V I R G I N I A

MARKETING AND FARM MANAGEMENT — ANNUAL REPORT — 1934

Index		Page
1 a 1	Land use planning	69-70
1 a 3.2	Production control, cotton	55, 61
1 a 3.5	Production control, tobacco	51-53,56-60
1 c 4.16	Enterprise accounts, truck and root . .	7-10
1 c 5	Farm accounts	1-5
1 c 5.4	Farm inventory	5
1 c 6	Farm organization	14-15
1 d 1.3	Buying fertilizer cooperatively	47
1 d 3.26	Milk producers' associations	16-27
1 d 3.32	Fruit growers' exchange	34-37
1 d 3.811	Egg marketing association	29
1 d 3.821	Poultry marketing association	32
1 d 3.1041	Canning crops association	38-39

FCL-13

REPORT FILES
OFFICE COOPERATIVE
EXTENSION WORK

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE EXTENSION WORK
OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

FROM DECEMBER 1, 1933 TO NOVEMBER 30, 1934.

Submitted by

Members of the Agricultural Economics Department.

Blacksburg, Virginia December 1, 1934.

Index

Page

A. Farm Management

(1) General Farm Accounts ---- 1
(2) A.A.A. Basic Commodity Record Books ---- 5
(3) Farm Inventory and Credit Statements ---- 6
(4) Single Enterprise Cost Accounts With Crops ---- 7
(5) Poultry Accounts ---- 11
(6) Reorganizing Demonstration Farms ---- 13
(7) Farm Development ---- 14

B. Marketing

(1) Cooperative Marketing of Milk ---- 16
(2) Stabilization of Milk Markets ---- 21
(3) Cooperative Marketing of Eggs ---- 28
(4) Turkey Pool Marketing ---- 31
(5) Cooperative Marketing of Fruit ---- 34
(6) Cooperative Tomato Canning ---- 38
(7) Cooperative Marketing of Rabbits ---- 40
(8) Cooperative Purchasing ---- 42

C. Other Activities

(1) Virginia Farm Economics ---- 49
(2) Radio Talks ---- 50
(3) The A. A. A. Program ---- 51
(4) Miscellaneous Activities ---- 62
(5) Land Planning ---- 69

Index (Cont'd)

	Page
D. Organization of the Department	73
E. Outlook for the Future	76
F. Statistical Summaries	78

General Farm Accounts

Specialist Employed on the Project

Mr. W. J. Rucksills, Jr., Farm Management Demonstrator, did all the work on this project.

Purpose

The primary purpose of the farm account project is to interest and train farmers in keeping records of their farm businesses. By keeping accurate accounts throughout the year, the farmer is enabled to make an analysis of his business at the end of the year. Such an analysis reveals both the strong and weak points of his business. The individual farmer can determine how his efficiency as a farmer compared with that of his neighbor by comparing the summary of his year's business with that of other farmers in the county. The main purpose of the farm account work is to enable farmers to increase their profits from year to year.

We feel that farmers should keep records of their operations and use the short and long time outlook for agriculture as a basis for planning their farming programs. The individual farmer should be able to gradually reorganize his farm business and materially increase his earnings over a period of years by carefully analyzing his farm record and applying the outlook to his individual case.

Method

Account schools were conducted by the farm management demonstrator in only ten counties this year. The bulk of the account books were distributed from this office by mail or handed to individual farmers by their county agents.

Time and Place

Record books were distributed from January through March in 60 counties.

Results

A total of 3894 records were distributed in 60 counties in 1934 as compared with 666 books in 74 counties in 1933.

Outlook for this Project During the Coming Year

During the coming year this project will be handled in about the same manner as it was during the year just ended. We feel that the work would be greatly improved if we had sufficient personnel to conduct farm management record closing schools in each county where there are twenty or more account keepers. Because of the lack of personnel we shall be unable to do this during the coming year, but will send out our general account book to farmers through the mail and to county agents who request them.

A. A. A. Basic Commodity Record Books

Specialists Responsible for this Project

Mr. W. J. Rushells, Jr., Farm Management Demonstrator, and Mr. P. E. Criswell, Assistant Agricultural Economist, conducted the work on this project.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to furnish each farmer signing an A. A.A. contract with a simple and convenient form in which to record all information which it will be necessary for him to furnish the Administration as proof of compliance with his contract or contracts. A further purpose of this project is to explain and familiarize each contract signer with the use of this record.

Method

On April 16 Mr. Criswell, United States Department of Agriculture, explained the project to the extension specialists. On the 16 to 18 Mr. Criswell and the farm management demonstrator contacted the district agents and the state supervisor of vocational agriculture. After these conferences meetings were held by the farm management demonstrator or Mr. Criswell in every county in which basic commodity contracts had been signed.

At these meetings an explanation was given of the A. A. A. Basic Commodity Record books to the county agents, Smith-Hughes teachers, members of the various community committees and to the contract signers in attendance. At these meetings it was suggested that the county agent, the Smith-Hughes teachers, and members of the various community committees hold similar meetings in the various communities of the county. In most cases these people agreed to hold

meetings over the county for the purpose of explaining the use of the record book to the contract signers. In other cases the members of the community committees agreed to set aside a particular time for contract signers in their neighborhood to call by for assistance in starting their record books.

Director Hutchcamp had all books sent directly to the county agents and they in turn distributed the books to contract signers. In most cases the books were mailed, along with a letter of explanation, to the contract signers. In other cases the books were given out in meetings, and in still other cases the inspectors delivered the books to the contract signers at the time of the first inspection.

Time and Place

Books were distributed from April 16 to May 29. Meetings were held from May 7-29. These books were distributed in every county in which basic commodity contracts had been signed.

Results

Approximately 35,000 books were distributed to contract signers in 1934. At least 2800 contract signers were reached in county meetings by either the farm management demonstrator or Mr. Cassell.

Farm Inventory and Credit Statements

Specialist Employed on this Project

Mr. W. J. Buchanan, Jr., Farm Management Demonstrator, did all the work on this project.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to interest as many farmers as possible in taking an inventory and making out a credit statement at the beginning and end of each year.

An annual inventory will:-

1. Show the farmer his net worth.
2. Show him how much he is getting ahead financially.
3. Provide a valuable list of property for use in case of a fire, or in the settlement of an estate.
4. Help him in getting bank credit.

Method

In December a circular letter was sent to each county agent, Smith-Hughes teacher and banker in the state. These agencies were invited to cooperate with the Extension Division in the distribution of the inventory and credit statement forms. These agencies assisted farmers in taking their inventories and in filling out their credit statements.

Time and Place

The inventory and credit statement forms were distributed during the early part of January. They were distributed in 88 counties.

Results

Requests were filled for 2878 copies of the inventory and credit statement forms. These forms were distributed in 38 counties.

Outlook

The work will be continued in the future more or less as it has been in the past.

Single Enterprise Cost Accounts With Crops

Specialist Employed on this Project

Mr. W. J. Nicholls, Jr., Farm Management Demonstrator, did all the work on this project.

Purpose:

The purpose of this project is to obtain accurate cost and cultural practice data on individual cash crops in the state. The information secured from the records on a single crop was summarized and taken to the farmers in group meetings. In these meetings the various factors affecting the cost of production, yield per acre, etc., as brought out by the records were discussed. These records were also used in connection with the outlook work. Mr. Kercher has made particularly good use of the potato cost figures in his outlook meetings. Cost figures and other data secured from the records were presented at both the tomato and potato hearings held by the A. A. A. this year.

Scope and Method

Enterprise accounts were supervised for potatoes and tomatoes in 1934. The farm management specialist, with the assistance of the county agents in the early potato producing counties, visited individual farmers and furnished each with a record book. On this visit the labor and expense records were brought up to date and each grower was given instructions on how to keep the records. One visit was made to each cooperator about the middle of the growing season. At this time the books were checked over and brought up to date. After the crop had been disposed of another visit was made to close out

and pick up the books. The books were then brought into the office for summarization and analysis, after which they were returned to the individual growers, together with a detailed summary of costs and returns for the crop and a comparison with average costs for other farmers in the study.

Mr. Dietrick and Mr. Beaver, together with the county agents, helped the farm management specialist with the tomato accounts. The methods used were about the same as with the potato records.

Time and Place

A. Potato records: Started April 10-14, 20-21, 26-28, and May 3-5.

Visited May 30 - June 7, records checked.

Visited Aug. 6-18 - records closed and picked up.

Records started in Accomac, Northampton, Princess Anne, Norfolk, James City and New Kent Counties.

B. Tomato records: Started June 14-22, 26-30, and July 5-11.

Visited Aug. 22-30 and Sept. 6-14, records checked.

Visited Oct. 16-20 and Oct. 29 - Nov. 1, records closed and picked up.

Records started in Lancaster, Westmoreland, Richmond, Essex, Bedford, Botetourt, Shenandoah and Page counties.

Results

A. Potato records -

A total of 130 records were started in comparison with 149 last year. A total of 90 records were closed this year as compared with 100 last year. A

partial summary of the findings of this study is given in Exhibit 1. This preliminary summary of the study has been written up and will appear in the December issue (No. 32) of Virginia Farm Economics.

Mr. Heather used the results of the 1933 potato cost study in all of his potato outlook meetings and he is making similar use of our 1934 potato cost figures.

The farm management demonstrator was called on to testify and present evidence at the Irish potato hearing held by the A. A. A. at Painter, Virginia, November 26-28. The evidence presented was based entirely on the potato records kept by farmers in 1933, 1933 and 1934. A copy of the evidence presented is included in this report as Exhibit 2.

2. Tomato records -

A total of 333 tomato records were started in eight counties this year as compared with 220 records started in seven counties last year. Last year 194 records were completed as compared with 217 completed records this year.

The summarization of the 1934 records was not completed in time for inclusion in this report. However, a detailed summary of the findings of this study will be given in the 1933 report. A detailed summary of the 1933 study appeared in the April issue (No. 29) of Virginia Farm Economics. This summary is given in Exhibit 3.

