Catalogue no. 21-601-MIE — No. 054

Research Paper

# Genetically Modified Grain Corn and Soybeans in Quebec and Ontario in 2000 and 2001




by Bernard Hategekimana

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

Telephone: 1 800-465-1991

*This paper represents the views of the author and does not necessarily reflect the opinions of Statistics Canada.*

Statistics Canada Statistique Canada

Canada

**Statistics Canada**
Agriculture Division

**Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series**
**Working Paper No. 54**

# Genetically Modified Grain Corn and Soybeans in Quebec and Ontario in 2000 and 2001

**Prepared by**
Bernard Hategekimana
Crops Section, Agriculture Division, Statistics Canada

**Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division**
**Jean Talon Building, 12th floor**
**Tunney's Pasture**
**Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0T6**

**September 2002**

**The responsibility of the analysis and interpretation of the results is that of the author and not of Statistics Canada.**

**Statistics**
**Canada**
Agriculture Division

Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series
Working Paper No. 54

# Genetically Modified Grain Corn and Soybeans in Quebec and Ontario in 2000 and 2001

Published by authority of the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada.



September 2002

Catalogue No. 21-601-MIE2002054

Frequency: Occasional

Ottawa

La version française est disponible sur demande (n° 21-601-MIF2002054 au catalogue)

***Note of appreciation***: Canada owes the success of its statistical system to a longstanding partnership between Statistics Canada and the citizens, businesses and governments of Canada. Accurate and timely statistical information could not be produced without their continued co-operation and good will.

## Table of Contents

# Genetically Modified Grain Corn and Soybeans in Quebec and Ontario in 2000 and 2001

## Highlights

- Total area of both genetically modified (GM) grain corn and soybean crops rose significantly in Quebec and Ontario in 2001 compared with 2000.
- The increase in GM soybean area was higher than that of GM grain corn.
- The abandon rate of GM was higher for grain corn than for soybean.
- Most of the increased GM area was in Quebec.
- The proportion of large farms reporting GM grain corn or soybeans increased more than any other farm size category.
- Yields for GM soybeans and grain corn were better than yields for non-GM crops in both cases.

## Abstract

This report focuses on the changes in the area of genetically modified (GM) grain corn and soybeans, comparing the year 2001 with 2000. In the 2001 growing season, total GM area increased significantly for both GM grain corn and soybean crops in Quebec and Ontario. The number of large farms seeding GM crops rose considerably, while the number of small- and medium-sized farms growing GM crops was quite unchanged.

The increase in GM soybean area was higher than that of GM grain corn. Farms growing both corn and soybeans made the biggest contribution to the increase. The increase appears to be a consequence of both higher average area of GM crops grown per farm by farmers who grew GM crops in 2000 and, to a lesser extent, the adoption of GM technology by new farmers.

Most of the increased GM area was in Quebec, where the area seeded to GM grain corn rose 30.3% and to soybeans, 63.0%. In Ontario, the increase was 11.3% for grain corn and 25.4% for soybeans. In both provinces, the greater GM area for soybeans was more than double the increase in GM area for grain corn.

In Quebec and in Ontario, the proportion of GM grain corn and soybean area to total grain corn and soybean area has increased significantly. In Quebec, GM area accounted for 31% of grain corn area and 27% of soybean area in 2001 compared to 27% and 17% respectively in 2000. In Ontario, the proportions were 29% for grain corn and 23% for soybean in 2001 compared to 27% and 17% respectively in 2000.

In 2001, the proportion of large farms (total operated area greater than 980 acres) reporting GM grain corn or soybeans increased more than any other farm size category. This was especially apparent in Quebec. However, the small farm category, which accounted for the largest proportion of GM area in 2000, saw its share drop significantly in 2001.

Statistics Canada's November Farm Survey data shows that yields for GM soybeans and grain corn have been better than yields for non-GM crops, and that growing GM grain corn and soybeans appears to have improved the average yield for both crops.

## Introduction

This paper provides information on the production of GM grain corn and soybeans in Canada. The biotechnology industry has fostered the creation of genetically modifed varieties of grain corn and soybeans in an attempt to develop crops that are able to resist damage by specific pests, fungus or particular herbicides. The purpose of the paper is to describe the adoption of these new crops and provide a basis for further work to analyse economic implications for agriculture.

Around the world, the genetically modified seed (GMS) area increased 11.0% in 2000, from 98.5 million to 109 million acres, with almost all that area found in developed countries in the Northern Hemisphere. But what exactly do we mean by GMS in the case of grain corn and soybeans? With respect to the grain corn and soybeans grown in Canada, the gene pool of seed

from a given variety of grain corn or soybeans has been modified through genetic engineering by the incorporation of a foreign gene from another species or variety, in order to transfer certain qualities or characteristics[1] (Saxena et al, 1999).

Scientists and companies who sell GMS and related chemicals believe that using GM plants, especially those that are resistant to herbicides and insects, is the best means of controlling pests, reducing the use of chemical pesticides and associated costs, and increasing crop yields. Many growers appear to share this opinion, especially as GM plants allow them greater flexibility in agricultural practices. There are, however, fears that useful insects may be affected and eliminated together with the pests in question, and that some of the characteristics may be accidently transferred to weeds that will become more difficult to control.

Cross-pollination from GM crops to non-GM varieties is also a risk, especially where producers are trying to grow non-GM crops to meet the demands of a specific domestic or export market. This is also of particular concern to organic growers attempting to grow non-GM crops. The degree to which cross-pollination may have resulted in the contamination of non-GM crop varieties is unknown, and segregation is technically difficult and costly on the farm, as well as in storage and transit. According to a recent U.S. survey, most growers are not planning on implementing segregation, given the high cost of this operation (*Agriweek,* 2001).

Farmers report that the main reason they grow GM crops is to facilitate farm work. This is an interesting observation; preliminary work suggests that GM crops do not guarantee better yields and that farmers may not capture much in the way of economic benefits from GM crops (Benbrook, 2001)[2]. The requirements imposed by certain importing countries, stipulating that grain must be segregated in the field and during storage and handling, may very well prove difficult for Canadian growers and is a further complication to the future role of GM crops in Canadian agriculture. This study attempts to record farmers' use and acceptance of GM grain corn and soybeans in Quebec and Ontario, as they evaluate the operational efficiency of their operation against the response of the marketplace.

[1] In the case of Bt-corn, the cry1Ab gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, which is responsible for producing the precursor of a toxin that kills the European corn borer, has been introduced. When the larvae of this small butterfly eat grain corn that has acquired the gene, the precursor is transformed into a toxin, and they die. The difference between other varieties of Bt-corn and StarLink Bt-corn lies in the fact that the latter contains the Cry9C gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subspecies *tolworthi*, which binds to different receptors than the Cry1Ab and CryAc genes. It produces high concentrations of the toxin (10 to 400 times the quantity produced by other varieties of Bt-corn) in all parts of the plant, whereas the toxins produced by other varieties are located mainly in the leaves and pollen. The toxin produced by the StarLink variety of Bt-corn also acts on other insects, while those of other varieties do not. The variety of Bt-corn most commonly grown in Canada is Bt_176, which contains the Cry1Ab gene. The proteo-chemical properties of the Cry9C gene are similar to those responsible for food allergies (allergens) (Rautenberg, Oliver, 2000), and consist primarily of stability in the face of high temperatures (90°C) and resistence to breakdown by gastric juices (Mendelsohn, 2001). The gene in corn and soybean Roundup Ready protects these crops from Roundup (glyphosate), a nonselective herbicide generally used for weed control.

[2] The report found that on average, yield increases due to Bt corn have not increased farm income enough to cover the higher costs of Bt seed. Between 1996-2001, American farmers paid at least $659 million in price premiums to plant Bt corn, while boosting their harvest by only 276 million bushels - worth some $567 million in economic gain. The bottom line for farmers is a net loss of $92 million—about $1.31 per acre.

## Methodology

The main goal of this study is to conduct a detailed data analysis in order to establish a profile of growers who sow all or part of their soybean or grain corn fields with genetically modified seed (GMS). At the same time, we planned to evaluate the actual impact of GMS use on crop yields and examine development in seeded area, as well as the process involved in the adoption of GMS as a farm input. The estimates in this paper are based on Statistics Canada farm survey data. Some differences can be found between the estimates used in this paper and the official published statistics, as the official statistics are based upon all available information—the survey estimates are one of those sources.

Our working hypothesis is that growers experiment with and adopt new technologies to meet specific needs and improve performance. To verify the hypothesis, in our previous research we examined the characteristics of farm operations likely to adopt the use of GMS, as well as other traits that these establishments might have in common. We applied logistical models to the data using the Wesvar Complex Samples 3.0 software program. Yield data have been taken from Statistics Canada's November 2000 and 2001 Farm Surveys. For each growing season, data were analyzed using the SUUDAN 7.5 "DESCRIPT" procedure.

In order to assess the differences which can exist among GM farm adopters, we created three size categories of farms. These were determined based on total operated area (TOA) from the June 2000 Farm Survey and 1996 Census of Agriculture data. The small size category's high limit was determined by calculating:

1) the mean of TOA from the June 2000 Farm Survey plus half of the standard error of Ontario and Quebec;
2)and the mean of TOA from the 1996 Census of Agriculture data for the same farms plus half the standard error.

The small size category's high limit (490 acres) has been set at the rounded mean of the results obtained in steps 1) and 2). Consultation with experts in agricultural business management has confirmed that 490 acres is the economic optimum size for many of the commodities in Ontario and Quebec. The high limit of the medium-sized farm category has been set at the double of the high limit of the small farm category. The third category is composed of all farms whose size is greater than the high limit of the medium ones.

In the present work, we evaluate the changes in seeded area and yields of GM crops between 2000 and 2001. The analysis of the 2001 data was complicated compared with that of the 2000 data, as some sample design changes were made in the 2001 farm surveys. The sample design differences introduced some unexpected challenges for the data analysis, particularly the inter year comparisons, as the 2000 and 2001 samples were not independent. To test the difference between the June 2001 and June 2000 estimates, we have had to use different formulas[3] for measuring the variance of the difference between totals and between ratios (Appendix 1).

[3] Formulae adapted by Milorad Kovacevic and Owen Phillips from Methods presented in Roberts et al, 2001, in order to suit a rotating panel design.

Longitudinal weights have been used to compare the status of GM growers during the 2000 and 2001 growing seasons. This allows the pooling of the regression results on the difference between 2000 and 2001 GM area and the difference between 2001 and 2000 non-GM area for farms having both GM grain corn and /or GM soybeans in both growing seasons.

Imputed data has been used in area calculations to adjust for non-response. Average values have been used to impute survey values for missing data to approximate the crop area of farmers who had GM crops but did not report GM area. The impact of this imputation was between 4.0% and 5.5% in 2001 and between 6.0% and 9.6% in the year 2000.

