

To obtain and throw some light on the most advantageous size of farm to operate, tables I and IA have been prepared. In studying the labour income in table IA it will be noticed that all groups are making a plus labour income, varying from \$351 to \$407 with an average of \$463. This average labour income is higher than the average labour income for the same districts as reported in the survey of 1919. There are two main reasons for this difference. First, the figures for the farms in the St. Gedeon (Lake St. John) district have been left out. If the reader will refer to the results of the 1919 survey and to table II in the present survey he will note that this district shows in both cases a minus labour income. A closer examination will reveal the fact that the minus labour incomes were due to the extraordinarily high values placed upon the land compared with other districts; that is, interest on capital consumed the profits. The incorporation of the results obtained on these farms in the table would not make a true average for the remaining districts where values are normal, nor would the figures obtained in this survey be comparable with figures obtained on similar surveys made in other provinces. Secondly, owing to higher prices obtainable for 1919 products than were obtainable the previous year, the average revenue from the farms in the present survey is much higher. The expenditure not having increased in proportion it leaves a general higher average labour income.

The figures given in tables I and IA are practically self-explanatory, but it may be well to call the attention of the reader to some of the outstanding facts. In the first place it will be noticed that the plus labour income does not increase in the same ratio as the size of the farms, as some might expect. There is a difference of \$236 in favour of the group of farms varying in size from 81 to 100 acres and a difference of only \$68 between the average of the smallest and the average of the largest farms. This shows that there is a tendency for farms of certain definite sizes to give larger labour incomes than a little larger or a little smaller farms.

Similar surveys conducted in other provinces and in the United States have revealed the fact that there are odd-sized farms which are too large for one and too small for two men; others are too large for two and too small for three men. On these odd-sized farms, with the exception of some on which specialization on some particular crop is practised with success, large average labour incomes are possible only through intensification of the system of farming and good farm management.

The results of this survey would appear to confirm the findings arrived at elsewhere and to demonstrate, through the above tables, that the most advantageous size of farms to operate are one-man farms of from 81 to 100 acres, two-men farms of from 141 to 160 acres and three-men farms of 200 acres or more. The writer realizes that there are many factors affecting the matter of advantageous size, such as type of farming followed, nature of the soil of the farm, location, number and age of children, available labour in district, and the knowledge and managerial ability of the farmer. The results obtained through the farm survey of the above groups reveals the following information: Percentages of farms receiving a plus labour income of \$600 or more according to size: 40 to 80 acres, 21 per cent; 81 to 100 acres, 38 per cent; 101 to 120 acres, 33 per cent; 121 to 140 acres, 35 per cent; 141 to 160 acres, 52 per cent; 161 to 180 acres, 48 per cent; 181 to 200 acres, 33 per cent; 200 and more acres, 50 per cent.

These figures substantiate the claim made that there are certain sized farms preferable to others, and further show that there are greater possibilities of farms of large acreage making a larger labour income, and also of providing a safe investment for capital which has a tendency to increase in value.

In studying the factors influencing the labour income of the various groups it will be noticed, in table IA, that the per cent cost of total expenses remain very nearly constant for all groups, the greatest deviation from the average either up or down being 1.2 per cent, regardless of capital invested or size of farms. It will also be