Messrs. Dietrich and Benner of the Horticulture Department used the results of our tomato study in all of their tomato meetings last winter and they plan to use this year's results in their meetings this year.

The results of the 1932 and 1933 studies were presented by Mr. Dietrich at the A. A. A. tomato hearing in Washington last winter.

EXHIBIT I

COST OF PRODUCING EARLY POTATOES IN VIRGINIA
IN 1954

Virginia ranked first in the production of early potatoes and ninth in total production of all potatoes during the five year period 1928-1932. According to "Crops and Markets" for October 1, 1954, estimated production for Virginia was 13,665,000 bushels, compared with the 8,640,000 bushel crop of 1953 and the five year average of 16,908,000 bushels.

Two counties, Northampton and Accomac, on the Eastern Shore of Virginia, produce approximately two-thirds of the entire Virginia crop. The counties surrounding Norfolk and bordering on the Chesapeake Bay are next in importance in the production of the Virginia crop of early potatoes.

Cost accounts on 1925.5 acres of early Irish potatoes of the 1954 crop were kept by 90 farmers. Books and directions for keeping these accounts were supplied by the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension Division, Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The farm management demonstrator set these accounts up; also closed them.

The average yield per acre on these 90 farms was 88.4 165-pound barrels. The average cost of producing an acre of potatoes was $94.40. Cull potatoes sold or fed were valued at $1.72 per acre. When this figure was subtracted from the total cost, it left a net cost of $92.68 for producing an acre of potatoes. The average net cost of producing a 165-pound barrel of potatoes was $1.05. The average selling price per barrel was $1.20, which leaked .89 per barrel of paying the cost of production. The net cost per acre ranged from $25.76 to $130.65 and the net cost per barrel was 32 cents to $4.86.

(Insert Table 1)

The total returns from potatoes averaged $70.94 per acre and lacked $21.74 of paying the average cost of production. After deducting from the total returns all the costs other than man labor (exclusive of contract labor), there remained sufficient returns to reimburse labor at the average rate of 47.0¢ per hour.

Account keepers in Accomac county received an average loss of 74.2¢ per hour for man labor spent on the potato crop. These farmers obtained an average yield of 80.6 barrels of salable No. 1 potatoes at a net cost of $93.20 per acre, or $1.16 per barrel. A loss of $22.37 per acre, or $0.28 per barrel, was sustained by this group. (Table 2).

With an average yield of 97.1 barrels of salable No. 1 potatoes per acre, account keepers in Northampton county received an average of 40.0¢ per hour of man labor spent on the potato crop. These farmers produced their potatoes at an average cost of $100.42 per acre, or $1.03 per barrel, and at a loss of $20.07 per acre, or .20 per barrel.

The Princess Anne county farmers received an average return of -87.7¢ per hour of man labor on the crop. This group produced their potatoes at a cost of $77.78 per acre, or $1.84 per barrel. They made an average loss of $16.84 per acre, or a loss of .83 per barrel.

Growers in James City county received an average return of -28.0¢ per hour of man labor on the crop. They produced their potatoes at a cost of $71.91 per acre, or $1.61 per barrel. These farmers lost an average of $15.08 per acre, or $0.31 per barrel.

Due to extreme differences in rainfall in various parts of the early potato section, it is impossible to show any correlation between amounts of fertilizer and manure used per acre and yield per acre. The variation in yield was wide, ranging from 16.8 barrels to 98.4 barrels per acre.

There is a close correlation between the yield per acre and cost per barrel. (See Table 8). On farms producing from 16.0 to 28.9 barrels of potatoes per acre, the cost per barrel averaged $2.44, whereas on farms producing 70 barrels and over per acre, the cost averaged only $1.44 per barrel. This suggests the importance of obtaining good yields economically.

Table 1.- DETAILED COST AND RETURNS FOR EARLY IRISH POTATOES, 90 VIRGINIA FARMS, 1925.5 ACRES, CROP SEASON OF 1934

Item	Average Cost per Acre in Dollars				
	A	B	C	D	E
GROWING COSTS:					
Use of land	$7.91	$10.07	$9.89	$5.96	$5.56
*Manure and cover crops	5.57	6.17	4.78	.26	1.46
*Fertilizer	24.10	25.92	28.54	26.14	23.12
*Lime	.29	.36	.38	.17	.10
Seed	18.03	16.50	21.06	17.77	13.89
Contract labor cutting seed	.52	.37	.69	.40	.56
Spray and dust material	.96	1.39	1.01	.66	.61
Man labor	2.02	2.78	2.86	3.05	3.13
Horse labor	3.69	3.56	3.82	2.88	3.85
Truck use	.05	.01	.11	.01	.04
Tractor use	.06	.15	.30	.77	.17
Equipment use	1.16	1.19	1.50	.75	.89
Interest	.56	.55	.69	.27	.74
Total	$64.12	$68.04	$75.83	$57.09	$54.92
HARVESTING COSTS:					
Man labor	.27	.20	.32	.17	.43
Horse work	.23	.19	.29	.16	.36
Contract labor picking up potatoes	5.86	6.71	7.23	4.02	5.62
Total	$ 6.50	$ 7.30	$ 7.86	$ 4.35	$ 6.41
MARKETING COSTS:					
Man labor	.36	.30	.45	.21	.49
Horse work	.06	.05	.07	---	.16
Truck use	.05	.04	.06	---	---
Contract hauling	3.05	2.16	3.60	3.70	1.94
Machine grading	1.48	.11	.75	4.82	.08
Package cost	13.65	14.38	18.38	7.56	9.56
Commissions	4.67	4.31	9.10	.25	.11
Deductions for undersize and decay	.51	.55	.90	.02	.23
Total	$23.18	$22.30	$33.24	$16.48	$12.57
Grand Total Cost	94.10	96.24	111.83	77.92	73.88
Value of culls sold or fed	1.72	2.58	2.11	.11	1.92
Grand total net cost of saleable No. 1's	92.38	93.66	109.42	77.78	71.91
No. 1 potatoes sold	70.94	60.32	89.35	61.24	56.83
Loss	21.74	33.37	20.07	16.54	15.08
YIELD PER ACRE (165 lb. bbls.)	56.4	50.8	67.1	50.6	47.7
COST PER BARREL	1.65	1.85	1.65	1.54	1.51
VALUE PER BARREL	1.26	1.19	1.33	1.21	1.20
LOSS PER BARREL	.39	.66	.30	.23	.31
**RETURNS PER HOUR OF MAN LABOR	-67.0¢	-74.2¢	-49.0¢	-57.7¢	-28.0¢

County	Number of farms keeping records	Average acres in potatoes per farm	Pounds fertilizer used per acre	Bags (165 lb. bags) of seed used per acre	Hours man labor per acre	Hours horse work per acre
A - State	90	21.5	1,975	5.9	58.7	47.5
B - Accomac	32	14.8	1,919	5.7	40.5	49.0
C - Northampton	22	32.8	1,857	4.7	41.2	51.5
D - Princess Anne	19	28.8	2,025	5.5	54.8	55.4
E - James City	17	16.4	1,965	5.5	59.5	54.8

* Only 80% of the total fertilizer expense charged to potatoes. Likewise only a portion of the manure and cover crop and lime expenses charged to potatoes. The percentage of these expenses charged varies from farm to farm depending on the number of years between applications.

** Returns per hour of man labor exclusive of contract labor.

Table 2.- Summary of Costs and Losses by Counties.
Virginia Early Irish Potatoes, 1934.

County	No. of Records	Yield per acre	Total Net Cost Per Acre	Total Net Cost Per Barrell	Value No.1 Potatoes Per Acre	Value No.1 Potatoes Per Barrel	Loss Per Acre	Loss Per Barrel	Returns per Hour Man Labor*
State	80	58.4	$ 92.69	$1.62	$70.94	$1.24	$21.74	.39	-27.0/
Accomac	22	50.6	92.69	1.83	60.32	1.19	32.37	.64	-78.2/
Northampton	22	67.1	109.42	1.63	82.35	1.23	30.07	.40	-45.0/
Princess Anne	19	55.6	77.72	1.36	61.24	1.21	16.34	.32	-27.7/
James City	17	47.7	71.61	1.51	56.83	1.20	15.06	.31	-25.0/

* Returns per hour of man labor exclusive of contract labor.

Table 8.- Relation of Yield per Acre to Cost of Production and Loss. Early Potatoes Virginia - Crop Season of 1934.

Yield Per Acre	Average yield per acre	Net Cost per acre	Net Cost per barrel	Loss per acre	Number of farms
10.0 - 29.9 barrels	22.6	$67.57	$2.44	$29.30	4
30.0 - 39.9 "	34.7	70.22	2.02	28.66	15
40.0 - 49.9 "	44.2	62.29	1.36	21.22	25
50.0 - 59.9 "	55.6	90.82	1.62	22.15	15
60.0 - 69.9 "	65.8	104.13	1.58	15.69	16
70.0 Barrels and Over	77.6	111.29	1.44	14.82	16

*165 pound barrels.

EXHIBIT 2
Introduction

During the period from March 11 to March 31, 1932, the farm management demonstrator, with the help of the county agents in the early Irish potato producing counties, assisted individual potato growers and started a potato record with each farmer desiring to cooperate in the cost of production study. The selection of the cooperators was made by the county agent in each county. The agents selected the average run of farmers, some good, some poor, and some indifferent. On the whole, it is thought that the group selected was representative of the average farmers for the area studied.

On the first visit a book was furnished each cooperating farmer by the farm management demonstrator. The work and expense records were brought up to date and each grower was given instructions on how to keep the record.

A second visit was made to each cooperator about the middle of the growing season. At this time the books were checked, and in case the grower's book was not up to date, the farm management demonstrator made the necessary entries to bring it up to date.

After the crop had been disposed of, a third visit was made to close out and pick up the record books. The books were then brought into the office for tabulation, summarization, and analysis. The books were then returned to their owners with a detailed summary of costs and returns for each individual crop, together with an average costs and returns summary for other farmers in the county.