Comparisons of yields were measured in terms of the difference in yields between the two growing seasons and between GM and non-GM crops. The SUUDAN 7.5 "Ratio" procedure and Jackknife[4] variance estimation methods were used to compute yields, means and yield differences for each growing season. To compare GM and non-GM yields, the yield was computed based on the production and the harvested area of GM and non-GM crops. In order to ascertain the impact of GM on global farm yield, farms were divided in three groups. The first group was made up of farms with only GM grain corn or GM soybeans (GM group). The second group consisted of farms with only non-GM grain corn or non-GM soybeans (non-GM group). The third and final group represented farms with both GM and non-GM grain corn areas or GM and non-GM soybean areas. In order to ensure accuracy and confidentiality, analysis at the regional level was restricted to the principal growing regions for both corn and soybean in the two provinces.

[4] The Jackknife is a resampling technique for obtaining design consistent estimates of variance. For more information on the Jackknife, see: Babubhai V.Shah et al, (1997).

## The Adoption Phenomena Are Dynamic

### 1. Farms with both grain corn and soybeans

### 1.1 Farming in 2001 and 2000

Individual farmer decisions on whether to grow GM grain corn and soybeans and how much to plant differed substantially from 2000 to 2001. In 2001, some farmers increased their GM area while others decreased their GM area or decided not to seed any farmland to GM crops. Of the farmers contacted in both years that had grown both grain corn and soybeans, 34.0% in Ontario and 38.8% in Quebec reported an increase in their area of GM grain corn. Of the same group of farmers, 22.8% in Ontario and 29.2% in Quebec reported larger areas of GM soybeans (Table 1, Figure 1).

Of the farmers who did not seed GM crops in 2000 but did seed them in 2001, the largest proportion seeded GM soybeans (50.1% in Ontario and 44.8% in Quebec) and a much smaller proportion seeded GM grain corn (32.8% in Ontario and 19.4% in Quebec). Many farmers decreased their area of GM grain corn; a much larger decline than that for GM soybean area (Figure 1).

Some farmers who seeded GM crops in 2000 did not seed GM crops in 2001. In Ontario, the 29.8% of farmers who did not seed genetically modified crops in 2001 were previously GM grain corn growers; and 24.1% were previously GM soybean growers. In Quebec, the percentage of GM farmers in 2000 who did not seed GM crops in 2001 was very similar for both grain corn (24.4%) and soybeans (24.3%).

### 1.2 Farmers contacted only in 2001

Among the new farmers in the sample who grew both grain corn and soybean, a relatively large percentage seeded with GM grain corn—33.2% in Ontario and 40.6% in Quebec. For soybeans, these percentages were 29.2% in Ontario and 24.2% in Quebec (Figure 1).

**Figure 1**
**Decisions to Grow GM Crops in 2001 by Farmers Planting both Grain Corn and Soybean**




***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, June Farm Surveys, 2000 and 2001.

## 2. Farms with grain corn or soybeans

### 2.1 Farming in 2001 and in 2000

In Ontario, 24.5% of GM growers increased their GM soybean area and 18.4% enlarged their GM grain corn area. In Quebec, the comparison is reversed; 26.9% of GM growers increased their GM grain corn area, but only 13.5% seeded a larger area to GM soybeans (Table 1, Figure 2).

Among Quebec farmers who did not grow GM crops in 2000 but planted GM in 2001, 52.7% chose soybeans and 39.4% grain corn. In Ontario, the percentage of farmers who seeded their first GM crop in 2001 was nearly equally divided: 46.9% grain corn and 47.8% soybeans.

Of Quebec farmers who devoted less farmland to GM crops, 33.8% decreased their GM soybean area but 21.1% decreased their GM grain corn area. Of Ontario farmers who planted less area with GM crops, 18.6% reduced their GM grain corn area compared with 13.5% who decreased their soybean area. In Quebec, 30.1% of farmers who reported growing GM grain corn in 2000 grew none of it in 2001. Of those who grew GM soybeans in 2000, 10.2% grew none in 2001 (Table 1, Figure 2).

## 2.2 Farmers contacted only in 2001

Among Ontario farmers who reported for the first time in 2001, 36.0% grew GM soybeans and 23.8% grew GM grain corn. In Quebec, 22.7% of the newly contacted farmers grew GM corn and 19.8% GM soybeans (Table 1).

**Figure 2**
**Decisions to Grow GM Crops in 2001 by Farmers Planting Grain Corn or Soybeans**




***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, June Farm Surveys, 2000 and 2001.

Of all Ontario GM growers who were contacted in 2000 and again in 2001, those who seeded both grain corn and soybeans accounted for 74.1% of the GM grain corn area and for 69.5% of the GM soybean area in Ontario. In Quebec, those percentages were 55.4% for grain corn and 83.7% for soybeans.

In 2001, as shown in the figures below and in Table 1:

- GM soybeans were favoured by farmers who seeded both grain corn and soybeans but did not seed GM crops in 2000. This was particularly apparent in Quebec.
- More farmers with both grain corn and soybeans decided to increase their GM grain corn area. Among those who decided to reduce their GM area, the majority chose to decrease GM grain corn rather than GM soybeans.
  More farmers with GM grain corn in 2000 abandoned it in 2001 than did those with GM soybeans.

- Farmers in Quebec and Ontario showed different GM adoption patterns. In Ontario, only a slightly larger proportion of farmers seeded GM grain corn than GM soybeans. In Quebec, however, farmers expressed more interest in GM soybeans than in grain corn. This may be explained by the different experiences with those two crops. Soybeans are a relatively new crop in Quebec compared with Ontario. More new farmers who seeded both GM grain corn and GM soybeans preferred to plant GM grain corn than GM soybeans. However, among farmers who decided to grow GM grain corn or GM soybeans, GM soybeans was the preferred crop, especially in Quebec.
- In Ontario, among farmers with only grain corn or soybeans, a relatively large number of those who seeded GM soybeans in 2000 increased their GM area in 2001. In Quebec, it was the case for farmers who had seeded GM grain corn in 2000.
- In Quebec, among farmers who grew only non-GM grain corn or soybeans in 2000 but tried GM crops in 2001, more chose GM soybeans than GM grain corn.

The results suggest that GM technology is still being adopted. However, according to the industry, corn borer damage was substantial in Ontario in 1999. Some industry analysts speculate that this may have encouraged more farmers to experiment with GM grain corn in 2000. Because corn borer damage was noticeably less severe in 2000, farmers may have been persuaded to continue to expand their GM area.

**Table 1. Percentage of GM Growers by Commodity and by Farm Category for Different Decisions**

| | Ontario | | Quebec | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grain corn | Soybean | Grain corn | Soybean |
| **1. Have sown both grain corn and soybeans** | | | | |
| Farms with both grain corn and soybeans that have increased GM grain corn area or soybeans | 34.0 | 22.8 | 38.8 | 29.2 |
| Farms with both grain corn and soybeans that didn't seed GM in 2000 but seeded GM grain corn or GM soybeans area in 2001 | 32.8 | 50.1 | 19.4 | 44.8 |
| Farms with both grain corn and soybeans that have decreased GM grain corn area or soybeans | 22.3 | 16.7 | 35.0 | 17.8 |
| Farms with both grain corn and soybeans that have planted GM in 2000 and not in 2001 | 29.8 | 24.1 | 24.4 | 24.3 |
| Farms with both grain corn and soybeans only that have seeded the same GM area | 4.4 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 1.5 |
| Farms with both grain corn and soybeans that didn't report GM area | 6.4 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 6.7 |
| **Total 11** | **100** | **100** | **100** | **100** |
| New farms with both grain corn and soybeans that have GM grain corn or soybeans | 33.2 | 29.2 | 40.6 | 24.2 |
| New farms with both grain corn and soybeans that have no GM grain corn or soybeans | 64.4 | 67.1 | 55.1 | 71.6 |
| New farms with both grain corn and soybeans that didn't report GM area | 2.4 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 4.2 |
| **Total 12** | **100** | **100** | **100** | **100** |
| **2. Have sown grain corn or soybeans** | | | | |
| Farms with grain corn or soybeans that have increased GM area | 18.4 | 24.5 | 26.9 | 13.5 |
| Farms with grain corn or soybeans that didn't seed GM in 2000 but seeded GM grain corn or GM soybeans area in 2001 | 46.9 | 47.8 | 39.4 | 52.7 |
| Farms with grain corn or soybeans that have decreased GM area | 18.6 | 13.5 | 21.1 | 33.8 |
| Farms with grain corn or soybeans that have GM area in 2000 and no GM area in 2001 | 25.1 | 22.6 | 30.1 | 10.2 |
| Farms with grain corn or soybeans that have the same GM area | 1.7 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |
| Farms with grain corn or soybeans that didn't report GM area | 14.5 | 14.2 | 10.3 | 0.0 |
| **Total 21** | **100** | **100** | **100** | **100** |
| New farms with grain corn or soybeans that have GM grain corn or soybeans | 23.8 | 36.0 | 22.7 | 19.8 |
| New farms with grain corn or soybeans that have no GM grain corn or soybeans | 67.2 | 61.8 | 73.0 | 69.9 |
| New farms with both grain corn and soybeans that didn't report GM area | 9.0 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 10.4 |
| **Total 22** | **100** | **100** | **100** | **100** |

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## General Profile

In Quebec and Ontario, the total area of GM grain corn and soybeans continues to increase, increasing the proportion of grain corn and soybeans seeded to GM varieties. Surprisingly, the number of farmers growing GM grain corn and soybeans are declining as the crop area continues to increase. This implies that there is a significant per-farm increase in GM seeded area among those that are choosing to remain as GM growers. Farmers that normally grow both grain corn and soybeans are making the most significant contributions to the increases in GM grain corn and soybeans (Table 2, Figure 3).

The number of farms growing grain corn and soybeans and reporting GM area for both crops increased, but not significantly. The number of farms growing grain corn and soybeans but reporting only GM area for grain corn fell sharply in Quebec and Ontario. However,

in both provinces the number of farms growing only GM soybeans grew significantly (Table 2, Figure 3).




***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, June Farm Surveys, 2000 and 2001.

The number of farmers growing only grain corn and reporting that they grew GM grain corn decreased in both Ontario and Quebec.

