



Catalogue no. 21-601-MIE — No. 073

ISSN: 1707-0368

ISBN: 0-662-40475-0

Research Paper


Effect of Urbanization on the Adoption of Environmental Management Systems in Canadian Agriculture

by Udith Jayasinghe-Mudalige, Alfons Weersink, Brady Deaton, Martin Beaulieu and Mike Trant

Agriculture Division

Jean Talon Building, 12th floor, Ottawa, K1A 0T6

Telephone: 1 800-465-1991



Statistics
Canada

Statistique
Canada

Canada



Statistics Canada
Agriculture Division

Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series

Effect of Urbanization on the Adoption of Environmental Management Systems in Canadian Agriculture

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada

© Minister of Industry, 2005

All rights reserved. The content of this publication may be reproduced, in whole or in part, and by any means, without further permission from Statistics Canada, subject to the following conditions: that it is done solely for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review, newspaper summary, and/or for non-commercial purposes; and that Statistics Canada be fully acknowledged as follows: Source (or "Adapted from", if appropriate): Statistics Canada, name of product, catalogue, volume and issue numbers, reference period and page(s). Otherwise, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, for any purposes, without the prior written permission of Licensing Services, Marketing Division, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0T6.

May 2005

Catalogue no. 21-601-MIE

ISSN 1707-0368

ISBN 0-662-40475-0

Frequency: Occasional

Ottawa

La version française de cette publication est disponible sur demande (n° 21-601-MIF au catalogue).

Note of appreciation

Canada owes the success of its statistical system to a long standing partnership between Statistics Canada, the citizens of Canada, its businesses, governments and other institutions. Accurate and timely statistical information could not be produced without their continued cooperation and goodwill.

I Introduction

The relative proximity of urban populations to farming land may be a root cause behind the factors that contribute to a farmers' decision to adopt environmental-friendly production practices. A number of factors are likely to contribute to farm level adoption of environmental-friendly production practices. For example, farmers may act in response to new municipal regulations, concerns about due diligence, or, from social pressures.

Many of these contributing factors may result from concerns voiced by residents living in close proximity to farmers. Subsequently, farmers operating in an urban milieu may be more likely to adopt environmental-friendly systems than those farmers located in more remote rural areas. These direct and indirect pressures to adjust farmers' management practices may increase the cost structure of farms located in the urban milieu. As a result, regional competitive advantage may be affected and thereby, precipitate spatial changes in agriculture production.

The adoption of an environmental management system (EMS) may be one means by which farmers adapt to operating in a relatively, densely-population region. An EMS documents a firm's activities that affect environmental performance but it does not generally measure actual effect of those practices on environmental quality. An EMS can involve a third party certifying organization, or be developed by trade associations, or be developed by the firm individually (Khanna, 2001). A farm's bottom line could be improved with an EMS through several avenues. Cost savings may result directly from efforts to conserve inputs and reduce waste but could also indirectly accrue to the firm in the process of

thoroughly evaluating its management practices. Costs could be further reduced as an EMS may lower liability risks and subsequently lower premiums charged by insurance companies and interest rates charged by financial institutions. In addition to cost savings, the firm could increase revenues by either obtaining a premium for their product or increasing sales if the EMS represents a credible signal to customers of the firm that it is "environmentally-friendly". Aside from affecting financial performance directly, a farm may be motivated by a moral concern for environmental quality and can use an EMS as a guide to reducing its ecological impact.

While financial reasons may be a driver for some farms, the major reasons that farms in an urban milieu voluntarily adopt an EMS are associated with social and regulatory pressures. The use of an EMS may allow the adopting farm to improve its public image with the community. In addition, an EMS can be used as evidence of due diligence which is often the only acceptable defense in a legal challenge stemming from an environmental accident (Wall and Weersink 2001). Rather than being pulled to enhance its reputation as a socially responsible citizen, firms may be pushed to adopt an EMS as a measure of its commitment to a systematic approach to environmental improvement through public pressure. Such pressures from customers, shareholders, trade associations and community groups have all been found to increase the likelihood of EMS use (Khanna and Damon 1999; Henriques and Sadosky 1996). These pressures for farms are likely to increase with population density.