During the period March 27 to April 24 the farm management demonstrator, together with the county agents, aided potato growers in starting their 1933 potato records. Again from April 10 to 28 the farm management demonstrator, together with the county agents, aided potato growers in starting their 1934 potato records. In both 1933 and 1934 the same procedure was followed as outlined above for 1932.

Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were secured from the material obtained from the cost studies made on early Irish potatoes in 1932, 1933, and 1934. A copy of each individual record, together with tabulation sheets for each year, are on file in the office of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Blacksburg, Virginia.

Exhibit #1

DETAILED COSTS AND RETURNS ON EARLY IRISH POTATOES, 69 VIRGINIA FARMS, 1928 ACRES, CROP SEASON OF 1932

Item	Average Cost per Acre in Dollars					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
GROWING COSTS:						
Use of land	$7.63	$10.05	$8.97	$4.53	$3.69	$5.67
*Manure and cover crops	4.65	9.13	5.71	.48	1.84	2.09
*Fertilizer	21.17	21.58	20.84	24.45	17.05	18.70
*Lime	.14	.14	.24	.21	----	----
Seed	9.96	12.40	9.16	9.55	7.62	7.75
Contract labor cutting seed	.60	.77	.42	.55	.27	.61
Spray and dust materials	.74	.88	1.04	.51	.56	.43
Man labor	5.41	5.82	5.17	2.95	5.09	5.24
Horse work	4.65	5.70	5.71	5.66	4.57	4.84
Truck use	.08	.15	.05	.02	.28	.04
Tractor use	.27	.04	.20	.19	----	.78
Equipment use	1.02	1.41	1.10	.50	.76	.61
Interest	.43	.69	.42	.22	.37	.34
Total	54.75	69.65	59.03	47.78	42.10	45.30
HARVESTING COSTS:						
Man labor	.59	.58	.51	.41	.54	.54
Horse work	.36	.35	.31	.25	.26	.33
Contract labor picking up potatoes	5.45	5.80	4.06	6.78	5.56	5.25
Truck use	.01	.01	.002	----	----	.01
Total	6.41	6.74	4.88	7.44	6.36	6.65
MARKETING COSTS:						
Man labor	.12	.18	.16	.10	1.16	.04
Horse work	.05	.13	.03	----	----	.03
Truck use	.12	.06	.13	.07	2.40	----
Contract hauling	2.90	3.60	1.44	5.10	1.94	1.50
Machine grading	.96	.25	----	4.71	----	.07
Package cost	11.30	15.14	9.30	9.70	6.81	8.39
Commissions	3.71	4.44	3.91	.90	1.16	3.09
Deductions for undersize and decay	.26	.54	.15	----	----	.11
Total	19.12	24.24	15.72	20.88	16.57	14.23
Grand total cost	80.28	98.63	79.63	76.80	64.96	66.16
Value of culls sold or fed	3.50	3.21	2.53	4.68	2.47	4.27
Grand total net cost of saleable No. 1's	76.57	95.42	73.10	71.15	62.49	61.89
No. 1 potatoes sold	79.31	81.32	49.08	104.03	80.80	73.68
Profit or loss	2.47	-14.10	-24.02	32.88	18.11	11.80
YIELD PER ACRE (165 lb. bbls.)	48.5	50.6	36.0	67.5	44.0	45.3
COST PER BARREL	1.59	1.95	2.09	1.05	1.12	1.41
VALUE PER BARREL	1.64	1.77	1.40	1.54	1.84	1.70
PROFIT PER BARREL	.05	-.09	-.69	.49	.41	.29
**RETURNS PER HOUR OF MAN LABOR	16.9¢	-11.0¢	-56.6¢	109.0¢	47.9¢	42.0¢

County	Number of farms keeping records	Hours man labor per acre	Hours horse work per acre	Average acres in potatoes per farm	Pounds of fertilizer used per acre	Bags of (165 pound bags) seed used per acre
A - State	69	59.5	51.6	27.8	2,001	6.1
B - Northampton	14	45.8	61.1	29.5	1,990	5.1
C - Accomac	20	55.6	44.8	14.0	1,382	3.6
D - Princess Anne	14	53.3	41.7	16.125	2,270	5.4
E - Elizabeth City and New Kent	7	57.2	43.2	4.14	1,693	5.0
F - James City	14	60.2	53.9	20.14	1,990	5.8

* Only 80% of the total fertilizer expense charged to potatoes. Likewise, only a portion of the manure and cover crop and lime expenses charged to potatoes. The percentage of these expenses charged varied from farm to farm depending on the number of years between applications.

** Returns per hour of man labor exclusive of contract labor.

DETAILED COSTS AND RETURNS ON EARLY IRISH POTATOES,
100 VIRGINIA FARMS, 1861 ACRES, CROP SEASON 1933

Item	Average cost per acre in dollars				
	A	B	C	D	E
GROWING COSTS:					
Use of land	5.01	5.02	11.10	8.82	8.06
*Manure and cover crops	2.05	1.56	3.90	5.54	.24
*Fertilizer	17.05	15.01	16.72	15.69	19.62
*Lime	.29	.02	.17	.11	.74
Seed	10.47	9.21	13.87	8.75	9.46
Contract labor cutting seed	.65	.46	.35	.28	.43
Spray and dust material	.74	.52	.69	1.15	.64
Man labor	2.79	3.16	2.75	2.77	2.63
Horse labor	3.35	4.10	3.72	3.54	2.99
Truck use	.12	---	.10	.08	.22
Tractor use	.11	.51	---	.02	.10
Equipment use	.99	.97	1.14	1.09	.73
Interest	.55	.42	.43	.32	.19
Total	44.31	40.12	54.99	48.96	45.10
HARVESTING COSTS:					
Man labor	.46	.53	.56	.40	.28
Horse work	.26	.32	.31	.25	.16
Contract labor digging up potatoes	4.22	4.17	4.74	4.84	5.09
Truck use	.02	---	.07	.01	---
Total	4.96	5.02	5.71	5.49	5.53
MARKETING COSTS:					
Man labor	.11	.06	.24	.03	.01
Horse work	.02	---	.02	.04	---
Truck use	.18	.37	.35	.06	.05
Contract hauling	2.06	1.78	2.25	1.54	2.69
Machine grading	1.11	.10	.16	.53	3.44
Package cost	9.90	7.69	15.15	12.45	4.97
Commissions	2.17	.22	2.92	5.92	.31
Deductions for undersize and decay	.07	---	.19	.06	---
Total	15.61	9.73	21.26	20.44	11.25
Grand total cost	64.87	54.92	81.96	74.89	57.91
Value of culls sold or fed	3.69	11.77	10.24	10.37	3.46
Grand total net cost of saleable No. 1's	60.99	47.15	71.72	64.51	54.45
No. 1 potatoes sold	117.41	108.86	106.61	142.62	106.20
Profit	56.42	61.90	37.79	77.11	51.75
YIELD PER ACRE (165 lb. Bbls.)	57.1	51.6	56.2	54.3	59.1
COST PER BARREL	1.65	1.06	1.46	1.38	1.09
VALUE PER BARREL	5.17	5.42	5.02	5.64	4.79
PROFIT PER BARREL	1.52	2.06	1.06	1.93	1.40
**RETURNS PER HOUR OF MAN LABOR	1.59	1.76	1.10	2.03	1.65

County	Number of farms keeping records	Hours man labor per acre	Hours horse work per acre	Average acres in potatoes per farm	Pounds of fertilizer used per acre	Rate of (165 lb. bags) seed used per acre
A - State	100	37.6	48.0	18.61	1,224	5.6
B - James City, Elizabeth City and New Kent	21	30.1	48.2	10.85	1,992	5.7
C - Northampton	17	37.8	56.6	20.77	1,020	4.7
D - Accomac	39	38.7	47.1	10.16	1,043	5.5
E - Princess Anne and Norfolk	23	35.7	41.3	2.58	2,665	5.4

* Only 80% of the total fertilizer expense charged to potatoes. Likewise only a portion of the manure and cover crop and lime expenses charged to potatoes. The percentage of these expenses charged varied from farm to farm depending on the number of years between applications.

** Returns per hour of man labor exclusive of contract labor.

DETAILED COST AND RETURNS FOR EARLY IRISH POTATOES, SO VIRGINIA FARMS, 1925.6 ACRES, CROP SEASON OF 1924

Item	Average Cost per Acre in Dollars				
	A	B	C	D	E
GROWING COSTS:					
Use of land	$7.91	$10.07	$9.89	$8.96	$8.56
*Manure and cover crop	5.67	8.17	4.78	.26	1.46
*Fertilizer	24.10	23.92	25.54	26.14	25.12
*Lime	.29	.36	.58	.17	.10
Seed	18.03	16.50	24.05	17.77	13.50
Contract labor cutting seed	.82	.37	.69	.40	.56
Spray and dust material	.86	1.39	1.01	.66	.61
Man labor	2.02	2.78	2.35	5.05	5.13
Horse labor	3.69	3.56	3.62	2.88	4.65
Truck use	.05	.01	.11	.01	.04
Tractor use	.26	.15	.39	.77	.17
Equipment use	1.16	1.19	1.50	.75	.89
Interest	.56	.55	.58	.27	.74
Total	$64.12	$68.34	$70.58	$57.09	$54.92
HARVESTING COSTS:					
Man labor	.27	.23	.32	.17	.40
Horse work	.22	.10	.29	.16	.56
Contract labor picking up potatoes	5.98	6.14	7.25	4.02	5.48
Total	$ 6.50	$ 6.35	$ 7.86	$ 4.35	$ 6.44
MARKETING COSTS:					
Man labor	.36	.31	.45	.21	.49
Horse work	.06	.05	.07	--	.16
Truck use	.05	.04	.06	--	--
Contract hauling	3.05	2.16	3.60	3.70	1.94
Machine grading	1.45	.11	.75	4.82	.09
Package cost	15.65	14.38	16.38	7.56	9.56
Commissions	4.67	4.30	6.10	.25	.11
Deductions for undersize and decay	.61	.55	.90	.02	.25
Total	$25.78	$21.90	$28.26	$16.55	$12.57
Grand Total Cost	94.40	96.24	111.58	77.99	73.93
Value of culls sold or fed	1.72	2.58	2.11	.11	1.92
Grand total net cost of salable					
No. 1's	92.68	93.66	109.42	77.78	71.91
No. 2 potatoes sold	70.94	60.32	89.56	61.24	56.83
Loss	21.74	33.37	20.07	16.54	15.08
YIELD PER ACRE (165 lb. bbls.)	56.4	50.6	67.1	50.6	47.7
COST PER BARREL	1.65	1.85	1.65	1.54	1.51
VALUE PER BARREL	1.26	1.10	1.08	1.21	1.20
LOSS PER BARREL	.39	.66	.30	.23	.21
**RETURNS PER HOUR OF MAN LABOR	-7.04	-74.24	-40.04	-37.74	-28.04