**Table 2. Changes in Total GM Farms in Ontario and Quebec**

| | Ontario | | | | | Quebec | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** |
| Total area | 1,877,970 | 1,972,108 | 5.0 | 2.79 | *** | 973,371 | 1,099,917 | 13.0 | 2.11 | ** |
| Total acres of GM products | 918,207 | 1,079,057 | 17.5 | 4.78 | *** | 317,639 | 432,821 | 36.3 | 1.6 | * |
| Total number of farms reporting GM products | 10,632 | 10,507 | -1.2 | 0.36 | ns | 3,463 | 3,166 | -8.6 | 1.58 | * |
| Number of farms with both grain corn and soybeans and GM grain corn and soybeans | 2,362 | 2,553 | 8.1 | 1.08 | ns | 615 | 685 | 11.4 | 0.78 | ns |
| Number of farms with both grain corn and soybeans and GM grain corn | 2,941 | 2,371 | -19.4 | 3.26 | *** | 1,202 | 952 | -20.8 | 2.5 | *** |
| Number of farms with both grain corn and soybeans and GM soybeans | 1,400 | 1,864 | 33.1 | 2.91 | *** | 116 | 212 | 82.8 | 1.83 | *** |
| Number of farms with grain corn and GM grain corn | 1,951 | 1,698 | -13.0 | 1.33 | * | 1,321 | 1,170 | -11.4 | 1.04 | ns |
| Number of farms with soybeans and GM soybeans | 1,978 | 2,021 | 2.2 | 0.21 | ns | 209 | 147 | -29.7 | 1.01 | ns |
| Average acres of GM products per farm | 86 | 103 | 18.9 | 5.43 | *** | 92 | 137 | 49.0 | 2.04 | ** |
| Total acres of GM and non-GM crops on farms with GM crops | 2,326,922 | 2,517,456 | 8.2 | 2.88 | *** | 791,370 | 916,797 | 15.8 | 1.44 | * |
| Average acres of GM and non-GM crops operated by GM Farms | 219 | 240 | 9.5 | 3.11 | *** | 229 | 290 | 26.7 | 2.43 | *** |
| Percent GM acres of total acres for GM growers | 39 | 43 | 8.6 | 3.18 | *** | 40 | 47 | 17.6 | 1.54 | * |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5%; *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

This supports the earlier observation that, in 2001, GM soybeans appear to have attracted the attention of farmers to a greater extent than has been the case with GM grain corn. That may have simply been a reflection of farmer price expectations in the spring of 2001 with respect to corn prospects and expected returns.

However, in the United States, GM soybeans also appear to have attracted farmers' attention to a greater extent than has GM grain corn, particularly in 1998 (Economic Research Service, 2001). That year, the planted area of the Herbicide-Tolerant Soybeans was around 44.2% of the total, compared with 37.5% for Bt Corn and Herbicide-Tolerant Corn together. Herbicide-Tolerant Soybeans were nearly 70% of the planted acreage in 2001 (Williams, L. et al., 2001a). The Starlink Corn variety incident[5] (Williams, L. et al., 2001b) can explain slow expansion of GM grain corn in 2001 compared to GM soybeans. With the incident, U.S. corn exports were disrupted, leading grain corn prices down and probably putting a brake on GM grain corn expansion for Canadian farmers.

Farmers growing only soybeans, and who reported having GM soybeans, increased their area by only 2.2% in Ontario but decreased it by 29.7% in Quebec (Table 2). It may be that farmers with

[5] Starlink is a GM Corn variety approved for animal feed but not for industrial uses and human consumption. Starlink corn contains the Cry9C protein which is toxic to European corn borers and certain other insect pests. In 2000, a testing lab indicated the presence of the Cry9C protein in a sample of Taco Bell taco shells. This incident led to the recall of hundreds of food products and corn shipments.

only grain corn or soybeans are still hesitating to adopt GM technology, probably because of anticipated risks about GM crop market or return.

**Commodity and Province Profile**

In Ontario, the area of GM grain corn and soybeans grew strongly from 2000 to 2001 GM soybean area increased 25.4%, and GM grain corn area, 11.3% (Table 3). The number of farms reporting GM grain corn has fell a sharp 8.7%, but the number of farms growing GM soybeans jumped 12.2%.

On Ontario farms that seeded GM crops, both the GM and non-GM areas of grain corn and soybeans expanded from 2000 to 2001. The average area of GM grain corn and GM soybeans per farm reporting seeding GM crops also increased. However, the land seeded to grain corn and soybeans by farmers who reported seeding GM crops rose for grain corn but fell slightly for soybeans. This means that the GM area increase in grain corn is mainly the result of existing GM growers expanding their GM area, and not new GM producers. However, for soybeans, the GM area increase in 2001 appears to be influenced mainly by farmers who decided to grow GM soybeans for the first time, and secondarily by existing producers who increased their GM crop area.

**Table 3. Changes in GM Farms by Commodity, Ontario**

| | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000 | 2001 | Change | T-test | P-value | 2000 | 2001 | Change | T-test | P-value |
| Total acres of GM products | 510,986 | 568,574 | 11.3 | 2.61 | *** | 407,221 | 510,483 | 25.4 | 4.6 | *** |
| Total number of farms reporting GM products | 7,255 | 6,622 | -8.7 | 2.61 | *** | 5,740 | 6,439 | 12.2 | 2.4 | *** |
| Average acres of GM products per farm | 70.4 | 85.9 | 21.9 | 5.26 | *** | 71 | 79 | 11.7 | 2.8 | *** |
| Total acres of GM products and non-GM crops operated on GM farms | 954,428 | 1,022,611 | 7.1 | 1.98 | ** | 810,505 | 893,740 | 10.3 | 2.28 | ** |
| Average acres of GM and non-GM crops operated on GM farms | 132 | 154 | 17.4 | 4.53 | *** | 141 | 139 | -1.7 | 0.42 | ns |
| Percent of GM acres of total acres for GM growers | 54 | 56 | 3.9 | 1.39 | * | 50 | 57 | 13.7 | 3.6 | *** |
| Total acres of non-GM product farms | 925,624 | 949,498 | 2.6 | 0.72 | ns | 1,510,534 | 1,282,525 | -15.1 | 5.35 | *** |
| Number of non-GM farms | 11,528 | 10,782 | -6.5 | 1.99 | ** | 13,025 | 11,642 | -10.6 | 3.93 | *** |
| Average acres per non-GM farms | 80 | 88 | 10.0 | 3.01 | ** | 116 | 110 | -5.0 | 2.0 | ** |
| Percent of GM acres of total GM and non-GM acres | 27 | 29 | 6.0 | 1.55 | * | 18 | 23 | 34.0 | 6.0 | *** |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

In Quebec, GM area jumped 30.3% for grain corn and 63.0% for soybeans from 2000 to 2001. As was the case in Ontario, the number of farms in Quebec reporting GM grain corn fell 10.6%, but the number of farms reporting GM soybeans rose 11.0%; this increase, however, was not statistically significant (Table 4). Among farms that reported GM crops, the average total area of grain corn and soybeans increased, as well as the percentage of GM area for both crops.

**Table 4. Changes in GM Farms by Commodity and Province, Quebec**

| | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** |
| Total acres of GM products | 259,705 | 338,373 | 30.3 | 1.55 | * | 57,934 | 94,448 | 63.0 | 1.46 | * |
| Total number of farms reporting GM products | 3,138 | 2,806 | -10.6 | 1.85 | ** | 940 | 1,043 | 11.0 | 0.89 | ns |
| Average acres of GM products per farm | 83 | 121 | 45.7 | 2.29 | ** | 62 | 91 | 46.9 | 1.34 | * |
| Total acres of GM products and non-GM crops operated on GM farms | 570,344 | 641,451 | 12.5 | 1.18 | ns | 96,774 | 123,493 | 27.6 | 1.07 | ns |
| Average acres of GM and non-GM crops operated on GM farms | 182 | 229 | 25.8 | 2.45 | *** | 103 | 118 | 15.0 | 0.71 | ns |
| Percent of GM acres of total acres for GM growers | 46 | 53 | 15.8 | 1.75 | ** | 60 | 76 | 27.8 | 2.57 | *** |
| Total Acres of non-GM products farms | 403,028 | 458,466 | 13.8 | 2.15 | ** | 251,125 | 230,410 | -8.2 | 1.24 | ns |
| Number of non-GM farms | 4,174 | 4,358 | 4.4 | 0.88 | ns | 3,172 | 2,989 | -5.8 | 1.16 | ns |
| Average acres per non-GM farms | 97 | 105 | 9.0 | 1.62 | * | 79 | 77 | -2.6 | 0.42 | ns |
| Percent of GM acres of total GM and non-GM acres | 27 | 31 | 15.3 | 1.22 | ns | 17 | 27 | 60.3 | 1.84 | ** |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Farm Size Comparisons

The number of large farms reporting GM increased significantly from 2000 to 2001, and the total area of GM grown on large farms has risen for both grain corn and soybeans, in Quebec and Ontario. The average area of GM grain corn and soybeans per farm grew sharply for all farm size categories; large farms reported the greatest increase. The share of total GM area found on small and medium farms decreased, but was more than offset by significant gains in area grown by large farms. This farm category made a large contribution to the increase in total GM area (Tables 6 and 5, Appendix 2).

In Ontario, the number of small farms reporting GM grain corn dropped a significant 11.5%. The proportion of small farms growing GM crops compared with all small farms has also fell 2.6%. To further complicate matters, survey estimates also show that, from 2000 to 2001, farms classified as small have declined in proportion to total farm numbers.

The situation with respect to GM soybeans is different. The number of farms reporting GM area and the proportion of farms reporting GM crops in relation to all farms reporting soybeans increased irrespective of farm size. The gains are statistically significant for farms classified as small and large, indicating that GM crops are gaining popularity among farmers, regardless of farm size.

U.S. farmers reported the same trend. According to the results of a survey conducted involving more than 300 Iowa farmers, GM crops have been gaining popularity among U.S. farmers, although not for economic reasons (Duffy, M. and Ernest, M., 2000).

Farms reporting GM soybeans as a proportion of all farms growing GM crops decreased for both small and medium farms. The proportion of large farms to all farms reporting GM crops jumped a significant 21.5%.

The total area of GM soybeans in Ontario rose sharply on both small (24.0%) and large (45.5%) farms. Despite the increase in land seeded to GM grain corn and soybeans, the proportion of total area seeded to GM crops declined on both small and medium farms (Figure 4).

**Figure 4**
**Changes in Farm Number Growing GM Crops in 2001 Compared to 2000 by Farm Size, Commodity and Province**




***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, June Farm Surveys, 2000 and 2001.

Ontario farms classified as large expanded their soybean area 45.5%. They also increased their proportion of total GM area in relation to all other size categories by 16.1%. Farms of all sizes contributed to the increase in the GM soybean area in 2001, but the large farms played a major role in the increase. Compared with 2000, this indicates a gain of interest of large farms in GM crops (Table 5, Appendix 2, Figure 5).




***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, June Farm Surveys, 2000 and 2001.

In Quebec, the GM soybean area increased as in Ontario. Large farms seeded the largest proportion of the increase in the GM area—more than double the GM crop in 2000. The trend for grain corn was similar (Table 6, Appendix 2, Figure 5). In Quebec, large farms accounted for the largest percentage of GM grain corn area, 38.6%, and the largest percentage of GM soybean area, 48.4%. The percentage of GM area held by Quebec's large farms has risen 66.7% for grain corn and 77.2% for soybeans from 2000 to 2001 (Table 6, Appendix 2).

