	26,561	8,163	14.9	30.7	18,398	69.3	4,364
Colchester	6,677	2,711	4.9	40.6	3,966	59.4	4,017
Cumberland	7,550	4,330	7.9	57.3	3,220	42.7	3,092
Digby	3,980	2,636	4.8	66.2	1,344	33.8	2,852
Guysborough	2,448	1,561	2.8	63.7	887	36.3	2,822
Halifax	47,857	9,892	18.0	20.6	37,965	79.4	5,331
Hants	4,747	2,197	4.0	46.2	2,550	53.8	3,779
Inverness	2,607	1,463	2.7	56.1	1,144	43.9	3,373
Kings	7,762	3,185	5.8	41.0	4,577	59.0	3,962
Lunenburg	7,387	3,944	7.2	53.3	3,443	46.7	3,416
Pictou	8,618	3,954	7.2	45.8	4,664	54.2	3,576
Queens	2,910	1,401	2.6	48.1	1,509	51.9	3,833
Richmond	2,087	1,191	2.2	57.0	896	43.0	3,117
Shelburne	3,409	2,160	3.9	63.3	1,249	36.7	2,999
Victoria	1,397	824	1.5	58.9	573	41.1	3,215
Yarmouth	4,814	2,655	4.8	55.1	2,159	44.9	3,479

Source: DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue No. 98-503, Table C3.

TABLE XII—TOTAL INCOME OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE OF INCOME, FOR INCORPORATED CITIES, TOWNS AND VILLAGES OF 10,000 POPULATION AND OVER, IN NOVA SCOTIA, 1961

	Total	Under \$3000	% Under \$3000	Above \$3000	% Above \$3000	Average
Amherst	2,529	865	34.2%	1,664	65.8%	4,154
Dartmouth	10,615	1,301	12.2	9,314	87.8	5,624
Glace Bay	5,255	1,892	36.0	3,363	64.0	4,021
Halifax	18,924	3,567	18.8	15,357	81.2	5,844
New Waterford	2,102	652	31.0	1,450	69.0	4,177
Sydney	7,121	1,431	20.0	5,690	80.0	5,271
Truro	3,085	938	30.4	2,147	69.6	4,705

Source: DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue No. 98-503, Table C4.

head of the family is a female. Husband and wife families are somewhat less exposed to poverty.

In the case of families with male heads the incidence of poverty was most serious in the youngest (under 25) and oldest age brackets (over 65). Families with female heads were especially poverty prone and have as many as 92% of all the families under \$3,000 where the family head was under 35 years old.

Families with male heads who only had an elementary education were twice as exposed to poverty as those with a family head with a secondary education. Families whose head was university trained fell into the poverty group in less than 10% of the cases.

Most of the poor—54.7%—were Craftsmen, Production Process and Related Workers, Labourers; or Transport and Communications workers. Those sectors which had the greatest incidence of poverty, however, were Farm Workers; Loggers and Related Workers; Fishermen, Trappers and Hunters; and Labourers.

As far as the geographical distribution of poor is concerned, the greatest number occurred in Cape Breton and Halifax Counties. The three poorest counties, however, were Digby, Guysborough and Shelburne.

¹The information used to construct these maps was based on data obtained from the 1961 census.

²Definition provided in the DBS, 1961 *Census of Canada*, Catalogue no. 98-504.

ANDERSON'S COVE

Noel Iverson

D. Ralph Matthews

The move from Anderson's Cove in 1965 is difficult to evaluate. Neither of the authors has ever been to the community, which no longer exists, or is in any way directly familiar with it. The following account rests largely upon interviews with eleven families from Anderson's Cove.

Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland: from *Communities in Decline: An Examination of Household Resettlement in Newfoundland*, Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies No. 6 by Noel Iverson and D. Ralph Matthews, 1968. Reprinted in an abridged form by permission of the Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