County	Number of farms keeping records	Average acres in potatoes used per farm	Pounds fertilizer used per acre	Bags (165 lb. bags) of seed used per acre	Hours man labor per acre	Hours horse work per acre
A - Otsego	90	22.4	1,900	5.6	51.7	47.5
B - Accomac	82	14.6	1,913	5.7	40.5	49.0
C - Northampton	22	32.0	1,867	4.7	47.2	51.5
D - Princess Anne	19	23.1	2,025	5.6	34.8	36.4
E - James City	17	16.4	1,953	5.5	59.5	54.5

* Only 80% of the total fertilizer expense charged to potatoes. Allowing only a portion of the manure and cover crop and lime expenses charged to potatoes, the percentage of these expenses charged varies from farm to farm depending on the number of years between applications.

** Returns per hour of man labor exclusive of contract labor.

EXHIBIT 4

Prices paid by Virginia potato farmers
for fertilizer and seed 1/

Year	Fertilizer (Per Ton)	Seed (Per 165 pound bag)
1932	$26.45	$2.43
1933	22.13	2.68
1934	31.30	4.62

1/ The above are average figures obtained from records kept by Virginia farmers. (1932 = 69 records; 1933 = 100 records; 1934 = 90 records.)

EXHIBIT 5

Some cash cost items entering into the production of early Irish potatoes - Virginia - 1932, 1933, and 1934

Fertilizer

In 1932 Virginia farmers paid from $22.70 per ton cash for a 7-8-5 goods to as high as $29.35 time price for the same goods. The average price paid by 69 farmers keeping records in 1932 was $26.46 per ton.

In 1933 Virginia farmers paid from $17.00 per ton cash for a 7-8-5 goods to as high as $27.75 time price for the same goods. The average price paid per ton by the 100 farmers keeping records in 1933 was $22.13 per ton.

In 1934, due to the N.R.A. Fertilizer Industry Code, the time price of $33.80 per ton for 6-8-5 goods (old 7-8-5) prevailed on the Eastern Shore of Virginia and in the Toano, Virginia, area. In the Norfolk area a time price of $32.15 per ton for 6-8-5 goods prevailed. The established deductions for cash payment allowed by the Code were followed, the cash price ranging from $27.35 to $29.73. The average price paid per ton by the 90 farmers keeping records in 1934 was $31.30 per ton.

Seed Potatoes

Maine Certified seed cost from $2.15 cash to $3.00 time price, per 11 peck sack, in 1932. The average price paid per 11 peck sack of seed (seed from all sources) purchased by the 69 growers keeping records in 1932 was $2.45.

Farmers in 1933 paid from $2.50 to $2.90 per 11 peck sack cash and from $3.50 to $3.75 per 11 peck sack time price for Maine Certified seed. The 100 farmers keeping records paid an average of $2.68 per 11 peck sack of seed (seed from all sources).

In 1934 Maine Certified seed sold at $4.00 to $4.25 cash price per 11 peck sack and from $4.75 to $5.50 per 11 peck sack time price. An average price of $4.62 per 11 peck sack of seed (seed from all sources) was paid by the 90 farmers keeping records in 1934.

Package Costs

In 1932 farmers paid a cash price of 25 cents to 26 cents per barrel for empty barrels, and the time price was 27 cents to 28 cents per barrel, depending on the quality of the barrel.

Covers sold for 3 cents each in all cases recorded in 1932.

The cash price for empty barrels was 23 cents to 25 cents per barrel in 1933 and the time price 25 cents to 27 cents per barrel, depending on the quality of the barrel. In a few cases a time price of 28 cents per barrel was charged for the better grade barrels.

The 1933 price for covers was 3 cents each in every case recorded.

The 1934 cash price was 30 cents and the time price 32 cents per barrel for empty barrels.

In all cases recorded in 1934 the cost per cover was 3½ cents.

In 1932 bags sold for 6 cents each, in 1933 they were 6½ cents each, and in 1934 they cost the growers 8 cents each. (The foregoing figures represent prices charged Princess Anne county farmers only. Prices charged growers in other sections were practically in line with those charged the Princess Anne growers).

In 1932 and again in 1934 (both years of low potato prices) a large number of farmers shipped potatoes in bulk rather than in packages. Had all record keepers shipped all of their potatoes in packages these two years the production cost per barrel would have been higher than that shown in Exhibits 1 and 3. The following table seems to support the above:

Year	Yield packages per acre (165 lb. packages)	Package 1/ cost per 165 lb. package	Barrel prices (Per Bbl.) Time	Barrel prices (Per Bbl.) Cash	Cover price (per cover)	Bag price (per bag)
1932	48.3	23.4¢	25¢-26¢	27¢-28¢	3¢	6¢
1933	37.1	26.7¢	23¢-25¢	25¢-28¢	3¢	6½¢
1934	56.4	24.2¢	30¢	32¢	3½¢	8¢

1/ Package cost per package includes cost of barrels, bags, and covers

Commissions

In 1932 the commission charge per package (165 lb.) for selling was 12½ cents and 15 cents with the 12½ cent charge predominating; in 1933 the commission charge was 15 cents and 22½ cents per package with the 22½ cent charge predominating, and in 1934 a commission of 15 cents was charged.

Calcium Arsenate

There has been practically no variation in the price charged for calcium arsenate during the 3-year period covered by the study.

EXHIBIT 6

Index of Prices Farmers Pay for Farm Machinery 1/

Index of Average Farm Price June, July and August. (Eastern Shore, Virginia) 2/

1910-1914 = 100

Year	Index	Index
1929	153	147
1930	154	125
1931	150	85
1932	141	62
1933	137	78
1934*	140	90

1/ Kopmer, R. V. and Vaughan, L. M. - Extension Handbook of Economic Information in Relation to the Agricultural Situation - page 5.

2/ New U. S. D. A. index July 1909-June 1914 = 100.

* 1934 figure for month of January only.

EXHIBIT 3

COST OF PRODUCING CANNING TOMATOES IN VIRGINIA IN 1938

Virginia was ninth in rank in the production of tomatoes for manufacture during the five-year period 1928-1932. According to "Crops and Markets" the December 1, 1938, estimated production for Virginia was 30,000 tons, compared with the 28,000 ton crop of 1932 and the five-year average of 44,000 tons.

Tomatoes for manufacture are produced in approximately 30 Virginia counties. Westmoreland, Lancaster, Essex, Bedford, Botetourt, Shenandoah, and Page are among the more important counties in the production of the Virginia crop, and the tomato crop is one of the principal cash crops in these counties.

Cost accounts on 899.7 acres of the 1938 Virginia crop of canning tomatoes were kept by 104 farmers. In Lancaster 41, Westmoreland 40, Essex 17, Shenandoah and Page 27, and Bedford and Botetourt counties 20 farmers kept these records. Books and instructions for keeping the accounts were furnished by the department of agricultural economics of the extension division of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The farm management demonstrator, together with the vegetable gardening specialist and the assistant garden specialist, set up and closed the accounts. The county agricultural agents in the counties listed above selected and helped obtain the cooperators in this project. An attempt was made to select representative farmers owning land of average fertility.

The average yield per acre on these 104 farms was 223.6 baskets (see footnote (*) of Table 1). The average cost of producing an acre of tomatoes was $200.54. The average return from tomatoes was $197.02 per acre, the returns exceeded the cost by $7.48. After all costs other than labor were deducted from the average returns, there remained a sufficient amount to reimburse labor at the rate of 21.8 cents per hour.

The average cost of producing a basket of tomatoes was 13.4 cents per basket, and the average selling price per basket was 17.0 cents, which left an average profit of 3.6 cents per basket.

There was a rather wide variation in the amount which the grower received from the canner for his fruit. Some canners paid as low as 11 cents per basket, compared with 25 cents paid by other canners for fruit of the same quality.

Man labor cost accounted for 30.06 percent of all costs. Manure, fertilizer, and lime for 24.00 percent; contract picking and hauling, 18.71 percent; horse work, 12.09 percent; use of land 12.00 percent; seed and plants 2.20 percent; truck, tractor and equipment use 1.47 percent, interest 0.90 percent, and spray and dust materials for 0.30 percent of the total cost of production.

The cost of production per acre ranged from $119.11 to $301.07 and the value per acre from $81.77 to $187.82. The profit per acre varied from a loss of $34.68 to a profit of $68.13. The cost of producing a basket of tomatoes ranged from 6.1 cents to 74.3 cents, and the returns per hour of man labor run from -.24 to $1.88.

Table 1.- Detailed Costs and Returns on Canning Tomatoes, 154 Virginia Farms, 899.7 Acres, Crop Season 1933.