The survey data for 2000 and 2001 show that more Ontario and Quebec farmers are adopting GM crops. It also appears that, as farmers gain more experience in growing GM crops, operators of large farms have become much more interested in GM grain corn and soybeans than they were in the first few years that the seeds came on the market. This is a different portrait of the GM growers identified in the 2000 survey, who tended to be drawn largely from among the operators of what would normally be categorized as small to medium farms. That large farms are pulling ahead in the race to adopt GM crops can be interpreted as a sign of the end of the experimental phase in GM grain corn and soybean crops.

## Regional Comparisons

In Quebec, increases in area of the GM grain corn were significant in two regions (9 and 13). However, GM grain corn area actually decreased in the other two regions (4 and 7). Although the total number of farms using GM grain corn dropped slightly, region 9 increased its number of GM farms. Area in GM soybean rose substantially in all regions, but growth was more noticeable in Region 7 and particularly Region 9, where GM soybean area more than quadrupled

in 2001. The higher number of Quebec farms in 2001 (up 9.0% from 2000) with GM soybean only partly explains this sharp rise in GM soybean area; much of the increase originated from farmers who already used GM soybean in 2000 expanding their GM area in 2001 (Table 8a and 8b Appendix 2).

In Ontario, the increase in GM grain corn area was mainly the result of a larger area sown by farmers who had grown GM grain corn in 2000. GM soybean area grew in 2001 because of both greater area sown by farmers who had grown GM soybeans in 2000 and more first-time GM soybean farmers, especially in Region 4 (Table 7a and 7b; Appendix 2).

The regression coefficients show that, in Ontario, as farmers increased their area of total grain corn, there was a corresponding increase in the area in GM corn. The situation for Ontario grain corn was similar to the pattern observed for Quebec soybeans (Table 9, Appendix 2).

## Yield Comparisons

### GM and non-GM Yield Comparisons

The Statistics Canada November Farm Survey reported that, generally, GM grain corn and soybean crops yielded more than non-GM varieties. According to the farmers surveyed in 2001, GM varieties yielded more than non-GM for both grain corn and soybeans in Ontario and Quebec. (Tables 10a, 10b, 11a and 11b, Appendix 2). This was the case across all farm sizes, the exception being grain corn grown on small Ontario farms. (Table 14a and 14b, Appendix 2).

In Ontario, GM grain corn yields were similar in 2000 and 2001. Yield for non-GM grain corn was lower in 2001 than in 2000 (Table 10a, Appendix 2). In Ontario, GM grain corn yielded 4.8 bushels per acre more than non-GM in 2000 and 7.8 bushels more in 2001.

In Quebec, the GM grain corn yield in 2001 was 18.7 bushels per acre greater than in 2000. That year was a poor one for grain corn in Quebec because of a dry spring followed by relatively cool and wet weather for the rest of the growing season. The GM grain corn yield was 11.5 bushels per acre more than non-GM grain corn in 2000, but in 2001, non-GM yields were 2.6 bushels per acre higher than GM yields (Table 11b, Appendix 2). We do not have a good explanation of why respondents to the 2001 survey reported better yields from non-GM grain corn compared with GM varieties. Farmer responses from the November 2001 Farm Survey also indicated substantial variation among agricultural regions (Tables 10a and 10b, Appendix 2). This variation was surprising, particularly the information that non-GM yields in some regions were higher than those for GM varieties. It may have been related to the response of the GM varieties to what were relatively dry crop conditions in the middle of the growing season.

For soybeans, the 2001 growing season produced one of the worst yields on record for Ontario. Unlike Ontario grain corn however, GM soybeans yielded more than non-GM soybeans in both 2000 and 2001. Yields varied substantially among agricultural regions, as was the case for grain corn (Table 11a, Appendix 2).

In Quebec, the GM soybean yields in 2000 and 2001 were similar. At the provincial level, soybean yields for non-GM varieties were 1.8 bushels per acre less than GM varieties in 2001,

but again there was substantial variation among regions. The GM yields were always higher than those of the non-GM varieties; 1.6 bushels per acre in 2000 and 3.5 bushels per acre in 2001.

## Impact of GM Crop Varieties on Provincial Grain Corn and Soybean Production

In an effort to measure the impact of GM grain corn on average provincial yields, we compared the average yields of grain corn growers who had planted their entire grain corn area with GM seed to those growers who had used both GM grain corn and regular grain corn, as well as to those of growers who had planted regular corn only.

### Grain Corn Yield

The findings show that, at the provincial level, in Quebec and Ontario, average grain corn yields for (1) farmers planting GM grain corn and (2) farmers planting both non-GM and GM varieties, yields were higher than the yields for farmers who reported growing only non-GM grain corn. This was the case in both 2000 and 2001. The GM techonology seems to have a positive impact on average yield per farm. This was a particularly interesting observation, as the grain corn growing conditions were quite different between the two years. In Ontario, conditions in 2000 were distinctly better than 2001; in Quebec, 2001 was clearly the better year (Table 12 and Table 12b, Appendix 2).

### Soybean Yield

In Ontario, the 2001 soybean crop was one of the worst on record for all farms in all parts of the province (Table 13a, Appendix 2). At the provincial level, farms who grew only GM soybeans had better yields (1.9 bushels per acre) than farms growing only non-GM soybeans (Table 13a).

In Quebec, farms with only GM soybeans reported better yields in 2001 than in 2000 compared with those who grew a mix of GM and regular soybeans and those who grew only regular soybeans. This is true in all the agricultural regions except Region 13 where, even though the 2001 yield was lower than that in 2000, the decrease was smaller for farms with only GM soybeans (Table 13b, Appendix 2). In both 2000 and 2001, yields obtained by farmers growing only GM soybeans were higher than those obtained by farmers growing only non-GM soybeans—the difference was 14.4 bushels per acre. in 2001. In 2000, with poorer growing conditions, the difference was a smaller 2.3 bushels per acre (Table 13b, Appendix 2).

One should not always expect higher yields with GM grain corn and soybeans. The impact of GM grain corn will be related to corn borer infestation. If there is little corn borer injury with non-GM grain corn, yield advantage with GM grain corn should be limited. For Roundup Ready soybeans, weed control is the primary issue. However, if weeds are controlled well with non-GM soybeans, and without significant herbicide injury to the plants, then GM and non-GM yields should be about the same. The yield of GM soybeans should be better only if Roundup Ready soybeans and the use of the Roundup herbicide is the better means for weed control. It has been shown that GM grain corn varieties may not be economical unless corn borer pressure is high (Mark Sears and Art Schaafsma, 2001).

### Yields by Commodity and Farm Size

In 2001, non-GM grain corn yielded more than GM grain corn in Quebec. The situation was reversed in Ontario (Table 14a, Appendix 2). Most of the variation in grain corn yields was observed among medium farms in both provinces.

Even though the 2001 growing season was less favorable, GM soybeans yielded more than non-GM soybeans (Table 14b, Appendix 2). Soybean yields similar to those of grain corn varied widely among farms classified as medium in both provinces.

### Conclusion and Outlook

Preliminary work suggests that GM crops do not guarantee better yields and that farmers may not always capture economic benefits from them. Based on Statistics Canada's Farm Surveys, land seeded to GM varieties of grain corn and soybeans has increased in Quebec and in Ontario. The increase in GM area was due to existing GM growers increasing their GM seeded area as well as other farmers who had never grown GM crops seeding GM varieties for the first time in 2001. The increase in GM soybean area was substantial, especially in Quebec. Although the early adopters of GM grain corn and soybeans appeared to be largely the operators of small farms, large farmers appear to have been quick to recognize what appears to be a successful innovation. Operators of large farms have paid attention to the results of GM crop adoption by smaller operators, and have now themselves seeded significant amounts of land and become responsible for a significant amount of GM crop production.

The Statistics Canada November Farm Survey data show that, GM yields for soybeans and grain corn have been generally better than non-GM yields. However, this is not an assurance of better yields; under certain conditions GM crops may deliver lower yields than other varieties. GM crop varieties appear to boost yields for both grain corn and soybean crops.

It will be interesting to analyze this trend over the long term and further investigate the economic implications for agriculture. As GM crops gain popularity in the coming years, it will be interesting to collect data on such aspects as:

- the reasons for GM crop adoption
- the costs and net returns of GM crops
- whether GM crops reduce the use of pesticides
- differences in prices of GM crops compared with other varieties
- the characteristics of the GM grain corn and GM soybean markets.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mike Trant, Rick Burroughs, Dave Roeske, Oliver Code, Julie Saumure and Mélanie Lefebvre for their helpful comments and text revision. I am also grateful to Owen Phillips of the Social Survey Methods Division for his assistance in data analysis and

methodological aspects. I would also like to thank Daniel Bergeron for verifying the data. It was very helpful.

## References

**Agriweek** 15 January 2001 [Winnipeg].

**Babubhai V.Shah and all., 1997.** "SUDAAN: Software for Statistical Analysis of correlated Data", User's Manual, Vol. 1, pp.3.34.

**Benbrook , Charles, 2001.** "When Does It Pay to Plant Bt Corn: Farm-Level Economic Impacts of Bt Corn, 1996-2001", Benbrook Consulting Services, former Executive Director of the National Academy of Science Board of Agriculture, USA.

**Duffy, M. and Ernest, M., 2000.** "Does planting GMO seed boost farmers' profits?", Leopold Center for Sustainable Agriculture, Iowa State University.
http://www.ag.iastate.edu/centers/leopold/newsletter/99-3leoletter/99-3gmoduffy.html

**Economic Research Service, 2001.** "Economic Issues in Agricultural Biotechnology: Farm-Level Effects of Adopting Genetically Engineered Crops", USDA, Information Bulletin No. 762, pp.13,
http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aib762.

**Mark Sears and Art Schaafsma, 2001.** "Responsible Deployment of Bt Corn Technology in Ontario", Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Plant Health and Production Division, Plant Biosafety Office,
http://www.inspection.gc.ca/english/plaveg/pbo/bt/btcormai2e.shtml.

**Rautenberg, Oliver, 2000.** "Aventis recalls this year GMO-grain corn StarLink harvest," [TR: sic] Bioscope, Biothec & Genetech Information,
http://www.bio-scope.com.case57e.htm.

**Saxena, D., Flores,S. and Stotziky, G. 1999.** "Transgenic Plants: Insecticidal Toxine in Root Exudates From Bt Corn", Nature, 402:480

**William Lin, Gregory K.Price and Jorge Fernadez-Cornejo, 2001a**. "Estimating Farm-Level Effects of Adopting of Herbicide-Tolerant Soybeans", Economic Research Service, USDA,
http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/biotechnology/readings.htm.

**William Lin, gregory K. Price, and Edward Allen, 2001b.** "Starlink: Impacts on the U.S. Corn Market and World Trade", Economic Research Service, USDA, http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/biotechnology/readings.htm.

