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 Other	56 2 2 2 2 3 58 16	Lower quality: Contractor would have accepted pigs delivered Producer would have made cash payment to fulfill contract No payment would have been received for inferior pigs Contract would have been invalidated Contract included a natural disaster clause Producer would have received payment based on quality actually delivered Pigs would have been sold on open market Pigs would have been destroyed	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	-	-	-	-	-	_