	Average costs and returns per acre, in dollars					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Use of land	$3.70	$3.82	$3.26	$4.05	$4.88	$4.08
Manure	2.19	2.02	1.86	2.70	1.36	.86
Fertilizer	5.07	7.76	4.76	6.82	3.02	2.61
Lime	.06	.11	.04	.06	—	.01
Seed	.81	.87	1.48	.67	.71	.80
Plants	.09	.06	.11	.16	.12	.08
Spray and dust	.06	.06	.11	.04	.04	—
Man labor	9.12	6.14	6.96	8.92	12.88	12.97
Horse work	3.94	3.06	4.20	3.34	3.71	3.45
Truck use	.06	.01	.06	.28	—	.13
Tractor use	.20	.28	.11	.04	.08	.08
Equipment use	.47	.48	.80	.17	.48	.81
Contract plowing	2.51	2.96	2.41	2.38	2.34	2.22
Contract hauling	1.46	2.79	1.96	1.61	.39	1.12
Interest	.30	.29	.27	.30	.34	.28
Total cost	$30.34	$31.02	$29.45	$30.56	$29.82	$31.26
Tomatoes sold	37.82	38.76	36.87	37.38	32.07	47.39
Profit	7.48	7.74	9.32	-2.24	2.25	16.71
Yield (baskets) per acre*	223.3	197.1	210.8	207.3	228.0	290.2
Cost per basket	.136	.150	.140	.148	.148	.109
Value per basket	.170	.187	.165	.182	.138	.163
Profit or loss per basket	.034	.037	.044	-.011	.010	.054
Returns per hour of man labor	.718	.830	.841	.069	.165	.305

County	Number of farms keeping records	Total acres in tomatoes	Average acres in tomatoes per farm	Average per acre: Pounds fertilizer used	Hours man labor	Hours horse work
A - State	154	899.7	5.84	499	76.1	60.8
B - Lancaster	41	161.96	3.71	713	83.9	89.7
C - Westmoreland	40	132.0	3.30	874	88.5	86.4
D - Essex	17	85.18	5.13	894	87.8	45.5
E - Shenandoah and Page	27	125.5	2.02	314	90.4	48.0
F - Bedford and Botetourt	29	107.0	3.69	881	94.6	61.9

* Yield per acre is given in terms of 5/8 baskets - except where tomatoes were sold by weight, 80 pounds was considered a basket.

Table 2.- Relation Between Yield, Costs, and Returns (Per cent and Per Basket) in Producing Canning Tomatoes on 154 Virginia Farms, 820.7 Acres, Crop Season of 1933.

Yield (Baskets) per acre	No. of farms	Average yield per acre (1)	Cost per acre	Value tomatoes sold per acre	Profit per acre	Cost per basket (1)	Value per basket	Profit per basket (1)	Returns per hour of man labor
		Baskets	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents
99.9----	23	71.2	24.15	11.67	-12.48	.339	.164	-.175	-.066
100.0 -199.9----	47	146.9	27.00	25.71	- 1.29	.184	.175	-.009	.142
200.0 -299.9----	45	240.9	30.32	40.90	10.58	.126	.170	.044	.255
300.0 -399.9----	24	338.3	33.19	55.80	22.61	.098	.165	.067	.449
400.0 and over---	17	500.0	48.25	79.90	35.67	.096	.160	.072	.480
All farms	154	225.2	30.54	37.02	7.48	.136	.170	.034	.218

(1) See footnote (*) of Table 1.

The variation in yield was very wide, ranging from 24.1 to 908.4 baskets per acre. The storm of August 28, 1928, was in a large measure responsible for many of the low yields. However, there was a rather close correlation between yield per acre and (1) cost per acre, (2) value of tomatoes sold per acre, (3) profit per acre, and (4) returns per hour of man labor. This correlation is brought out in Table 8.

On 23 farms having an average yield of 71.2 baskets per acre the cost of producing an acre of tomatoes was $84.18 as compared with an average cost of $44.22 per acre for the 17 farms obtaining an average yield of 300 baskets per acre. Most of the extra cost of producing 300 baskets over a 71.2 basket yield is accounted for by the extra cost of picking and hauling the larger yield.

The value of tomatoes sold per acre increased as the yield increased as the farms averaging 71.2 baskets per acre. On these farms the average value of tomatoes sold per acre was only $113.00, whereas the average value was $78.00 per acre on the farms averaging 300 baskets yields.

The net profit per acre also varied with the yield. Those farms having an average yield of 300 baskets per acre made a net profit of $38.07, compared with the loss of $12.46 per acre for the group with an average yield of only 71.2 baskets per acre. It cost the high-yield group 8.2 cents to produce a basket of tomatoes and the low-yield group 62.3 cents per basket. The amount made per basket ranged from the loss of 17.5 cents to a profit of 7.2 cents. Those farms making an average yield of 300 baskets per acre received a return of 46 cents per hour for each hour spent on the tomato crop. However, the group with a yield of 71.2 baskets paid 9.6 cents per hour for the privilege of working the crop.

Poultry Accounts

Specialist Employed on this Project

Mr. W. J. Rothelle, Jr., Farm Management Demonstrator, did all the work on this project.

Purpose

The objects of this project are to teach farmers how to keep poultry accounts, to enable them to compute the costs of producing poultry and eggs, to help poultrymen discover ways of cheapening the cost of producing pullets, broilers, and eggs, and to enable poultrymen to improve their methods of managing the poultry farm business.

Method

This project was started in 1931 and the method used was explained in the 1931 annual report. A total of 612 poultry records were furnished old and new record keepers in 20 counties in 1934.

Time and Place

A large number of these books were mailed out by this office in compliance to requests received from individual producers. The county agents also filled many requests by furnishing these books to producers.

Results

Due to lack of personnel no follow-up work was done on this project in 1934. It is thought, however, that if the poultrymen are interested enough to write in for these account books that they should be furnished with them. The training received by individual poultry producers in 1931

and 1952 in keeping these books should be a distinctive advantage to most of them in helping them to continue this project with a minimum of assistance from this office.

Reorganizing Demonstration Farms

Specialist Employed on this Project

Mr. W. J. Nuckols, Jr., Farm Management Demonstrator, did all the work on this project.

Purpose

The purpose of the project "Reorganizing Farms in Tobacco Belt" was reported in detail in the annual report of 1927.

Method

Mr. Brodell of the United States Department of Agriculture and the farm management demonstrator visited cooperating farmers in Charlotte County and secured a farm survey of the 1928 crop year from each individual. Previous recommendations and plans for the future were discussed with each of the cooperators. Mr. Brodell summarized the records and sent each cooperator a summary of his business for 1928.

Time and Place

The annual visit was made July 19-21. This project is conducted in Charlotte County.

Results

Material not available at present. Mr. Brodell is now preparing a manuscript giving the results of this project.

Farm Development

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. H. H. Young, Head of Department.

This project is cooperative between the following parties: The Division of Farm Engineering and Drainage, United States Department of Agriculture, and the Departments of Agricultural Engineering, Agronomy and Agricultural Economics at V. P. I.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to assist cooperating farmers in making changes in their farm practices so that they can make more money.

Method

This project was started in the fall of 1931 and the method used was fully discussed in the 1932 annual report. Once a year a labor income record is taken on each farm. This is brought to the office and figured out, after which another visit is made to the farm and the progress of the project discussed with the farmer, as well as plans for the future.

Location

Botetourt, Albemarle, Buckingham, York, Princess Anne, Warwick, Elizabeth City, Appomattox, Tazewell, Scott, Lee, Smyth and Wythe counties.

Results

Of the 36 farmers who started this project, 35 are still cooperating. One farmer in Botetourt County dropped out after the end of the first year

and after he had put into effect practically all the recommendations given him. With one or two exceptions, the cooperating farmers are putting into effect the recommendations which were given them. In the majority of cases the adoption of these recommendations has apparently resulted in higher labor incomes.

Cooperative Marketing of Milk

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

Purpose

To assist groups of interested dairymen to organize and efficiently operate cooperative milk marketing associations so that they may develop an efficient and effective cooperative milk marketing association netting the members higher returns on every market in the state.

Methods

Tazewell - Conferences with committees of directors and officers.

Roanoke - Conferences with directors and officers and manager, two days, and personal assistance to manager in bookkeeping and computing basic allotments and Certificates of Interest. Met with county agent at times - spent eight days all told.

Lynchburg - Conferred with leaders and held meetings with dairymen. Spent parts of four days without apparent progress.

Danville - Conferred with leaders and members in cooperation with the Health Department. Spent parts of four days in the market.

Farmville - Spent parts of two days in conferences with dairymen and the county agent.

Harrisonburg - Spent parts of two days in conferring the management of the association and assisting them with computations.

Fredericksburg - Spent parts of two days in conferences with leaders and meeting with dairymen.

Waynesboro - Spent twelve days conferring with and assisting the management with accounting and record keeping problems and conferring with the directors and members in meetings.

Winchester - Spent parts of four days in conference with the manager.

Richmond - Spent two days in conferences with the officers.

Norfolk - Spent sixteen days assisting the secretary-treasurer with computations and at the annual meeting of the members.

Newport News - Spent parts of ten days conferring with the officers regarding plans, conferring with them and the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives and in the office preparing material for the loan application.

It is difficult to produce statistics to show the results of this type of service work in the form of benefits to the members. The improved functioning of the associations as a result of this service work is reflected in improved membership relations and united action in support of such measures as the Milk Control Law.

Location

Counties: Roanoke Market - Roanoke, Bedford.

Danville Market - Pittsylvania, Halifax.

Lynchburg Market - Bedford, Campbell, Amherst, Appomattox.

Farmville Market - Prince Edward.

Harrisonburg Market - Rockingham.

Waynesboro-Staunton Market - Augusta, Rockbridge.

Winchester Market - Frederick

Fredericksburg Market - Spotsylvania.

Richmond Market - Hanover, Amelia, Nottoway, etc.

Norfolk Market - Norfolk, Princess Anne, Nansemond, Southampton, Isle of Wight, James City.

Accomplishments

Tazewell - Assisted with plans for joint regulation of the market by Virginia and West Virginia milk control bodies.