**Mendelsohn, M., 2001.** "*Bacillus thuringiensis* subspecies *Tolworthi* Cry9C Protein and the Genetic Material Necessary for Its Production in Corn", Biopesticides Fact Sheet, United States Environmetal Protection Agency (EPA)
http://www.epa.gov.oppbppd1.biopesticides/factsheets/fs006466t.htm.

**Roberts, G., Kovacevic, M., Mantel, H., Phillips, O., 2001.** "Cross-sectional inference based on longitudinal surveys: Some experiences with Statistics Canada Surveys. To appear in *Proceedings of the 2001 Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology research conference.*

## APPENDIX 1. Variance Calculation Formulae

### Variance of the Difference between Totals

Variance estimates for the change from 2000 to 2001 have been calculated through the steps below.

The estimate for a total $\hat{y}_t$ (area or number of farms) for a given growing season *t* have been calculated as follow[6]:

$$\hat{Y}_t = \sum_{h=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{n_h} w_{thk}\, y_{thk}(d)$$

Where $y_{thk}(d) = \begin{cases} y_{thk} \text{ if farm } k \text{ in the stratum } h \text{ belongs to domain } d \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$

And $w_{thk}$ represent the adjusted weighted of farm *k* of $n_h$ farms in the stratum *h* of *L* strata.

The variance of $\hat{Y}_1 - \hat{Y}_2$ is estimated by $\hat{V}(\hat{Y}_1 - \hat{Y}_2) = \hat{V}(\hat{Y}_1) + \hat{V}(\hat{Y}_2) - 2Cov(\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2)$

Where $\hat{V}(\hat{Y}_t) = \sum_{h=1}^{L}\left(1 - \frac{n_{th}}{N_{th}}\right)\frac{n_{th}}{n_{th}-1}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{th}}(w_{thk}\, y_{thk}(d) - \bar{y}_{th}(d))^2$, nth represent

$$\bar{y}_{th}(d) = \frac{1}{n_{th}}\sum_{k=1}^{n_{th}} w_{thk}\, y_{thk}(d),$$

$$Cov(\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2) = \sum_{h=1}^{L}\left(1 - \frac{n_h^*}{\min(N_{1h}, N_{2h})}\right)\frac{n_h^*}{n_h^* - 1}\sum_{k=1}^{n_h^*}(w_{1hk}\, y_{1hk}(d) - \bar{y}_{1h}^*(d))(w_{2hk}\, y_{2hk}(d) - \bar{y}_{2h}^*(d)),$$

$$\bar{y}_{th}^*(d) = \frac{1}{n_h^*}\sum_{k=1}^{n_h^*} w_{thk}\, y_{thk}(d),$$

And $n_h^*$ represent the overlap of the two samples.

### Variance of the Difference between Ratios

The ratio for the period *t* is estimated by $\hat{R}_t = \frac{\hat{Y}_t}{\hat{X}_t} = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{n_h} w_{thk}\, y_{thk}(d)}{\sum_{h=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{n_h} w_{thk}\, x_{thk}(d)}$,

Where $y_{thk}(d) = \begin{cases} y_{thk} \text{ if farm } hk \text{ belongs to the domain} \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$

[6] Formulas adapted by Milorad Kovacevic and Owen Phillips from Methods presented in Roberts et al., 2001 to suit a rotating panel design. Methodologist, Social Survey Methods Division (SSMD), Statistics Canada

And $x_{thk}(d) = \begin{cases} x_{thk} \text{ if farm } hk \text{ belongs to the domain} \\ 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$

Because the numerator and the denominator are both sample estimates, the Taylor linearization has been used to approximate the variance of the ratio change.

Then we approximate the variance of $\hat{R}_1 - \hat{R}_2$ by $\hat{V}(\hat{Z}_1 - \hat{Z}_2)$

Where $\hat{Z}_t = \sum_{h=1}^{L} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{th}} w_{thk} z_{thk}(d),$

And $z_{thk}(d) = \frac{(y_{thk}(d) - \hat{R}_t x_{thk}(d))}{\hat{X}_t},$

The variance is estimated by $\hat{V}(\hat{Z}_1 - \hat{Z}_2) = \hat{V}(\hat{Z}_1) + \hat{V}(\hat{Z}_2) - 2Cov(\hat{Z}_1, \hat{Z}_2)$

Where $\hat{V}(\hat{Z}_t) = \sum_{h=1}^{L} \left(1 - \frac{n_{th}}{N_{th}}\right) \frac{n_{th}}{n_{th} - 1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{th}} (w_{thk} z_{thk}(d) - \bar{z}_{th}(d))^2,$

$\bar{z}_{th}(d) = \frac{1}{n_{th}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{th}} w_{thk} z_{thk}(d),$

$Cov(\hat{Z}_1, \hat{Z}_2) = \sum_{h=1}^{L} \left(1 - \frac{n_h^*}{\min(N_{1h}, N_{2h})}\right) \frac{n_h^*}{n_h^* - 1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_h^*} (w_{1hk} z_{1hk}(d) - \bar{z}_{1h}^*(d))(w_{2hk} z_{2hk}(d) - \bar{z}_{2h}^*(d)),$

And $\bar{z}_{th}^*(d) = \frac{1}{n_h^*} \sum_{k=1}^{n_h^*} w_{thk} z_{thk}(d).$

## APPENDIX 2. Reference Tables

### Table 5. Changes in Farms by Size and Commodity in Ontario

| Parameters | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000 | 2001 | Change | T-test | P-value | 2000 | 2001 | Change | T-test | P-value |
| Number of GM farms <= 490 acres | 5,429 | 4,807 | -11.5 | 2.23 | ** | 4,391 | 4,918 | 12.0 | 1.86 | ** |
| Number of GM farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 1,220 | 1,149 | -5.8 | 0.84 | ns | 916 | 932 | 1.7 | 0.18 | ns |
| Number of GM farms > 980 acres | 605 | 666 | 10.1 | 1.55 | * | 433 | 590 | 36.3 | 4.16 | *** |
| Number of non-GM farms <= 490 acres | 9,615 | 8,874 | -7.7 | 2.06 | ** | 10,674 | 9,476 | -11.2 | 3.48 | *** |
| Number of non-GM farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 1,441 | 1,387 | -3.7 | 0.49 | ns | 1,659 | 1,593 | -3.9 | 0.62 | ns |
| Number of non-GM farms > 980 acres | 473 | 524 | 11.0 | 1.09 | ns | 692 | 573 | -17.2 | 2.32 | ** |
| Ratio of GM farms to total farms <= 490 acres (Ratio of number of farms) | 36.1 | 35.1 | -2.6 | 0.54 | ns | 29.1 | 34.2 | 17.2 | 2.9 | *** |
| Ratio of GM farms to total farms > 490 and <=980 acres | 45.9 | 45.3 | -1.2 | 0.19 | ns | 35.6 | 36.9 | 3.7 | 0.5 | ns |
| Ratio of GM farms to total farms > 980 acres | 56.2 | 56.0 | -0.4 | 0.06 | ns | 38.5 | 50.7 | 31.9 | 4.0 | *** |
| Ratio of number of GM farms (<= 490 acres) to total number of GM farms | 74.8 | 72.6 | -3.0 | 1.54 | * | 76.5 | 76.4 | -0.2 | 0.1 | ns |
| Ratio of number of GM farms (>490 acres and <=980 acres) to total number of GM farms | 16.8 | 17.4 | 3.2 | 0.42 | ns | 16.0 | 14.5 | -9.4 | 1.1 | ns |
| Ratio of number of GM farms (> 980 acres) to total number of GM farms | 8.3 | 10.1 | 20.6 | 2.62 | *** | 7.5 | 9.2 | 21.5 | 2.3 | ** |
| Ratio of number of all farms (<= 490 acres) to total number of all farms | 80.1 | 78.6 | -1.9 | 2.02 | ** | 80.3 | 79.6 | -0.8 | 1.0 | ns |
| Ratio of number of all farms (> 490 acres and <= 980 acres) to total number of all farms | 14.2 | 14.6 | 2.8 | 0.58 | ns | 13.7 | 14.0 | 1.8 | 0.4 | ns |
| Ratio of number of all farms (> 980 acres) to total number of all farms | 5.7 | 6.8 | 19.2 | 3.53 | *** | 6.0 | 6.4 | 7.3 | 1.4 | * |
| Total acres of GM farms <= 490 acres | 240,033 | 242,048 | 0.8 | 0.13 | ns | 201,595 | 250,247 | 24.1 | 2.99 | *** |
| Total acres of GM farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 118,170 | 127,773 | 8.1 | 0.95 | ns | 103,981 | 112,342 | 8.0 | 0.69 | ns |
| Total acres of GM farms > 980 acres | 152,782 | 198,754 | 30.1 | 3.14 | *** | 101,646 | 147,894 | 45.5 | 4.11 | *** |
| Average of GM acres for farms <= 490 acres | 44 | 50 | 13.9 | 3.18 | *** | 46 | 51 | 10.8 | 2.22 | ** |
| Average of GM acres for farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 97 | 111 | 14.8 | 2.48 | *** | 113 | 121 | 6.3 | 0.70 | ns |
| Average of GM acres for farms > 980 acres | 252 | 298 | 18.2 | 2.41 | *** | 235 | 251 | 6.8 | 0.85 | ns |
| Ratio of GM farms (<= 490 acres) area to total area of GM farms | 47.0 | 42.6 | -9.4 | 2.09 | ** | 49.5 | 49.0 | -1.0 | 0.2 | ns |
| Ratio of GM farms (> 490 acres and < 980 acres) area to total area of GM farms | 23.1 | 22.5 | -2.8 | 0.37 | ns | 25.5 | 22.0 | -13.8 | 1.5 | * |
| Ratio of GM farms (> 980 acres) area to total area of GM farms | 29.9 | 35.0 | 16.9 | 2.38 | *** | 25.0 | 29.0 | 16.1 | 1.9 | ** |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1%  **: Significantly different at 5%  *: Significantly different at 10%  ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 6. Changes in Farms by Size and Commodity in Quebec