The public pressures may eventually result in direct environmental regulations and this threat of mandatory regulation has been shown theoretically to increase the level of

voluntary abatement effort (Segerson and Miceli, 1998). The threat of liability was found to be directly related to the adoption of voluntary management programs such as the US 33/50 program (Khanna and Anton 2002; Khanna and Damon 1999). A Canadian agricultural example is the Ontario Environmental Farm Plan which is a voluntary EMS developed by farm organizations in the early 1990s as a proactive response to potentially tough regulation forthcoming from the newly-elected NDP government (Smithers and Furman 2003). Although it may not prevent environmental legislation, the use of an EMS may serve to influence the type and severity of future. Finally, an EMS may not be voluntary. For example, nutrient management plans were required in many Ontario municipalities before a building permit was issued for the construction of new or expanded livestock facilities. Ontario is currently undergoing a transition from local regulation of livestock facilities to a provincial system that supersedes local by-laws and requires the completion of a nutrient management plan.

The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which farming practices have adjusted to the presence of urbanization in Canada. In particular, we compare the adoption rates for environmental management systems (EMSs) by farmers close to urbanized areas versus those in more rural, isolated regions. Using information from the national survey on Farm Environmental Management Practices (FEMS), eight EMSs are considered. We hypothesize that farmers operating close to the urban milieu demonstrate strategic behavior by selecting more environmentally-friendly farm management practices to overcome social and regulatory pressures from such communities compared to those farmers that operate in rural communities

II Overall EMS adoption by farmers

The adoption rates for the eight EMSs were obtained from the Farm Environmental Management Survey (FEMS) conducted in 2001 by Statistics Canada and sponsored in part by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC). Over 21,000 farmers were surveyed and approximately 76 percent responded. Of the 16,053 farmers responding, 2,250 raised only livestock, 5,425 grew only crops, and 8,378 had both livestock and crops. The survey gathered information on the use of a variety of farm management practices including the adoption of eight environmental management systems.

The eight EMSs considered are: (1) whole farm environmental plan; (2) manure management plan; (3) fertilizer management plan; (4) pesticide management plan; (5) water management plan; (6) wildlife conservation plan; (7) grazing management plan, and (8) nutrient management plan. The definition of the eight EMSs and their adoption rate among different farm types are listed in Table 1. The most common EMSs used by all farmers are fertilizer and pesticide management plans. These have been enacted by 27 percent of all crop-only farmers. Approximately the same percentage of mixed farms have a fertilizer management system but there is a drop in the use of a pesticide management plan by those farmers with both crops and livestock compared to those specializing in crop production. The correlation coefficient between these two EMSs is 0.8 which indicates that the same farmers are likely to adopt both plans.

Mixed farms have the highest adoption rates in general across the eight EMSs considered while livestock only farms have the lowest.

For example, over one-quarter of livestock farms that also grow crops have a manure management plan in place compared to 15 percent of livestock-only operations. The same approximate adoption rates across the farm types are evident for a grazing management plan. A whole farm environmental plan is the most comprehensive of the possible EMSs options but it is the least likely to be adopted. For example, all eight EMSs are appropriate for mixed farms and only 15 percent have a whole farm environmental plan (WFEP) in place. The correlation between WFEP and other systems is low with the exception of nutrient management plans for which there are more likely to be over-laps in reporting requirements.

III Urbanization and EMS use

Defining Urbanization

The degree of urbanization is captured by two variables; 1) the distance of the farm operation to an urban centre, and 2) population density. Distance is measured “as the crow flies” from the geographical center of each dissemination area¹ (DA) to the geographical center of the nearest CMA² or CA³. Thus, a different distance value can be assigned to each farm observation according to the DA in which the farm is located. Population density is measured as the number of people per square km of a DA in which the farming operation is located.

1. The DA is a small area with a population of 400 to 700 persons. It is the smallest standard geographic area for which census data are reported. All of Canada is divided into dissemination areas.

2. The CMA is a geographic area with an urban core population of 100,000 and over. It includes all neighbouring municipalities where 50 percent or more of the workforce commutes to the urban core.

3. The CA has an urban core population of 10,000 to 99,999. It includes all neighbouring municipalities where 50 percent or more of the workforce commutes to the urban core.