Roanoke - Developed a smoothly functioning organization which was primarily responsible for securing the passage of the Milk Control Law which resulted in raising the price on the Roanoke market from $2.50 to $2.75 per cwt. of 4 percent milk.

Lynchburg - No progress made in developing a cooperative association.

Danville - Helped complete the organization of the Danville Wholesale Milk Producers Association which negotiated an increase in price from $2.60 to $2.90 per cwt. which was increased to $3.16 by the regulations of the Milk Commission.

Farmville - Helped the dairymen set up the Farmville Dairymen's Association which was instrumental in stabilizing the market.

Harrisonburg - Rendered service to the Valley of Virginia Milk Producers Association primarily in re-determining bases.

Fredericksburg - Helped the producers set up the Spotsylvania Milk Producers Association to negotiate improved prices on the Fredericksburg market.

Waynesboro - Aided the Early Dawn Cooperative Dairy to increase its operating efficiency.

Winchester - Aided the Orchard Farm Cooperative Dairy work out a price schedule of payments to producers which was more satisfactory to the dairymen.

Richmond - Rendered service to the Richmond Cooperative Milk Producers Association.

Norfolk - Rendered services to the Norfolk Cooperative Milk Producers Association, particularly in revising basic allotments, computing Certificates of Indebtedness, and checking distributors' reports.

Newport News - Helped the Colony Farms Cooperative Dairy complete its organization and secure a loan from the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives to finance the erection and equipping of a cooperative milk distributing plant, primarily to handle milk of producer-distributors.

Exhibits

Included in the exhibits are a copy of the Certificate of Interest of the Roanoke Association and pictures of the operations of Roanoke, Early Dawn and Norfolk Associations.

Continuation of the Project

The project should be continued along the same lines. The number of calls for assistance indicates that the Associations feel the need of this type of service.

Needs

More time is needed to help certain associations with specific problems, such as working out a practicable system of checking the route drivers and keeping an accurate inventory at Early Dawn Cooperative Dairy, and working out a program for improving membership relations of all the cooperative milk associations.

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

OF THE

ROANOKE COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

NOT NEGOTIABLE

This certifies that _____ has an interest in the Revolving Capital Fund of the ROANOKE COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, Inc., in the sum of $_____ for moneys deducted from returns due the member on milk sold the Association, and loaned and advanced unto it, which sum it hereby promises, covenants and agrees to pay the member, or his estate, when the Board of Directors finds that the Revolving Capital Fund of the Association has accumulated to ample proportions to properly finance the operations of the Association, or in any event upon the dissolution of the Association. The Certificates of Interest of this Association shall be retired in the order in which issued.

The Certificates of Interest issued by this Association are subject and junior to all other obligations thereof.

In witness whereof, the ROANOKE COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, Inc., has caused this certificate to be executed this _____ day of _____ 19_____.

(SEAL)

ROANOKE COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, Inc.

_____ Treasurer.

Stabilization of Milk Markets

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon E. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

Purpose

To assist interested groups in working out effective programs for stabilizing milk markets at price levels which approximately cover production costs for efficient producers. The ultimate goal is the establishment of permanent machinery for stabilizing milk markets at price levels that will approximately cover the cost of production of efficient dairymen and be as reasonable as possible to consumers to help increase the consumption of milk and its products.

Methods

From November, 1933 through January, 1934, the Marketing Specialist conferred with the Milk Section of the A. A. A. (3 days) regarding milk market licenses for seven Virginia markets and conferred with committees in these markets regarding their licenses and agreements. During late March and early April the Marketing Specialist spent a day in Charlottesville conferring with dairy organizations regarding the A. A. A. program for production control and two days in Philadelphia on the same program. Virginia producers opposed the plan as unfair to them.

Starting with three days in December, 1933 spent in studying the milk control laws of other states and drafting a law for Virginia, the Marketing Specialist made this his major project for the year. Following the

convention of the State Dairymen's Association which endorsed the control law, the Marketing Specialist spent four days in Richmond assisting the committee with drafting the law. He also spent a day attending the hearing on the bill before the House agriculture committee and was present when the bill was defeated. Several days later the Marketing Specialist met with the manager of the Roanoke Association to go over association matters and the manager showed him a telegram he had drafted asking the governor to hold the legislature in session until they passed the control law. The Marketing Specialist suggested he ask the governor for a hearing on the matter. The governor granted the hearing at which the opponents and supporters reached agreement on the bill which passed the General Assembly in the closing minutes of the session. This occupied two days time and another day was required at the hearing held by the governor before he signed the bill. From the latter part of May, when the Commission was appointed, until November 15, when the law was ruled unconstitutional, the Marketing Specialist spent 29 days in Richmond in conference with the Commission and attending hearings for the various markets assisting the groups present their case and advising with the Commission.

The Marketing Specialist spent forty days conferring with groups on the various markets helping them draw up the provisions they wanted included in the regulations, prepare supporting material, and put the regulations into operation. He also spent parts of ten other days in similar work in addition

to much time in the office working on material for the groups on the various markets to use in their hearings before the Commission.

Location

Counties: Bluefield-Tazewell Market - Bland and Tazewell.

Charlottesville Market - Albemarle.

Clifton Forge-Covington Market - Alleghany, Bath, Augusta.

Danville Market - Pittsylvania, Halifax.

Farmville Market - Prince Edward.

Fredericksburg Market - Spotsylvania.

Galax Market - Carroll, Grayson.

Harrisonburg Market - Rockingham.

Lynchburg Market - Bedford, Campbell, Amherst, Appomattox.

Newport News-Williamsburg Market - Warwick, York, Elizabeth City, James City.

Norfolk-Portsmouth Market - Norfolk, Princess Anne, Nansemond, Isle of Wight, Southampton, James City.

Petersburg-Hopewell Market - Dinwiddie, Prince George, Chesterfield, Amelia.

Roanoke Market - Roanoke, Montgomery, Franklin, Bedford, Botetourt.

Staunton-Waynesboro Market - Augusta.

Accomplishments

The Milk Control Law was enacted by the General Assembly in March, 1934. The Milk Commission was appointed in May and held the first hearing early in

June. The first regulations went into effect on the Roanoke market June 16. Regulations were in effect in eight market areas November 15 when the State Supreme Court ruled the Milk Control Law unconstitutional. The operation of the law brought substantial improvement toward stabilization at more favorable prices to the dairyman in virtually every market to which it was applied.

Bluefield-Tazewell - The foundations were laid for stabilization under joint regulation of the two states.

Charlottesville - The constitutionality of the law and the regulations under it were immediately challenged. Pending the decision of the Staunton case the regulations were withdrawn and a milk price war resulted. The wholesale producers gained in volume of sales but the price does not cover cost of production.

Clifton Forge-Covington - Hearings were held and preparations made to install regulations when the Staunton case was decided favorably. The court decision unfavorable to the law prevented the inauguration of the regulations.

Danville - The regulations worked well and to the satisfaction of virtually all parties. The price received by wholesale producers was raised from $2.00 to $2.18 per cwt.

Farmville - The enactment of the law enabled the association to hold the price cutters fairly well in line and improve conditions on the market.

Fredericksburg - The enactment of the law enabled the association to hold the price cutters fairly well in line and improve conditions on the market.

Galax - The enactment of the law enabled the association to hold the price cutters fairly well in line and improve conditions on the market.

Harrisonburg - The selling price was raised from 8-9¢ to 10-11¢ and the price to producers from $1.90 to $2.25 per cwt.

Lynchburg - The price for Class I milk to producers was raised from 17-22¢ to 23.6¢ per gallon for 4 percent milk with no increase in price to consumers.

Newport News - The price on the streets was raised from 10-11¢ to 13-13¢ and the price paid producers from 14-22¢ per gallon to 26.1¢ per gallon.

Norfolk - Price cutting that threatened a reduction in price to producers was largely eliminated and the Class I price to producers raised from 26.1¢ per gallon to 27¢.

Petersburg-Hopewell - Selling prices on the street were to a large degree stabilized and the price to producers raised from $2.75 to $3.20 per cwt. of 4 percent milk.

Roanoke - The selling price on the streets was restored from 10¢ to 12¢ per quart and the price to producers for Class I milk raised from $2.30 to $2.75 per cwt. of 4 percent milk with minor improvement in the prices of other classes of milk. Basic allotments were revised to a more equitable basis.

Staunton-Waynesboro - The selling prices were raised from the range of 8-12¢ and largely stabilized at 11¢ for 4 percent milk and a small volume of sales of higher test milk at 12¢. The price to producers was raised from a range of $1.40 to $2.50 for 4 percent milk to $2.80 per cwt. for 4 percent milk. The regulations requiring a deposit on bottles in which milk is sold by stores reduced the bottle loss of the Early Dawn Cooperative Dairy sufficiently that they were able to pay their members a higher price and sell the milk at 11¢ as compared with 12¢.

Exhibits

Included in the exhibits are a copy of the Milk Control Law and a sample copy of the regulations put into effect by the Commission, both of which the Marketing Specialist helped to draft.

Outlook

The various markets are attempting by voluntary agreement to continue the regulations in operation until the application for a re-hearing of the case before the Supreme Court is finally decided. The prospects for securing a re-hearing and a reversal of the decision are regarded as fair. The stabilization of the milk markets of the state depends upon the outcome of the re-hearing.

Needs

More time is needed to assist the producers groups on the various markets to work out the proper application of the regulations, especially the checking

of the records of the distributors to see that the producers are correctly paid. The Commission is financially unable to do this work; it is largely educational extension work in showing the representatives of the producers and the local Milk Board how to do the work of checking.

#24,798

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

Blacksburg, Virginia
January 17, 1934.

Dear Mr.

In Virginia we have been working on AAA milk market agreements since last summer. Seven of these agreements were sent to Washington for approval before September 10th and only the Richmond agreement has been put into operation; that was on December 20th. Apparently no action has been taken on the agreements for our other milk markets since the middle of December, when the reorganization of the AAA was started. The last time I was in Washington (early this month) they were still considering what policy to adopt in regard to milk market agreements.