| Parameters | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000 | 2001 | Change | T-test | P-value | 2000 | 2001 | Change | T-test | P-value |
| Number of GM farms <= 490 acres | 2,382 | 1,988 | -16.5 | 2.30 | ** | 696 | 672 | -3.5 | 0.23 | ns |
| Number of GM farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 559 | 544 | -2.8 | 0.30 | ns | 168 | 223 | 32.8 | 1.77 | ** |
| Number of GM farms > 980 acres | 197 | 274 | 39.1 | 1.64 | * | 76 | 148 | 94.8 | 1.96 | ** |
| Number of non-GM farms <= 490 acres | 3,530 | 3,663 | 3.8 | 0.65 | ns | 2,483 | 2,263 | -8.8 | 1.44 | * |
| Number of non-GM farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 531 | 523 | -1.5 | 0.12 | ns | 537 | 534 | -0.7 | 0.06 | ns |
| Number of non-GM farms > 980 acres | 113 | 173 | 52.3 | 2.11 | ** | 152 | 193 | 26.9 | 1.45 | * |
| Ratio of GM farms to total farms <= 490 acres (Ratio of number of farms) | 40.3 | 35.2 | -12.7 | 1.90 | ** | 21.9 | 22.9 | 4.5 | 0.31 | ns |
| Ratio of GM farms to total farms > 490 and <= 980 acres | 51.3 | 51.0 | -0.7 | 0.08 | ns | 23.8 | 29.5 | 23.8 | 1.40 | * |
| Ratio of GM farms to total farms > 980 acres | 63.5 | 61.3 | -3.4 | 0.30 | ns | 33.4 | 43.5 | 30.2 | 1.28 | * |
| Ratio of number of GM farms (<= 490 acres) to total number of GM Farms | 75.9 | 70.9 | -6.6 | 2.17 | ** | 74.0 | 64.4 | -13.0 | 2.12 | ** |
| Ratio of number of GM farms (> 490 acres and <= 980 acres) to total number of GM farms | 17.8 | 19.4 | 8.7 | 0.82 | ns | 17.9 | 21.4 | 19.7 | 1.03 | ns |
| Ratio of number of GM farms (> 980 acres) to total number of GM farms | 6.3 | 9.8 | 55.5 | 2.19 | ** | 8.1 | 14.2 | 75.5 | 1.84 | ** |
| Ratio of number of non-GM farms (<= 490 acres) to total number of all farms | 80.8 | 78.9 | -2.4 | 1.72 | ** | 77.3 | 72.8 | -5.9 | 2.60 | *** |
| Ratio of number of non-GM farms (> 490 acres and <= 980 acres) to total number of all farms | 14.9 | 14.9 | -0.1 | 0.02 | ns | 17.1 | 18.8 | 9.4 | 1.07 | ns |
| Ratio of number of non-GM farms (> 980 acres) to total number of all farms | 4.2 | 6.2 | 46.9 | 2.97 | *** | 5.5 | 8.5 | 52.5 | 2.67 | *** |
| Total acres of GM farms <= 490 acres | 124,589 | 129,358 | 3.8 | 0.42 | ns | 25,789 | 29,686 | 15.1 | 0.90 | ns |
| Total acres of GM farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 75,048 | 78,521 | 4.6 | 0.44 | ns | 15,871 | 19,062 | 20.1 | 1.14 | ns |
| Total acres of GM farms > 980 acres | 60,068 | 130,494 | 117.2 | 1.42 | * | 16,276 | 45,700 | 180.8 | 1.20 | ns |
| Average number of GM acres for farms <= 490 acres | 52 | 65 | 24.4 | 3.8 | *** | 37 | 44 | 19.3 | 2.3 | ** |
| Average number of GM acres for farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 134 | 144 | 7.6 | 0.8 | ns | 94 | 85 | -9.6 | 0.7 | ns |
| Average number of GM acres for farms > 980 acres | 305 | 476 | 56.2 | 1.3 | * | 214 | 308 | 44.2 | 0.8 | ns |
| Ratio of GM farms (<= 490 acres) area to total area of GM farms | 48.0 | 38.2 | -20.3 | 1.6 | * | 44.5 | 31.4 | -29.4 | 1.3 | ns |
| Ratio of GM farms (> 490 acres and <= 980 acres) area to total area of GM farms | 28.9 | 23.2 | -19.7 | 1.3 | * | 27.4 | 20.2 | -26.3 | 1.0 | ns |
| Ratio of GM farms (> 980 acres) area to total area of GM farms | 23.1 | 38.6 | 66.7 | 1.6 | * | 28.1 | 48.4 | 72.2 | 1.3 | ns |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1%  **: Significantly different at 5%  *: Significantly different at 10%  ns: Not significant.

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 7a. Changes in GM Area by Agricultural Region in Ontario

| | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** |
| Region 1 | 234,277 | 254,409 | 8.6 | 1.36 | * | 216,497 | 275057 | 27.0 | 3.21 | *** |
| Region 2 | 162,902 | 193,195 | 18.6 | 2.25 | ** | 117,459 | 138371 | 17.8 | 1.92 | ** |
| Region 3 | 59,327 | 62,708 | 5.7 | 0.48 | ns | 44,387 | 48542 | 9.4 | 0.76 | ns |
| Region 4 | 53,856 | 58,158 | 8.0 | 0.74 | ns | 27,416 | 47861 | 74.6 | 4.33 | *** |

T-test: T test Student value
*** Significantly different at 1% ** Significantly different at 5% * Significantly different at 10% ns Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 7b. Changes in GM Farm Number by Agricultural Region in Ontario

| | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** |
| Region 1 | 3,111 | 2,836 | -8.8 | 1.41 | * | 3,166 | 3,380 | 6.8 | 0.98 | ns |
| Region 2 | 2,576 | 2,357 | -8.5 | 1.21 | ns | 1,595 | 1,782 | 11.7 | 1.21 | ns |
| Region 3 | 771 | 670 | -13.1 | 1.38 | * | 469 | 498 | 6.2 | 0.44 | ns |
| Region 4 | 787 | 756 | -3.9 | 0.38 | ns | 479 | 748 | 56.2 | 3.61 | *** |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 8a. Changes in GM Area by Agricultural Region in Quebec

| | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** |
| Region 4 | 37,923 | 28,961 | -23.6 | 1.82 | ** | 13,767 | 14,565 | 5.8 | 0.27 | ns |
| Region 7 | 16,316 | 13,721 | -15.9 | 1.05 | ns | 5,220 | 9,193 | 76.1 | 2.62 | *** |
| Region 9 | 3,965 | 7,319 | 84.6 | 1.81 | ** | 1,170 | 6,218 | 431.5 | 2.34 | *** |
| Region 13 | 190,732 | 281,146 | 47.4 | 1.80 | ** | 37,354 | 63,132 | 69.0 | 1.05 | ns |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 8b. Changes in GM Farm Numbers by Agricultural Region in Quebec

| | Grain corn | | | | | Soybeans | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** | **2000** | **2001** | **Change** | **T-test** | **P-value** |
| Region 4 | 510 | 450 | -11.8 | 0.67 | ns | 208 | 220 | 5.8 | .26 | ns |
| Region 7 | 229 | 188 | -17.9 | 1.10 | ns | 61 | 116 | 90.2 | 2.06 | ** |
| Region 9 | 63 | 92 | 46.0 | .99 | ns | 25 | 44 | 76.0 | 1.46 | * |
| Region 13 | 2029 | 1903 | -6.2 | .71 | ns | 630 | 630 | 0.0 | .01 | ns |

T-test: T test Student value
***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 9. Regression of the Difference between 2001 and 2000 GM Area on the Difference between 2001 and 2000 Non-GM Area for Farms Having GM Grain Corn and/or GM Soybean in both Growing Seasons 2001 and 2000.

| Province | Crops | Dependent variable | Weighted mean of dependent variable (acres ) | Independent variable and effect | BETA | SE | T: BETA=0 | P-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ontario | Grain corn | $d260_{01\text{-}00}$ | 14.9 (17.9) | Intercept | 7.75 | 3.15 | 2.46 | ** |
| | | | | $d216_{01\text{-}00}$ | 0.40 | 0.06 | 6.25 | *** |
| | Soybean | $d261_{01\text{-}00}$ | -18.05 (-1.8) | Intercept | -17.93 | 4.49 | 3.99 | *** |
| | | | | $d228_{01\text{-}00}$ | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.43 | ns |
| Quebec | Grain corn | $d260_{01\text{-}00}$ | 5.4 (-6.2) | Intercept | 9.59 | 8.31 | 1.15 | ns |
| | | | | $d216_{01\text{-}00}$ | 0.68 | 0.47 | 1.43 | ns |
| | Soybean | $d261_{01\text{-}00}$ | -20.5 (-21.5) | Intercept | 3.37 | 9.70 | 0.35 | ns |
| | | | | $d261_{01\text{-}00}$ | 1.11 | 0.45 | 2.47 | ** |

$d260_{01\text{-}00}$: 2001 GM grain corn area – 2000 GM grain corn area
$d261_{01\text{-}00}$: 2001 GM soybean area – 2000 GM soybean area
$d216_{01\text{-}00}$: 2001 non-GM grain corn area – 2000 non-GM grain corn area
$d228_{01\text{-}00}$: 2001 non-GM soybean area – 2000 non-GM soybean area
BETA: regression coefficient
T: BETA: T-test of Student
SE: standard error
***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 10a. Comparison of Average GM and Non-GM Grain-Corn Yields, Based on Area, Ontario

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province: | GM | 109.0 | 109.1 | 0.1 | **4.8** | **7.8** |
| | Non-GM | 104.2 | 101.3 | -2.9 | | |
| | **Mean** | **105.6** | **103.4** | **-2.2** | | |
| Region 1[11] | GM | 118.4 | 111.2 | -7.2 | 4.6 | 11.0 |
| | Non-GM | 113.8 | 100.2 | -13.6 | | |
| Region 2 | GM | 108.1 | 112.4 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 4.9 |
| | Non-GM | 101.0 | 107.5 | 6.5 | | |
| Region 3 | GM | 98.6 | 90.2 | -8.4 | 2.0 | 10.1 |
| | Non-GM | 96.6 | 80.1 | -16.5 | | |
| Region 4 | GM | 90.9 | 106.0 | 15.1 | 9.2 | 3.5 |
| | Non-GM | 81.7 | 102.5 | 20.8 | | |

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

[11] Main grain corn-producing areas in Ontario and Quebec:

| **Ontario** | | **Quebec** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Region No. | Area Name | Region No. | Area Name |
| 1 | Southern Ontario | 4 | Mauricie-Bois-Francs |
| 2 | Western Ontario | 7 | Lanaudière |
| 3 | Central Ontario | 9 | Laurentides |
| 4 | Eastern Ontario | 13 | Montérégie |

## Table 10b. Comparison of Average GM and Non-GM Grain Corn Yields, Based on Area, Quebec

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province: | GM | 101.2 | 119.9 | 18.7 | **11.5** | **-2.6** |
| | Non-GM | 89.7 | 122.5 | 32.8 | | |
| | **Mean** | **95.6** | **121.9** | **26.3** | | |
| Region 4 | GM | 81.9 | 132.8 | 50.9 | 6 | 6.1 |
| | Non-GM | 75.9 | 126.7 | 50.8 | | |
| Region 7 | GM | 80.9 | 105.4 | 24.5 | 3.2 | -7.1 |
| | Non-GM | 77.7 | 112.5 | 34.8 | | |
| Region 9 | GM | 91.7 | 89.8 | -1.9 | 22.8 | 5.5 |
| | Non-GM | 68.9 | 84.3 | 15.4 | | |
| Region 13 | GM | 105.6 | 120.1 | 14.5 | 7.9 | -6.7 |
| | Non-GM | 97.7 | 126.8 | 29.1 | | |