Adoption Rates and the Effect of Urbanization

The mean values for the two urbanization variables were calculated for each of the eight EMSs stratified by farmers who adopt EMS (adopters) and for those who do not adopt EMS (non-adopters). The results are illustrated in Figure 1 with distance as the urbanization measure and Figure 2 with population density. The graphs are presented only for mixed farms but the results are similar for exclusively crop and livestock farms. As expected, the distance to an urban centre is smaller for adopters of an EMS than for non-adopters (Figure 1). The mean values of these entire EMS are statistically significant at $p=0.01$. Average distance for adopters is smallest for whole farm and nutrient management plans and greatest for wildlife conservation and grazing management plans. The two former plans represent the most comprehensive coverage of agri-environmental practices and thus are more likely to be used in the most intensive urban areas as measured by the relatively short distance to a CMD. In contrast, farms concerned with grazing and wildlife habitat are likely to be operating large areas and thus are likely to be further from a CMD.

The effect of population density on adoption rate of EMSs is similar to that found using the distance measure for urbanization (Figure 2). Adopters of EMSs are more likely to be located in regions with a higher population density than non-adopters. The mean values of all EMSs, except the wildlife conservation plan (WCP) and nutrient management plan (NMP), are significant at $p = 0.01$, where the WCP and NMP are significant at $p = 0.05$ and $p = 0.10$ respectively. For example, the average population density of the region for farms adopting a manure management system was

approximately 22 people per km² as opposed to around 14 people per km² for farms not adopting. The result is consistent with the hypothesis that farmers operating in the urban milieu are more likely to use an EMS as a means to deal with direct social pressure or indirect regulatory pressures from non-farm neighbours.

Number of EMPs Adopted and Urbanization

A significant number of farmers may adopt more than one EMS. For example, 37.2 percent of mixed farms had more than one EMS in place. The mean values for urbanization were calculated for the all farms on the basis of the number of EMSs adopted. The results are plotted in Figure 3 for the distance measure and in Figure 4 for the population density measure. The number of EMSs adopted increases with the degree of urbanization. For example, the average distance to a CMA for non-adopters of an EMS by mixed farms is approximately 60 km but it drops to 40 km for those farms adopting seven plans (see Figure 3). Similarly, the average population density for mixed farms adopting only 1 EMS is approximately 15 persons per km² and increases to over 55 persons per km² on average for those adopting seven plans (see Figure 4). Note that mixed farms on average tend to operate in less urbanized environments than specialized crop or livestock farms.

IV Conclusions and policy implications

A portion of Canada's farmland is in close proximity to rapidly expanding urban areas. This presents a policy dilemma so far as farmers' preferences for land use are likely to conflict with the preferences and concerns of nearby urban residents. This conflict is

likely to be intensified by increases in proximity between farmers and non-farm residents and, therefore, we hypothesized that the degree of urbanization was likely to affect farm management decisions. Our empirical observations support our hypothesis – adopters of environmental management systems were, on average, located closer to urban areas than non-adopters.

While the aforementioned results provide insight into what is going on, additional research is needed to refine our understanding of the urbanization effect. First, future studies need to examine the urbanization effect while simultaneously accounting for other variables (e.g., farm size) that may influence the decision of farmers to adopt environmental management systems. Such analysis will enable us to better isolate the influence of urbanization on farm management decisions. Second, future studies need to empirically assess *how* urbanization influences farm level decisions. For example, do urban concerns manifest themselves in stricter regulations at the municipal level? Does the presence of increasing numbers of residential neighbors increase the likelihood of legal conflict and thereby, heighten farmers' desire to pursue activities that enable them to appeal to due diligence? Are farmers voluntarily responding to concerns voiced by urban neighbours? The answer to these questions will illuminate important issues such as the appropriate role of governance in arbitrating conflicts that may emerge between municipalities and/or farmers and urban residents.

Expanding urban and ex-urban populations suggest that farm level practices will continue to be scrutinized by their urban counterparts. Policy makers will face the difficult challenge of advising government on how best to respond to the changing

needs of farmers and urban residents. Recognizing, as this study does, that the degree of urbanization may already be

precipitating changes in farm management practices provides an initial starting place for future inquiry.