You may have noticed a report in the newspapers last week that a new policy will be adopted in regard to milk market agreements. This policy would have the AAA milk market agreements set forth only the prices which distributors would be licensed to pay producers delivering milk to them. No selling prices on the streets would be established. Such a program may work fairly satisfactorily in markets where producer-distributors handle an insignificant proportion of the milk supplies. It is doubtful whether an agreement of the type proposed would be of much help on some Virginia markets where the greatest problem at present is price cutting. I have pointed this out in a letter to the AAA but as yet have received no reply.

The suggestion has been made that the dairy interests in Virginia attempt to secure the passage of a state milk market control law similar to the National Agricultural Adjustment Act. Under this proposal, a State Milk Market Commission would put into operation milk market agreements similar to those we have been working on under the AAA. The major responsibility for the operation of these agreements would be placed in the hands of local milk market boards representing both producers and distributors.

The operation of AAA milk market agreements and of various state milk control laws is coming up for discussion at the joint session of the Virginia Dairy Products Association and the Virginia Dairymen's Association meetings in Richmond the morning of Thursday, January 25th. The committee which is arranging the program for these meetings, is planning a time during the session when the representatives of the milk marketing cooperatives can get together and consider whether they wish to push the

enactment of a state milk marketing law. If D. E. Shank, president of the Dairy Products association, could get the distributors together and appoint a committee to act with a similar committee from the co-ops, the dairy interests could present a united front and stand a very good chance of getting favorable consideration for a milk marketing control law.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon H. Ward

Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist

GHW/nbs

Cooperative Marketing of Eggs

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

Purpose

To assist interested egg producers in developing an efficient and effective cooperative marketing organization to secure increased returns for the eggs, and to develop this cooperative to a point where it will get increased returns to poultrymen of all types located in all parts of the state where more eggs are produced than are needed on the local market.

Methods:

The Marketing Specialist conferred with directors of the Southern States Marketing Cooperative, the management and the Division of Markets regarding the set-up and operating methods. M. C. Kilpatrick, formerly with the State Poultry Federation, was engaged to do field work in educating producers in quality improvement so as to increase their returns through the Southern States Marketing Cooperative and build up the membership. The Marketing Specialist advised with him from time to time. They were unable to secure the cooperation of the Division of Markets on account of Director Nash's personal animosity for Mr. Kilpatrick. The activities of the Division of Markets tended to turn producers away from the Southern States Marketing Cooperative. The result was that Mr. Kilpatrick was unable to expand the volume sufficient to provide the funds for supporting

his field work. He was therefore shifted to a Southern States Cooperative district managership and the Division of Markets has since provided the field work for the Southern States Marketing Cooperative.

Location

Counties: The principal counties served by the Southern States Marketing Cooperative are:- Fairfax, Page, Culpeper, Orange, Shenandoah, Rockingham, Augusta, Lancaster, Gloucester, Caroline, Henrico, Hanover, Appomattox and Prince Edward.

Accomplishments

The Southern States Marketing Cooperative has cooperated with its jobber outlet in Washington in improving quality to the point that the prices received average 5¢ per dozen above the New York top quotation, as compared with 4¢ a dozen under that quotation two years ago. In addition, the expansion of operations of the cooperative has materially raised the price level for eggs over the entire northern half of the state in those sections producing for outside markets. The volume going through the Southern States Marketing Cooperative has been built up to where the operations are self-sustaining.

Outlook

With the cooperation of the Division of Markets restored, the producer support for the Southern States Marketing Cooperative will continue to grow. Progress is being made in developing additional outlets in Washington and if the returns to producers can be kept favorable as compared with prices offered by other agencies, the volume handled by the Southern States Marketing Cooperative will expand rapidly during the year.

Needs

The main need is a larger force in the field carrying on education among the poultrymen helping them to improve the quality of their eggs so as to get a larger proportion in the top grades to increase their returns. The V.P.I. Poultry Department and Division of Markets could work together on this project more closely to very good advantage with the V. P. I. specialists devoting much more time to the project.

Turkey Pool Marketing

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

Purpose

To assist interested groups of turkey growers to organize and operate and perpetuate cooperative turkey pools to market their turkeys alive or dressed cooperatively to obtain higher net returns in all important turkey producing sections of the state.

Methods

In order to create interest in turkey pooling the Marketing Specialist prepared brief publicity items telling of the accomplishments of various cooperative turkey marketing groups. These were sent out almost every week during the fall of 1933 and 1934 to county agents and vocational agriculture teachers for insertion in the local and county newspapers. When county agents wrote the Marketing Specialist that there were people in their counties interested in turkey pooling, he supplied them information regarding pooling methods and buyers. In the fall of 1934 the Marketing Specialist worked out an arrangement whereby Land O'Lakes cooperative agreed to handle dressed turkeys from Virginia pools but no group in Southwest Virginia was sufficiently interested to sell their turkeys dressed.

Location

Counties: Scott, Russell and Grayson. In addition the weekly publicity releases were sent to county agents and vocational agriculture teachers

throughout the turkey producing regions of southwestern, central and northern Virginia.

Accomplishments

In Scott County turkey pools operated in the fall of 1933 and sold turkeys for the members at substantial increases in price over the local prices. The pool operated in the Gate City section of the county netted 2-5¢ per pound more to the members and the Tungsten-Fort Blackmore pool obtained a price 2¢ to 3¢ a pound or or local prices which were offered by merchants paying one-half cash and one-half in trade.

The Castlewood pool in Russell County, in the fall of 1933, handled some 4,400 turkeys with a gain of over $1,100 to the 161 members. A somewhat similar accomplishment was made in the fall of 1934 when County Agent Connelly combined the Lebanon turkey pool with the Castlewood pool. Bedford County turkey growers expressed interest in a turkey pool too late in November, 1934 to permit organization of a pool.

Exhibits

Copies of the publicity items on turkey pooling are included in the exhibits.

Outlook

The outlook is for slow progress in turkey marketing cooperatively. The growers are slow to take up new methods and the county agents are too busy with the A. A. A. program to devote the necessary time to explaining the project to the growers. The interest in Bedford County is increasing and by stressing the

increased returns from dressed turkeys we may be able to get a pool started there in the fall of 1955.

Needs

The principal need in connection with this project is more time to visit the various counties, confer with county agents and arrange a program with the county agents and vocational agriculture teachers to interest the leading turkey growers in the project and developing a program which will win grower support.

#14719

Va. Agr. & Mech. Col. & Poly. Inst. & U. S. Dept. of Agr., Cooperating

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA
Blacksburg, Virginia
December 14, 1933

EXTENSION SERVICE

Turkey Pool Publicity

Release #10

CASTLEWOOD TURKEY POOL AGAIN SUCCESSFUL

For the third successive year the Castlewood turkey pool in Russell county was successful in securing higher returns for the turkeys it sold for the members at Thanksgiving. The pool sold 4,400 turkeys for the Thanksgiving market at 10½¢ per pound live weight, delivered at the local shipping points in the territory. The local price at the time the pool announced its price was 8¢ per pound. The farmers who cooperated with their neighbors in the marketing of their turkeys thus secured an advantage of 2½¢ per pound for their birds. This meant that the members of the pool obtained over $1200. more for their Thanksgiving turkeys than they would have otherwise.

The membership of the Castlewood turkey pool numbers 165 farmers. These producers all signed simple agreements pledging to deliver to the pool their turkeys that were ready for market at Thanksgiving. The agreement also gave the sales committee of the pool full authority to sell the birds at the best prices obtainable. It further authorized the committee to deduct 1¢ per bird from the returns received for the turkeys from the buyer to be used to pay the expenses of the pool.

The sales committee was active in seeking bids from a large number of buyers and received six bids on the Thanksgiving pool. Some of these bids were on a graded basis. The prices bid on the pool ranged from 6¢ per pound up to 10½¢ in comparison with the 8¢ per pound that was being offered locally. The activity of the sales committee in interesting additional buyers was therefore of great importance in the success of the pool.

Many of the birds in Russell county this year were late in maturing so the Castlewood pool is operating at Christmas time for the first time in its history.
— This material may be used in whatever form you see fit.

Gordon H. Ward

Gordon H. Ward, Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist.

Turkey Pool Publicity Release #1

TURKEY POOLS PLANNING 1934 OPERATIONS

The leaders in the cooperative turkey pools which operated last fall in Scott, Russell, Washington and Grayson counties are beginning to make preparations for handling turkeys for the coming Thanksgiving season. Growing conditions this summer have been generally favorable in Southwest Virginia, and the turkeys have done quite well. The total number of turkeys being raised this year is about the same as last year, and the quality is reported as very good.

The markets are more particular than ever regarding quality. This fall, quality will probably count more than usual. Storage stocks of frozen turkeys are about three-fourths of a million pounds greater than they were last fall, and about a third of a million pounds above normal as a result of a larger proportion than usual of last year's turkeys being marketed after the holiday season. The post-holiday market was very poor; most of the birds went into storage and have been held for this fall's market. These frozen turkeys will compete with the fresh turkeys and will hold down the price of low grade fresh turkeys. Consumers would rather have a good quality storage turkey than a poor quality fresh turkey.

Storage stocks of other kinds of frozen poultry are considerably above normal and prices have been depressed. The income of the majority of city consumers is still much below normal, so they are unable to pay normal prices for turkeys.

Under these conditions it is all the more important that Virginia turkeys be marketed in the best way possible. Last year there were a number of turkey pools operating in the important turkey growing sections of the state. These cooperative pools sold several thousand turkeys at substantial premiums over the general market prices. The members of these pools were so well satisfied with their achievements that they are planning to operate again this fall. Other groups are also planning to organize and sell through turkey pools this fall. If you are interested in selling through a turkey pool, get in touch with your county agent or teacher of vocational agriculture.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

Blacksburg, Virginia
October 2, 1934

TO COUNTY AGENTS AND TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE:

You will probably remember the turkey pool publicity releases that we have used the past two falls in trying to develop interest in turkey pools. A number of county agents and agricultural teachers have considered these items sufficiently valuable to justify their use again this fall. I am enclosing turkey pool publicity release number 1, and other issues will be sent out the first of each week until the first of January.