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 11a. Comparison of Average GM and Non-GM Soybean yields, Based on Area, Ontario

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province | GM | 39.0 | 21.7 | -17.3 | | |
| | **Mean** | **38.0** | **20.9** | **-17.1** | **1.0** | **0.8** |
| Region 1[11] | GM | 40.7 | 21.3 | -19.4 | 1.1 | 0.8 |
| | Non-GM | 39.6 | 20.5 | -19.1 | | |
| Region 2 | GM | 37.2 | 22.5 | -14.7 | -0.3 | 1.8 |
| | Non-GM | 37.5 | 20.7 | -16.8 | | |
| Region 3 | GM | 38.5 | 16.5 | -22.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 |
| | Non-GM | 30.0 | 16.5 | -13.5 | | |
| Region 4 | GM | 35.1 | 26.3 | -8.8 | 0.9 | -1.7 |
| | Non-GM | 34.2 | 28.0 | -6.2 | | |

**Source**: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

[11] Main soybean-producing areas in Ontario and Quebec:

| **Ontario** | | **Quebec** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Region No. | Region Name | Region No. | Region Name |
| 1 | Southern Ontario | 4 | Mauricie-Bois-Francs |
| 2 | Western Ontario | 7 | Lanaudière |
| 3 | Central Ontario | 9 | Laurentides |
| 4 | Eastern Ontario | 13 | Montérégie |

## Table 11b. Comparison of Average GM and Non-GM Soybean Yields, Based on Area, Quebec

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province | GM | 38.6 | 38.7 | 0.1 | **1.6** | **3.5** |
| | Non-GM | 37.0 | 35.2 | -1.8 | | |
| | **Mean** | **37.5** | **35.6** | **-1.9** | | |
| Region 4 | GM | 33.4 | 42.0 | 8.6 | 5.0 | 5.5 |
| | Non-GM | 28.4 | 36.5 | 8.1 | | |
| Region 7 | GM | 36.5 | 33.4 | -3.1 | -1.5 | -1.1 |
| | Non-GM | 38.0 | 34.5 | -3.5 | | |
| Region 9 | GM | 28.8 | 27.3 | -1.5 | -3.5 | -1.2 |
| | Non-GM | 32.3 | 28.5 | -3.8 | | |
| Region 13 | GM | 40.5 | 40.6 | 0.1 | -0.5 | 5.3 |
| | Non-GM | 41.0 | 35.3 | -5.7 | | |

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 12a. Comparison of Average Grain Corn Yields, Based on Overall Farm Yield , Ontario

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000*** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province | Non-GM AND GM | 107.2 | 109.6 | 2.4 | -2.4 | -1.8 |
| | GM | 104.8 | 107.8 | 3.0 | **2.6** | **10.2** |
| | Non-GM | 102.2 | 97.6 | -4.6 | **5.0** | **12** |
| Region 1 | Non-GM AND GM | 116.6 | 114.5 | -2.1 | -8.2 | -7.8 |
| | GM | 108.4 | 106.7 | -1.7 | **-4.8** | **11.5** |
| | Non-GM | 113.2 | 95.2 | -18.0 | **3.4** | **19.3** |
| Region 2 | Non-GM AND GM | 107.0 | 114.9 | 7.9 | 0.3 | 2.8 |
| | GM | 107.3 | 117.7 | 10.4 | **9.5** | **13.5** |
| | Non-GM | 97.8 | 104.2 | 6.4 | **9.2** | **10.7** |
| Region 3 | Non-GM AND GM | 99.9 | 77.8 | -22.1 | 1.0 | 10.2 |
| | GM | 100.9 | 88.0 | -12.9 | **13.0** | **14.4** |
| | Non-GM | 87.9 | 73.6 | -14.3 | **12.0** | **4.2** |
| Region 4 | Non-GM AND GM | 85.8 | 100.2 | 14.4 | -0.7 | -40.9 |
| | GM | 85.1 | 59.3 | -25.8 | **4.7** | **-40.7** |
| | Non-GM | 80.4 | 100.0 | 19.6 | **5.4** | **0.2** |

[7]

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

[7] *: First row gives the yield difference between GM and GM and non-GM, the second row the yield difference between GM and non-GM and the third row, the yield difference between non-GM and GM and non-GM. Same remark valid for tables 12a, 12b, 13a, 13b.

## Table12b. Comparison of Average Grain Corn Yields, based on Overall Farm Yield, Quebec

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province | Non-GM AND GM | 96.8 | 122.5 | 25.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| | GM | 97.3 | 122.8 | 25.5 | **13.1** | **4.0** |
| | Non-GM | 84.2 | 118.8 | 34.6 | **12.6** | **3.7** |
| Region 4 | Non-GM AND GM | 78.8 | 124.8 | 46.0 | 10.9 | 17.9 |
| | GM | 89.7 | 142.7 | 53.0 | **17.1** | **17.6** |
| | Non-GM | 72.6 | 125.1 | 52.5 | **6.2** | **-0.3** |
| Region 7 | Non-GM AND GM | 83.8 | 105.0 | 21.2 | 1.9 | -10.0 |
| | GM | 85.7 | 95.0 | 9.3 | **5.7** | **-20.0** |
| | Non-GM | 80.0 | 115.0 | 35.0 | **3.8** | **-10.0** |
| Region 9 | Non-GM AND GM | 95.3 | 83.8 | -11.5 | -17.0 | - |
| | GM | 78.3 | 0.0 | - | **3.9** | - |
| | Non-GM | 74.4 | 83.5 | 9.1 | **20.9** | **0.3** |
| Region 13 | Non-GM AND GM | 102.8 | 125.7 | 22.9 | 2.8 | -3.3 |
| | GM | 105.6 | 122.4 | 16.8 | **13.1** | **-0.1** |
| | Non-GM | 92.5 | 122.5 | 30.0 | **10.3** | **3.2** |

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 13a. Comparison of Average Soybean Yields, Based on Overall Farm Yield, Ontario

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province | Non-GM AND GM | 38.1 | 21.6 | -16.5 | 0.6 | 2.0 |
| | GM | 38.7 | 23.6 | -15.1 | **0.6** | **1.9** |
| | Non-GM | 38.1 | 21.7 | -16.4 | **0.0** | **-0.1** |
| Region 1 | Non-GM AND GM | 40.2 | 20.3 | -19.9 | 0.4 | 2.7 |
| | GM | 40.6 | 23.0 | -17.6 | **1.2** | **2.0** |
| | Non-GM | 39.4 | 21.0 | -18.4 | **0.8** | **-0.7** |
| Region 2 | Non-GM AND GM | 36.6 | 21.9 | -14.7 | 1.0 | 3.3 |
| | GM | 37.6 | 25.2 | -12.4 | **-1.0** | **3.0** |
| | Non-GM | 38.6 | 22.2 | -16.4 | **-2.0** | **-0.3** |
| Region 3 | Non-GM AND GM | 32.1 | 17.0 | -15.1 | 3.9 | -2.2 |
| | GM | 36.0 | 14.8 | -21.2 | **5.2** | **-3.1** |
| | Non-GM | 30.8 | 17.9 | -12.9 | **1.3** | **-0.9** |
| Region 4 | Non-GM AND GM | 35.4 | 29.4 | -6.0 | -1.3 | -1.9 |
| | GM | 34.1 | 27.5 | -6.6 | **-0.1** | **-0.5** |
| | Non-GM | 34.2 | 28.0 | -6.2 | **1.2** | **1.4** |

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

**Table13b. Comparison of Average Soybean Yields, Based on Overall Farm Yield, Quebec**

| Level of Analysis | Group | 2000 | 2001 | **Difference between 2001 and 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000** | **Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Province | Non-GM AND GM | 40.4 | 30.6 | -9.8 | -0.9 | 19.2 |
| | GM | 39.5 | 49.8 | 10.3 | **2.3** | **14.4** |
| | Non-GM | 37.2 | 35.4 | -1.8 | **3.2** | **-4.8** |
| Region 4 | Non-GM AND GM | 32.2 | 39.6 | 7.4 | 3.4 | 1.7 |
| | GM | 35.6 | 41.3 | 5.7 | **4.2** | **5.1** |
| | Non-GM | 31.4 | 36.2 | 4.8 | **0.8** | **3.4** |
| Region 7 | Non-GM AND GM | 47.5 | 21.0 | -26.5 | -9.8 | 17.6 |
| | GM | 37.7 | 38.6 | 0.9 | **-2.0** | **0.8** |
| | Non-GM | 39.7 | 37.8 | -1.9 | **7.8** | **-16.8** |
| Region 9 | Non-GM AND GM | 40.2 | 21.1 | -19.1 | -13.4 | 13.6 |
| | GM | 26.8 | 34.7 | 7.9 | **-7.7** | **6.9** |
| | Non-GM | 34.5 | 27.8 | -6.7 | **5.7** | **-6.7** |
| Region 13 | Non-GM AND GM | 40.9 | 33.6 | -7.3 | 0.3 | 5.9 |
| | GM | 41.2 | 39.5 | -1.7 | **0.0** | **4.3** |
| | Non-GM | 41.2 | 35.2 | -6.0 | **-0.3** | **-1.6** |

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 14a. Changes in GM and Non-GM Grain Corn Yield by Province, and Farm Size

| Farm size | GM Grain corn Yield (bushels / acre) | | | Non-GM Grain corn Yield (bushels / acre) | | | Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000 | | Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000 | 2001 | Difference between 2001 and 2000 | 2000 | 2001 | Difference between 2001 and 2000 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Quebec** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farms <= 490 acres | 100.1 | 119.9 | 19.8 | 92.9 | 121.1 | 28.2 | 7.2 | 2.01 ** | -1.2 | 0.34 ns |
| Farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 107.1 | 116.0 | 8.9 | 90.5 | 119.7 | 29.2 | 16.6 | 1.82 * | -3.7 | 0.69 ns |
| Farms > 980 acres | 102.1 | 124.1 | 22.0 | 90.4 | 128.3 | 37.9 | 11.7 | 1.22 ns | -4.2 | 0.69 ns |
| **Ontario** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farms <= 490 acres | 110.0 | 111.9 | 1.9 | 106.7 | 103.7 | -3.0 | 3.3 | 1.87 * | 8.2 | 2.65 *** |
| Farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 109.7 | 111.9 | 2.2 | 102.6 | 101.1 | -1.5 | 7.1 | 2.46 ** | 10.8 | 2.33 ** |
| Farms > 980 acres | 109.0 | 104.1 | -4.9 | 102.7 | 96.8 | -5.9 | 6.3 | 1.54 ns | 7.3 | 1.84 * |

***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

## Table 14b. Changes in GM and Non-GM Soybean Yield by Province, Commodity and Farm Size

| Farm size | GM Soybean Yield (bushels / acre) | | | Non-GM Soybean Yield (bushels / acre) | | | Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2000 | | Yield Difference between GM and Non-GM in 2001 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000 | 2001 | Difference between 2001 and 2000 | 2000 | 2001 | Difference between 2001 and 2000 | | T-test | | T-test |
| **Quebec** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farms <= 490 acres | 39.6 | 37.3 | -2.3 | 37.9 | 35.8 | -2.1 | 1.7 | 1.01 ns | 1.5 | 0.72 ns |
| Farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 37.4 | 37.5 | 0.1 | 37.0 | 34.3 | -2.7 | 0.4 | 0.28 ns | 3.2 | 1.85 * |
| Farms > 980 acres | 38.1 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 35.4 | 0.5 | 3.2 | 0.65 ns | 2.7 | 1.69 * |
| **Ontario** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farms <= 490 acres | 38.9 | 22.3 | -16.6 | 39.2 | 21.9 | -17.3 | -0.3 | 0.33 ns | 0.4 | 0.66 ns |
| Farms > 490 acres and <= 980 acres | 41.1 | 22.0 | -19.1 | 39.0 | 20.5 | -18.5 | 2.1 | 0.76 ns | 1.5 | 1.51 ns |
| Farms > 980 acres | 37.5 | 20.4 | -17.1 | 35.3 | 19.4 | -15.9 | 2.2 | 1.79 * | 1.0 | 1.05 ns |

***: Significantly different at 1% **: Significantly different at 5% *: Significantly different at 10% ns: Not significant

***Source***: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, calculated estimates from data of the 2000 and 2001 June Farm Surveys.