References

- Ainger, D., Hopkins, J., Johansson, R. (2003) Beyond compliance: sustainable business practices and the bottom line. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 55, (5), 1126-1139.
- Anton, W.R.Q., Deltas, G., Khanna, M. (2004) Incentives for environmental self-regulation and implications for environmental performance. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 48 (1) 632-654.
- Beaulieu, M. 2001. Intensive Livestock Farming: Does Farm Size Matter?. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Agriculture and Rural Working Paper No. 48. Catalogue No. 21 – 601 – MIE.
- Beaulieu, M., F. Bedard, and P. Lanciault. 2001. Distribution and Concentration of Canadian Livestock. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Agriculture and Rural Working Paper No. 47. Catalogue No. 21 – 601 – MIE.
- Emilsson, S., Hjelm, O. (2002) Implementation of standardized environmental management systems in Swedish local authorities: reasons, expectations and some outcomes. *Environmental Science and Policy* 5 (6), 443-448.
- Esty, D.C., Chertow, M.R. (1997) Thinking ecologically: an introduction. In M.R. Chertow and D.C. Esty (eds) *Thinking Ecologically: the Next Generation of Environmental Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Henriques, I., Sadorsky, P. (1996) The determinants of an environmentally responsive firm: an empirical approach. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 30 (3) 381-395.
- Jackson, S.L. (1997) *The ISO 14001 Implementation Guide: Creating an Integrated Management System*. New York, Wiley.
- Khanna, M. (2001) Non-mandatory approaches to environmental protection. *Journal of Economic Surveys*. 15 (3), 291-324.
- Khanna, M., Anton, W.R. (2002) Corporate environmental management: regulatory and market-based incentives. *Land Economics* 78 (4), 539-558.
- Khanna, M., Damon, L. (1999) EPA's voluntary 33/55 program: impact on toxic releases and economic performance of firms. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 37 (1), 1-25
- King, A.A., Lenox, M.J. (2000) Industry self-regulation without sanctions: the chemical industry's responsible care

- program. *Academy of Management Journal* 43 (4), 698-716.
- Melnyk, S.A., Sroufe, R.P., Calantone, R. (2003) Assessing the impacts of environmental management systems on corporate and environmental performance. *Journal of Operations Management* 21 (3), 329-351.
- Morrow, D., Rondinelli, D. (2002) Adopting corporate environmental management systems: motivations and results of ISO 14001 and EMAS certification. *European Management Journal* 20 (2), 159-171.
- Segerson, K., Miceli, T.J. (1998) Voluntary environmental agreements: good or bad news for environmental protection? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 36 (2), 109-130.
- Smithers, J., Furman, M. (2003) Environmental farm planning in Ontario: exploring participation and the endurance of change. *Land Use Policy* 20 (4), 343-356.
- Videras, J., Alberini, A. (2000) The appeal of voluntary environmental programs: which firms participate and why? *Contemporary Economic Policy* 18 (4), 449-460.
- Wall, E., Weersink, A., Swanton, C.J. (2001) Agriculture and ISO 14000 *Food Policy* 26 (1), 35-48.

Table 1 –Definition and adoption rate of environmental management systems (EMSs) by farm type:

Environmental Management System (EMS)		Number (%) Adopting EMS by Farm Type		
Type (Notation)*	Definition	Livestock n = 2001	Crop n = 5425	Mixed n = 8378
Whole Farm Environmental Plan (WPEP)	An overall assessment of environmental issues or concerns related to the farm	<u>150 (7.5)</u>	<u>564 (10.4)</u>	<u>1304 (15.6)</u>
<u>Manure Management Plan (MMP)</u>	Manure storage systems used, specific treatments used (e.g. additives, separation, drying), and odour control systems	<u>309 (15.4)</u>	<u>255 (4.7)</u>	<u>2187 (26.1)</u>
<u>Nutrient Management Plan (NMP)</u>	Methods of testing nutrient content of manure; soil testing procedures, consideration of nutrient carry-overs, timing of applications etc.	<u>7 (0.3)</u>	<u>804 (14.8)</u>	<u>1263 (15.1)</u>
<u>Fertilizer Management Plan (FMP)</u>	Measures used to apply fertilizer; mix of legume and chemical fertilizer to be used in each season, and their frequencies etc.	<u>66 (3.3)</u>	<u>1493 (27.5)</u>	<u>2163 (25.8)</u>
<u>Pesticide Management Plan (PMP)</u>	Application strategies; sprayer calibration frequencies and techniques, and alternative methods other than chemical pesticides etc.	<u>55 (2.7)</u>	<u>1478 (27.2)</u>	<u>1762 (21.0)</u>
<u>Water Management Plan (WMP)</u>	Sources and volume of water to be used, irrigation methods, domestic water testing etc.	<u>261 (13.0)</u>	<u>988 (18.2)</u>	<u>1838 (21.9)</u>
<u>Wildlife Conservation Plan (WCP)</u>	<u>Measures taken to conserve natural land and wildlife habitats adjacent to farm</u>	<u>215 (10.7)</u>	<u>653 (12.0)</u>	<u>1365 (16.3)</u>
<u>Grazing Management Plan (GMP)</u>	Measures taken to conserve wetland areas, rotational grazing, and practices such as re-seeding	<u>320 (16.0)</u>	<u>155 (2.9)</u>	<u>2081 (24.8)</u>

