Table 52. Contract Provisions for Variation in Quantity and Quality for Tomatoes for Processing

(Based on 280 contracts reported)

	Farms		Farms
Lesser quantity: Contractor would have accepted tomatoes delivered Producer would have purchased deficit amount to fulfill contract Producer would have made cash payment to fulfill contract contract would have been invalidated Contract included a natural disaster clause	189 1 2 2 86	Lower quality: Contractor would have accepted tomatoes delivered	43 - 99 2 35
No provision to cover lesser quantity. Other	1 28	Producer would have received payment based on quality actually delivered Tomatoes would have been sold on open market Tomatoes would have been destroyed. Tomatoes would have been offered to contractor; then sold on open market No provision to cover lower quality Other	102 8 33 16 26 9
excess. Excess would have been offered to contractor; then sold on open market. Excess tomatoes would have been destroyed. Producer would have received an incentive or premium payment. No provision to cover greater quantity. Other.	3 87 36 3 78	Higher quality: No additional payment would have been received. Producer would have received an incentive or premium payment Tomatoes would have been sold on open market. Tomatoes would have been offered to the contractor; then sold on open market. No provision to cover higher quality. Other	208 7 3 8 48 11

Table 53. Other Contract Characteristics for Tomatoes for Processing

(Based on 280 contracts reported)

		Acres of tomatoes produced under contract in 1977							
	Total	1 to 49 acres	50 to 99 acres	100 to 249 acres	250 to 499 acres	500 to 749 acres	750 acres and over		
Other contractors were available for negotiation	157	67	28	33	14	8	7		
Producer had knowledge of key provisions of other contracts	115	37	24	29	12	8	5		
Negotiations were undertaken with more than one contractor	49	7	6	16	7	7	6		
Contract was specified in writing	260	107	46	52	29	14	12		
Contract covered more than one production period	5	4	-	-	-	-	1		
Contract specified a specific amount of tomatoes	165	54	29	35	25	11	11		
Product was pooled with others prior to final payment									
determination	42	18	7	7	5	2	3		
Product was under a State or Federal market order	54	12	9	16	10	4	3.		
Contractor was a cooperative	55	21	5	13	8	6	2		
Producer was a member of this cooperative	42	12	5	9	8	6	2		
Contract was associated with a joint venture between two or more			-	•	•	-	-		
cooperatives or a cooperative and another firm	11 /	6	_	4	_	1	- 1		
Producer's operation was a part of this joint venture	6	3	_	,		ī			
A bargaining association was involved in negotiating the contract	113	20	15	33	23	13	9		
Producer was a member of this bargaining association	77	14	10	24	17	8	4		
Contractor provided supply, demand and/or price outlook	{					_	1		
information	55	27	7	10	5	6	- 1		
Producer considered this as main source of market information.	32	15	Á	6	2	5	- 1		
Producer was generally satisfied with production terms of	32 {	-2	-	· ·	-	,			
	188	79	33	38	20	10	8		
contract	100	/ /	33	70	20		ı,		
Producer was generally satisfied with marketing terms of	169	56	30	37	24	11	11		
contract	205	71	38	44	30	12	10		
Producer plans to continue utilization of contracts	1	12	30	3	30	- 12			
Tomatoes would have been produced without a contract	19	12	1	3	3	-	- 1		
Total reporting size of operation	275	113	51	53	30	15	13		

Table 54. Extent of Contract Usage for Tomatoes for Processing

(Based on 280 contracts reported. Producer's opinion of tomatoes for processing produced under contract)

	1977				1972				1967			
	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 tomatoes in	241	62	86	93	219	58	80	81	195	54	77	64
area contracted: None Under 25 percent 25 to 49 percent 50 to 74 percent 75 percent and over	5 5 12 219	1 1 7 53	- 2 4 4 76	1 90	1 4 3 18 193	- - - 8 50	- 3 2 6 69	1 1 1 4 74	2 4 3 20 166	- - 11 43	1 2 3 6 65	1 2 - 3 58