**APPENDIX 3. Agricultural Regions of Ontario and Quebec (1996 Census of Agriculture)**


QUEBEC
1996 Census Agricultural Regions
QUÉBEC
Régions agricoles de recensement, 1996
Legend Légende
1 Bas-Saint-Laurent
2 Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean-Côte-Nord
3 Québec
4 Mauricie-Bois-Francs
5 Estrie
6 Montréal-Laval
7 Lanaudière
8 Outaouais
9 Laurentides
10 Abitibi-Témiscamingue-Nord-du-Québec
11 Gaspésie-Îles-de-la-Madeleine
12 Chaudière-Appalaches
13 Montérégie
Source: 1996 Census of Agriculture, Agriculture, Division, Statistics Canada
Source : Recensement de l'agriculture de 1996, Division de l'agriculture, Statistique Canada

# ONTARIO

**1996 Census Agricultural Regions**

# ONTARIO

**Régions agricoles de recensement, 1996**

| LEGEND | LÉGENDE |
|---|---|
| 1 Southern Ontario Region | Région du Sud de l'Ontario |
| 2 Western Ontario Region | Région de l'Ouest de l'Ontario |
| 3 Central Ontario Region | Région du Centre de l'Ontario |
| 4 Eastern Ontario Region | Région de l'Est de l'Ontario |
| 5 Northen Ontario Region | Région du Nord de l'Ontario |




Source: 1996 Census of Agriculture, Agriculture Division, Statistics Canada

Source : Recensement de l'agriculture de 1996, Division de l'agriculture, Statistique Canada

# Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series

**(* Available at** http://dissemination.statcan.ca/english/IPS/Data/21-601-MIE.htm**)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| No.1 | (21-601-MPE80001) | **A Description of Theil's RMPSE Method in Agricultural Statistical Forecasts (1980)**, Stuart Pursey |
| No.3 | (21-601-MPE81003) | **A Review of the Livestock Estimating Project with Recommendations for the Future (1981)**, Bernard Rosien and Elizabeth Leckie |
| No.4 | (21-601-MPE84004) | **An Overview of the Canadian Oilseed Industry (1984)**, Glenn Lennox |
| No.5 | (21-601-MPE84005) | **Preliminary Analysis of the Contribution of Direct Government Payments to Realized Net Farm Income (1984)**, Lambert Gauthier |
| No.6 | (21-601-MPE84006) | **Characteristics of Farm Entrants and their Enterprises in Southern Ontario for the Years 1966 to 1976 (1984)**, Jean B. Down |
| No.7 | (21-601-MPE84007) | **A Summary of Commodity Programs in the United States (1984)**, Allister Hickson |
| No.8 | (21-601-MPE84008) | **Prairie Summerfallow Intensity: An Analysis of 1981 Census Data (1984)**, Les Macartney |
| No.9 | (21-601-MPE85009) | **The Changing Profile of the Canadian Pig Sector (1985)**, Mike Shumsky |
| No.10 | (21-601-MPE86010) | **Revisions to the Treatment of Imputed House Rents in the Canadian Farm Accounts, 1926-1979 (1986)**, Mike Trant |
| No.11 | (21-601-MPE92011) | **The Ratio Estimator: an Intuitive Explanation and Its Use in Estimating Agriculture Variables (1992)**, François maranda and Stuart Pursey |
| No.12 | (21-601-MPE91012) | **The Impact of Geographic Distortion Due to the Headquarters Rule (1991)**, Rick Burroughs |
| No.13 | (21-601-MPE91013) | **The Quality of Agriculture Data - Strengths and Weaknesses (1991)**, Stuart Pursey |
| No.14 | (21-601-MPE92014) | **Alternative Frameworks for Rural Data (1992)**, A.M. Fuller, Derek Cook and Dr. John Fitzsimons |
| No.15 | (21-601-MPE93015) | **Trends and Characteristics of Rural and Small Town Canada (1993)**, Brian Bigs, Ray Bollman and Michael McNames |
| No.16 | (21-601-MPE92016) | **The Microdynamics and Farm Family Economics of Structural Change in Agriculture (1992)**, Phil Ehrensaft and Ray Bollman |
| No.17 | (21-601-MPE93017) | **Grains and Oilseeds Consumption by Livestock and Poultry, Canada and Provinces 1992**, Livestock and Animal Products Section |
| No.18 | (21-601-MPE94018) | **Trends and Patterns of Agricultural Structural Change: Canada / US Comparison**, Ray Bollman, Leslie A. Whitener and Fu Lai Tung |
| No.19 | (21-601-MPE94019) | **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-MPE91020) | **Adjustment in Canadian Agriculture (1994)**, George McLaughlin |
| No.21 | (21-601-MPE93021) | **Microdynamics of Farm Size Growth and Decline: A Canada-United States Comparison**, Fred Gale and Stuart Pursey |
| No.22 | (21-601-MPE92022) | **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-MPE92023) | **Potatoes: A Comparison of Canada/USA Structure**, Glenn Zepp, Charles Plummer and Barbara McLaughlin |
| No.24 | (21-601-MPE94024) | **Farm Structure Data: A US-Canadian Comparative Review**, Victor J. Oliveira, Leslie A. Whitener and Ray Bollman |
| No.25 | (21-601-MPE94025) | **Grain Marketing Statistics Statistical Methods Working Paper Version 2**, Karen Gray |
| No.26 | (21-601-MPE94026) | **Farm Business Performance: Estimates from the Whole Farm Database**, W. Steven Danford |
| No.27 | (21-601-MPE94027) | **An Attempt to Measure Rural Tourism Employment**, Brian Biggs |
| No.28* | (21-601-MIE95028) | **Delineation of the Canadian Agricultural Ecumene for 1991**, Timothy J. Werschler |
| No.29 | (21-601-MPE95029) | **Mapping the Diversity of Rural Economies: A preliminary Typology of Rural Canada**, Liz Hawkins |
| No.30* | (21-601-MIE96030) | **Structure and Trends of Rural Employment: Canada in the Ciontext of OECD Countries**, Ron Cunningham and Ray D. Bollman |
| No.31* | (21-601-MIE96031) | **A New Approach to Non-CMA/CA Areas**, Linda Howatson-Leo and Louise Earl |

# Agriculture and Rural Working Paper Series (continued)

**(* Available at** http://dissemination.statcan.ca/english/IPS/Data/21-601-MIE.htm**)**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| No.32 | (21-601-MPE96032) | **Employment in Agriculture and Closely Related Industries in Rural Areas: Structure and Change 1981-1991**, Sylvain Cloutier |
| No.33* | (21-601-MIE98033) | **Hobby Farming - For Pleasure or Profit?**, Stephen Boyd |
| No.34* | (21-601-MIE98034) | **Utilization of Document Imaging Technology by the 1996 Canadian Census of Agriculture**, Mel Jones and Ivan Green |
| No.35* | (21-601-MIE98035) | **Employment Patterns in the Non-Metro Workforce**, Robert Mendelson |
| No.36* | (21-601-MIE98036) | **Rural and Small Town Population is Growing in the 1990s**, Robert Mendelson and Ray D. Bollman |
| No.37* | (21-601-MIE98037) | **The Composition of Business Establishments in Smaller and Larger Communities in Canada**, Robert Mendelson |
| No.38* | (21-601-MIE98038) | **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-MIE99039) | **Human Capital and Rural Development: What Are the Linkages?**, Ray D. Bollman |
| No.40* | (21-601-MIE99040) | **Computer Use and Internet Use by Members of Rural Households**, Margaret Thompson-James |
| No.41* | (21-601-MIE99041) | **RRSP Contributions by Canadian Farm Producers in 1994**, Marco Morin |
| No.42* | (21-601-MIE99042) | **Integration of Administrative Data with Survey and Census Data**, Michael Trant and Patricia Whitridge |
| No.43* | (21-601-MIE01043) | **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-MIE01044) | **Rural Youth Migration Between 1971 and 1996**, Juno Tremblay |
| No.45* | (21-601-MIE01045) | **Measuring Economic Well-Being of Rural Canadians Using Income Indicators**, Carlo Rupnik, Margaret Thompson-James and Ray D. Bollman |
| No.46* | (21-601-MIE01046) | **The Geographical Patterns of Socio-Economic Well-Being of First Nations Communities in Canada**, Robin P. Armstrong |
| No.47* | (21-601-MIE01047) | **Distribution and Concentration of Canadian Livestock**, Martin S. Beaulieu |
| No.48* | (21-601-MIE01048) | **Intensive Livestock Farming: Does Farm Size Matter?**, Martin S. Beaulieu |
| No.49* | (21-601-MIE01049) | **Agriculture Statistics for Rural Development**, Ray D. Bollman |
| No.50* | (21-601-MIE01050) | **Rural and Small Town Employment: Structure by Industry**, Roland Beshiri and Ray D. Bollman |
| No.51* | (21-601-MIE01051) | **Working Time: How do Farmers Juggle with it and How has it Impacted Their Farmily Total Income**, Sylvain Cloutier |
| No.52* | (21-601-MIE01052) | **Growers of Genetically Modified Grain Corn and Soybeans in Quebec and Ontario: A Profile**, Bernard Hategekimana |
| No.53* | (21-601-MIE02053) | **Integration of Canadian and U.S. Cattle Markets**, Rita Athwal |