Table 20. Contract Provisions for Variation in Quantity and Quality for Feeder Pigs

(Based on 132 contracts reported)

	Farms		Farms
Lesser quantity: Contractor would have accepted pigs delivered Producer would have purchased the deficit amount to fulfill contract Producer would have made a cash payment to fulfill contract Contract would have been invalidated Contract included a natural disaster clause No provision to cover lesser quantity	56 2 2 2 2 3 58 16	Lower quality: Contractor would have accepted pigs delivered	9 14 - - 60 15
Greater quantity: No payment would have been received for excess produced	2 15	market No provision to cover lower quality Other	26 11 4
Producer would have received a reduced payment for excess. Excess would have been offered to contractor; then sold on open market. Producer would have received an incentive or premium payment. No provision to cover greater quantity	1 20 23 63 16	Higher quality: No additional payment would have been received Producer would have received an incentive or premium payment Pigs would have been sold on open market Pigs would have been offered to contractor; then sold on open market No provision to cover higher quality Other	43 31 5 31 6

Table 21. Other Contract Characteristics for Feeder Pigs

(Based on 132 contracts reported)

		Feeder pigs produced under contract in 1977							
	Total	1 to 49 pigs	50 to 99 pigs	100 to 199 pigs	200 to 499 pigs	500 to 999 pigs	1,000 pigs and over		
Other contractors were available for negotiation	53	_	2	3	22	8	18		
Producer had knowledge of key provisions of other contracts	39	_	2	3	15	8	11		
Negotiations were undertaken with more than one contractor	18	-	ī	-	7	2	8		
Contract was specified in writing	117	5	3	12	49	25	23		
Contract covered more than one production period	111	5	2	10	45	20	29		
Contract specified a specific number of feeder pigs	20	_	_	2	10	5	3		
Product was pooled with others prior to final payment				-			-		
determination	81	3	1	8	40	20	9		
Product was under a State or Federal market order	10	1	-	-	5	3	i l		
Contractor was a cooperative	100	5	3	12	42	24	14		
Producer was a member of this cooperative	90	3	2	11	39	23	12		
Contract was associated with a joint venture between two or	,,,,	,	2		3,	23			
more cooperatives or a cooperative and another firm	6	1	_	2	_	3	2		
Producer's operation was a part of this joint venture	4	_		2		1	1		
	10			_		_	11		
A bargaining association was involved in negotiating the contract	10	-	-	-	4	,	1		
Producer was a member of this bargaining association	9	-	-	-	3	3	1		
Contractor provided supply, demand and/or price outlook	67	•	-	~	0.5		,,,		
information	67	2	1	/	25	. 17	15		
Producer considered this as main source of market information	31	-	-	3	12	10	6		
Producer was generally satisfied with production terms of		_			_		Ì		
contract	124	5	4	12	7	25	31		
Producer was generally satisfied with marketing terms of contract	120	4	4	11	46	25	30		
Producer plans to continue utilization of contracts	92	3	4	7	32	21	25		
Pigs would have been produced without a contract	87	4	4	6	36	15	22		
Total reporting size of operation	129	5	4	12	50	26	32		

Table 22. Extent of Contract Usage for Feeder Pigs

(Based on 132 contracts reported. Producer's opinion of pigs produced under contract)

	1977				1972				1967			
<u></u>	Farms	Region I	Region II	Region III	Farms	Region I	Region II	Region III	Farms	Region I	Region II	Region III
Total reporting Percent of pigs in area contracted:	102	59	31	12	87	51	28	8	76	46	23	7
None	_	-	_	-	3	_	1	2	9	4	2	3
Under 25 percent	22	11	5	6	24	13	8	3	35	17	14	4
25 to 49 percent	16	7	6	3	26	11	12	3	21	15	6	_
50 to 74 percent	31	18	12	1	29	22	7	-	11	10	1	_
75 percent and over	33	23	8	2	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	_