*A formal, written plan prepared by a trained person or specialist to cover certain operational aspects of the farm

Figure 1 - Average distance to urban center for adopters and non-adopters of environmental management systems (EMSs) by mixed farms




Figure 2 - Average population density of location for adopters and non-adopters of environmental management systems (EMSs) by mixed farms




Figure 3 - Average distance to an urban center by the number of environmental management systems adopted for crop, livestock and mixed farms





Figure 4 - Average population density by the number of environmental management systems adopted for crop, livestock and mixed farms



Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series

(* The *Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series* is now available on Statistics Canada's Web Site (www.statcan.ca). From the *Our products and services* page, under *Browse our Internet publications (PDF or HTML)*, choose *Free*.)

- No.1 (21-601-MPE1980001) **A Description of Theil's RMPSE Method in Agricultural Statistical Forecasts (1980)**, Stuart Pursey
- No.3 (21-601-MPE1981003) **A Review of the Livestock Estimating Project with Recommendations for the Future (1981)**, Bernard Rosien and Elizabeth Leckie
- No.4 (21-601-MPE1984004) **An Overview of the Canadian Oilseed Industry (1984)**, Glenn Lennox
- No.5 (21-601-MPE1984005) **Preliminary Analysis of the Contribution of Direct Government Payments to Realized Net Farm Income (1984)**, Lambert Gauthier
- No.6 (21-601-MPE1984006) **Characteristics of Farm Entrants and their Enterprises in Southern Ontario for the Years 1966 to 1976 (1984)**, Jean B. Down
- No.7 (21-601-MPE1984007) **A Summary of Commodity Programs in the United States (1984)**, Allister Hickson
- No.8 (21-601-MPE1984008) **Prairie Summerfallow Intensity: An Analysis of 1981 Census Data (1984)**, Les Macartney
- No.9 (21-601-MPE1985009) **The Changing Profile of the Canadian Pig Sector (1985)**, Mike Shumsky
- No.10 (21-601-MPE1986010) **Revisions to the Treatment of Imputed House Rents in the Canadian Farm Accounts, 1926-1979 (1986)**, Mike Trant
- No.11 (21-601-MPE1992011) **The Ratio Estimator: an Intuitive Explanation and Its Use in Estimating Agriculture Variables (1992)**, François maranda and Stuart Pursey
- No.12 (21-601-MPE1991012) **The Impact of Geographic Distortion Due to the Headquarters Rule (1991)**, Rick Burroughs
- No.13 (21-601-MPE1991013) **The Quality of Agriculture Data - Strengths and Weaknesses (1991)**, Stuart Pursey
- No.14 (21-601-MPE1992014) **Alternative Frameworks for Rural Data (1992)**, A.M. Fuller, Derek Cook and Dr. John Fitzsimons
- No.15 (21-601-MPE1993015) **Trends and Characteristics of Rural and Small Town Canada (1993)**, Brian Bigs, Ray Bollman and Michael McNames
- No.16 (21-601-MPE1992016) **The Microdynamics and Farm Family Economics of Structural Change in Agriculture (1992)**, Phil Ehrensaft and Ray Bollman
- No.17 (21-601-MPE1993017) **Grains and Oilseeds Consumption by Livestock and Poultry, Canada and Provinces 1992**, Livestock and Animal Products Section
- No.18 (21-601-MPE1994018) **Trends and Patterns of Agricultural Structural Change: Canada / US Comparison**, Ray Bollman, Leslie A. Whitener and Fu Lai Tung
- No.19 (21-601-MPE1994019) **Farm Family Total Income by Farm Type, Region and Size for 1990 (1994)**, Saiyed Rizvi, David Culver, Lina Di Piétro and Kim O'Connor
- No.20 (21-601-MPE1991020) **Adjustment in Canadian Agriculture (1994)**, George McLaughlin
- No.21 (21-601-MPE1993021) **Microdynamics of Farm Size Growth and Decline: A Canada-United States Comparison**, Fred Gale and Stuart Pursey
- No.22 (21-601-MPE1992022) **The Structures of Agricultural Household Earnings in North America: Positioning for Trade Liberalization**, Leonard Apedaile, Charles Barnard, Ray Bollman and Blaine Calkins
- No.23 (21-601-MPE1992023) **Potatoes: A Comparison of Canada/USA Structure**, Glenn Zepp, Charles Plummer and Barbara McLaughlin
- No.24 (21-601-MPE1994024) **Farm Structure Data: A US-Canadian Comparative Review**, Victor J. Oliveira, Leslie A. Whitener and Ray Bollman
- No.25 (21-601-MPE1994025) **Grain Marketing Statistics Statistical Methods Working Paper Version 2**, Karen Gray

Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series (continued)

(* The *Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series* is now available on Statistics Canada's Web Site (www.statcan.ca). From the *Our products and services* page, under *Browse our Internet publications (PDF or HTML)*, choose *Free*.)

- No.26 (21-601-MPE1994026) **Farm Business Performance: Estimates from the Whole Farm Database**, W. Steven Danford
- No.27 (21-601-MPE1994027) **An Attempt to Measure Rural Tourism Employment**, Brian Biggs
- No.28* (21-601-MIE1995028) **Delineation of the Canadian Agricultural Ecumene for 1991**, Timothy J. Werschler
- No.29 (21-601-MPE1995029) **Mapping the Diversity of Rural Economies: A preliminary Typology of Rural Canada**, Liz Hawkins
- No.30* (21-601-MIE1996030) **Structure and Trends of Rural Employment: Canada in the Context of OECD Countries**, Ron Cunningham and Ray D. Bollman
- No.31* (21-601-MIE1996031) **A New Approach to Non-CMA/CA Areas**, Linda Howatson-Leo and Louise Earl
- No.32 (21-601-MPE1996032) **Employment in Agriculture and Closely Related Industries in Rural Areas: Structure and Change 1981-1991**, Sylvain Cloutier
- No.33* (21-601-MIE1998033) **Hobby Farming - For Pleasure or Profit?**, Stephen Boyd
- No.34* (21-601-MIE1998034) **Utilization of Document Imaging Technology by the 1996 Canadian Census of Agriculture**, Mel Jones and Ivan Green
- No.35* (21-601-MIE1998035) **Employment Patterns in the Non-Metro Workforce**, Robert Mendelson
- No.36* (21-601-MIE1998036) **Rural and Small Town Population is Growing in the 1990s**, Robert Mendelson and Ray D. Bollman
- No.37* (21-601-MIE1998037) **The Composition of Business Establishments in Smaller and Larger Communities in Canada**, Robert Mendelson
- No.38* (21-601-MIE1998038) **Off-farm Work by Census-farm Operators: An Overview of Structure and Mobility Patterns**, Michael Swidinsky, Wayne Howard and Alfons Weersink
- No.39* (21-601-MIE1999039) **Human Capital and Rural Development: What Are the Linkages?**, Ray D. Bollman
- No.40* (21-601-MIE1999040) **Computer Use and Internet Use by Members of Rural Households**, Margaret Thompson-James
- No.41* (21-601-MIE1999041) **RRSP Contributions by Canadian Farm Producers in 1994**, Marco Morin
- No.42* (21-601-MIE1999042) **Integration of Administrative Data with Survey and Census Data**, Michael Trant and Patricia Whitridge
- No.43* (21-601-MIE2001043) **The Dynamics of Income and Employment in Rural Canada: The Risk of Poverty and Exclusion**, Esperanza Vera-Toscano, Euan Phimister and Alfons Weersink
- No.44* (21-601-MIE2001044) **Rural Youth Migration Between 1971 and 1996**, Juno Tremblay
- No.45* (21-601-MIE2001045) **Measuring Economic Well-Being of Rural Canadians Using Income Indicators**, Carlo Rupnik, Margaret Thompson-James and Ray D. Bollman
- No.46* (21-601-MIE2001046) **The Geographical Patterns of Socio-Economic Well-Being of First Nations Communities in Canada**, Robin P. Armstrong
- No.47* (21-601-MIE2001047) **Distribution and Concentration of Canadian Livestock**, Martin S. Beaulieu
- No.48* (21-601-MIE2001048) **Intensive Livestock Farming: Does Farm Size Matter?**, Martin S. Beaulieu
- No.49* (21-601-MIE2001049) **Agriculture Statistics for Rural Development**, Ray D. Bollman
- No.50* (21-601-MIE2001050) **Rural and Small Town Employment: Structure by Industry**, Roland Beshiri and Ray D. Bollman

Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series (end)

(* The *Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series* is now available on Statistics Canada's Web Site (www.statcan.ca). From the *Our products and services* page, under *Browse our Internet publications (PDF or HTML)*, choose *Free*.)

- No.51* (21-601-MIE2001051) **Working Time: How do Farmers Juggle with it and How has it Impacted Their Family Total Income**, Sylvain Cloutier
- No.52* (21-601-MIE2001052) **Growers of Genetically Modified Grain Corn and Soybeans in Quebec and Ontario: A Profile**, Bernard Hategekimana
- No.53* (21-601-MIE2002053) **Integration of Canadian and U.S. Cattle Markets**, Rita Athwal
- No.54* (21-601-MIE2002054) **Genetically Modified Grain Corn and Soybeans in Quebec and Ontario in 2000 and 2001**, Bernard Hategekimana
- No.55* (21-601-MIE2002055) **Recent Migration Patterns in Rural and Small Town Canada**, Neil Rothwell et al
- No.56* (21-601-MIE2002056) **Performance in the Food Retailing Segment of the Agri-Food Chain**, David Smith and Michael Trant
- No.57* (21-601-MIE2002057) **Financial Characteristics of Acquired Firms in the Canadian Food Industry**, Martin S. Beaulieu
- No.58* (21-601-MIE2002058) **Provincial Trade Patterns**, Marjorie Page
- No.59* (21-601-MIE2002059) **An Analysis of Profits within the Canadian Food Processing Sector**, Rick Burroughs and Deborah Harper
- No.60* (21-601-MIE2002060) **Rural Diversification**, Marjorie L. Page
- No.61* (21-601-MIE2002061) **Definitions of « Rural »**, Valerie du Plessie et al
- No.62* (21-601-MIE2003062) **A Geographic Profile of Canadian Livestock**, Martin S. Beaulieu et Frédéric Bédard
- No.63* (21-601-MIE2003063) **Sub-provincial Income Disparity in Canada: Evidence from 1992 to 1999**, Alessandro Alasia
- No.64* (21-601-MIE2003064) **Canada – Mexico Agricultural Economies and Trade Under Closer North American Relations**, Verna Mitura et al
- No.65* (21-601-MIE2003065) **Computer Technology Adoption by Canadian Farm Businesses: An Analysis Based on the 2001 Census of Agriculture**, Jean Bosco Sabuhoro and Patti Wunsch
- No.66* (21-601-MIE2004066) **Factors Associated with Household Internet Use in Canada**, Vik Singh
- No.67* (21-601-MIE2004067) **Mapping the Socio-Economic Diversity of Rural Canada: A Multivariate Analysis**, Alessandro Alasia
- No.68* (21-601-MIE2004068) **The Effect of FDI on Agriculture and Food Trade: An Empirical Analysis**, W.H. Furtan and J.J. Holzman
- No.69* (21-601-MIE2004069) **Canada's Beef Cattle Sector and the Impact of BSE on Farm Family Income**, Verna Mitura and Lina Di Piéto
- No.70* (21-601-MIE2004070) **Measuring Industry Concentration in Canada's Food Processing Sectors**, Darryl Harrison and James Rude
- No.71* (21-601-MIE2004071) **Trends in Non-farm Self-employment Activity for Rural Women**, Valerie du Plessis
- No.72* (21-601-MIE2004072) **The Redesign of the Canadian Farm Product Price Index**, Andy Baldwin