In order to comply with the Post Office regulations on the use of the franking privilege, it will be necessary for me to sign my name at the bottom of each release. However, I have no particular desire to have these releases published in the county papers over my name. Many editors like to have items to publish over the signature of the county agent or teacher of vocational agriculture. If you care to turn these releases over to the paper to be published over your name, I will be glad to have you do so.

Where the turkey producers show an interest in the establishment of a cooperative turkey pool I will be glad to cooperate in explaining the operations of turkey pools to the farmers, and will do all I can in helping to organize and operate the pool. Please let me know as far ahead as possible the date that you wish me to attend a conference or meeting in your territory because I am very busy with the Milk Market Agreements under our Virginia Milk Control Law, and I want to fit the turkey pool meetings into my schedule.

Yours for cooperative marketing,

Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist

GHW/nbs

Enclosure 1

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

Blacksburg, Virginia
October 9, 1934

EXTENSION SERVICE

Turkey Publicity

Release #2

DUNGANNON TURKEY POOL PLEASED MEMBERS

Very well pleased with the 1933 Christmas turkey pool were the members of the Dungannon-Fort Blackmore Cooperative Pool. The pool secured higher prices for the turkeys and the members were paid all cash on delivery of the birds to the buyers at the concentration points. Those farmers who sold through the pool made a much better sale than did those who sole individually.

There were 55 members in the pool who pledged to deliver 1300 live turkeys. The members elected a sales committee which secured bids from a number of buyers. Three outside concerns submitted bids in addition to local buyers. At the time of opening the bids the current local price was 10¢ per pound and the local stores were paying only half of the price in cash and the farmer had to take the other half in trade. The bids accepted by the sales committee were for 10½¢ and 10¾¢ a pound, cash on delivery. Although the increase in price amounted to only a few cents per bird the members were glad to get the entire price in cash. They have other products to sell at the stores in trade for groceries and other supplies and need cash to meet other needs.

The pool received the assistance of S. T. Chesto, vocational agriculture teacher, and County Agent J. E. Dolp in perfecting the organization. These public servants helped the committee secure bids on the turkeys but the decision in making the sale rested entirely in the hands of the committee members, who had some of their own turkeys in the pool. The committee in reality was selling their own and their neighbors' birds cooperatively. The members made delivery to the buyers at both Dungannon and Fort Blackmore which were the two most convenient points for the majority of the members.

- - - - -

Dear Friend: The above material may be used as you think best to help stimulate interest in a turkey pool.

Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA
Blacksburg, Virginia
October 15, 1934

Va. Agr. & Mech. College & Poly. Inst. & U.S.D.A., Cooperating

EXTENSION SERVICE

Turkey Pool Publicity

Release No. 3

LAND O' LAKES CO-OP. TURKEYS POPULAR

The fancy quality and fine flavor of Land O' Lakes Co-op. turkeys are making them increasingly popular with consumers in the eastern markets. These Land O' Lakes turkeys are handled by the Land O' Lakes Cooperative Creameries for the 40,000 farmer members who believe that quality pays. They are marked by a button carrying the Land O' Lakes brand and attached to a wing. The demand for these quality turkeys amounted to over 5 million pounds during the 1933-34 season, and there is a question whether the Cooperative will have enough of these branded turkeys to supply the holiday demands this fall and winter.

The Land O'Lakes Cooperative is helping the members put out fancy quality turkeys. It supplies the farmers information regarding the best feeding practices to produce tender, juicy meat. It also instructs the members how to kill and dress the turkeys in the most attractive manner. Experience has shown that turkeys dressed by experts in properly equipped plants will produce a larger proportion of No. 1 turkeys than when the turkeys are dressed on the farms. In order to encourage the members to deliver their birds alive for dressing in the cooperative plants the members are charged only 10¢ per bird for killing and dressing. The turkeys delivered by each member are bonded so that after they are chilled in the big cold rooms the graders can give each member credit for the number of pounds of turkeys he delivered to each grade pool.

A button bearing the Land O' Lakes brand is attached to a wing of each top grade turkey, which is then packed in an attractive box and shipped to a branch warehouse in an eastern city. Twenty-three branches are selling the Land O' Lakes turkeys and dairy products direct to retail meat markets. The Cooperative is carrying the members' products as close to the consumers as possible in order to secure for them the largest possible proportion of the consumer's dollar.

The members are advanced about 75% of the market value of the graded turkeys. After the birds are sold the Cooperative deducts the marketing expenses and settles with the producers within three weeks after each holiday market. The farmers are thus paid the actual market price received less the necessary operating expenses, and this nets them a higher price for their turkeys.

Small turkey pools patterned after the Land O' Lakes method of handling turkeys have operated in Page and Culpeper counties in recent years. These Virginia pools handling dressed turkeys have shown that producers can frequently secure larger returns than by selling the turkeys alive.

- - - - -

Dear Friend: This material can be used in whatever way you consider will increase the interest of producers in marketing through a turkey pool.

Very truly yours,
Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Econ.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

Va. Agr. & Mech. Col. & Poly. Inst. and U. S. D. A., Cooperating

EXTENSION SERVICE

Turkey Pool Publicity

Release #4

CASTLEWOOD TURKEY POOL HAS FINE RECORD

The Castlewood turkey pool has a fine record of accomplishment in helping Russell County farmers to sell their turkeys at higher prices. This pool first operated in the fall of 1931 and handled 3000 birds for the 85 members with a gain of over $2000. as compared with the prices offered by local buyers. The success of the pool stimulated an increase in membership in the fall of 1932 to 153 farmers who pooled 3,300 turkeys to make a gain of over $1350 above local prices. In the fall of 1933 the membership had grown to 165. The pool that fall handled 4,400 turkeys and returned the members more than $1150 above the prices paid by local buyers. The total gain to the farmers who pooled their turkeys during these three years was over $4500. This does not include the benefit to the non-member farmers who sold their turkeys individually to local buyers at the higher prices resulting from the operation of the co-op. pool. The smaller total savings for each of the last two years have resulted from lower market prices and the higher quotations by local buyers in their effort to compete with the turkey pool.

The selling of the turkeys entered in the Castlewood pool is handled by a local committee of the members headed by W. C. Fletcher. The committee finds out from the members the number of birds they will have to sell at Thanksgiving and Christmas. They secure bids from the local buyers and also from buyers on northern markets and other outside points. Usually they have six or more bids for the pool turkeys. The prices bid are on the basis of cash at the point of loading. The committee supervises the delivery and weighing of the birds to assure fair treatment to members.

The Castlewood pool requires each man to sign a simple agreement stating that he will deliver his birds according to the terms of the sale made by the committee. The membership agreement also provides for deducting one cent per bird to take care of the expenses of the pool. The pool committee also arranges for trucks to haul turkeys from the farms to the loading point when it is not feasible for the farmers to deliver their own birds.

Mr. C. V. Duff, agricultural instructor at the Castlewood high school, has been assisting the turkey growers in organizing and operating the turkey pool. He has advised with the sales committee in regard to policies and plans of operation. This Russell county turkey pool has been of real service to the turkey growers of the area and they appreciate what it has accomplished for them.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

This material may be used in any way to promote interest in a turkey pool.

October 23, 1934

Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

Blacksburg, Va.
Oct. 30, 1934

Dear Friend:

Is there a group of producers in your territory interested in selling their turkeys for Thanksgiving cooperatively? If there is, I believe that we can work out a worth while sale for the turkeys either alive or dressed.

I have communicated with a number of buyers of live turkeys on the Philadelphia and New York markets. I have letters from two of these concerns stating that they are interested in bidding on pools of live turkeys. These are earlet buyers and will bid only on pools of at least a thousand to twelve hundred birds. They want the turkeys delivered in Philadelphia or New York by Saturday, November 24. Julius Kestein, of New York City, will bid a flat price on the turkey pools. Risser and Robinowitz, of Philadelphia, will bid a flat price or they will bid on the basis of an initial payment of cash on delivery of the birds to the shipping point plus a final settlement based on the market price when the turkeys arrive in Philadelphia.

In order to get the birds to market by November 24, shipment of the live turkeys should be made from Southwest Virginia November 19-22. The bids from the various buyers should be opened and the sale made November 15-17, so that the arrangements can be made in good season. The letters asking for bids should be sent out by the local sales committee around November 10. The committee should know the approximate number of birds in the pool at the time it calls for bids.

For those producers who are interested in selling their turkeys dressed, the Land O'Lakes Creameries have an interesting proposition. Their branch sales offices in Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York sell direct to retail meat markets. Many of these stores want turkeys packed in barrels, whereas all of the Land O'Lakes turkeys are packed in boxes. The manager of the Land O'Lakes egg and poultry department has expressed a willingness to handle the sale of barrel-packed, dressed turkeys from cooperative groups in Virginia. This looks like an attractive outlook for our Virginia producers in view of the prices netted members of Land O'Lakes last fall. The Minnesota growers received 17 cents a pound dressed weight at Thanksgiving, and 17½ cents a pound at Christmas. This net price to them was based on a market of 20-21 cents for No. 1 birds in Philadelphia. Considering the smaller expense of transportation and packing, our Virginia producers should not closer to the market selling prices. This looks like a worth while outlet in comparison with the 10½-12 cents a pound received for live birds by members of the Southwest Virginia turkey pools last fall.

I am communicating with Land O'Lakes regarding the complete details of their proposition and arrangements for a substantial advance payment of cash on delivery of the turkeys. If any group in your territory shows interest

in developing either a dressed turkey pool or a live turkey pool, I shall be glad to cooperate with you in completing the organization of the pool and arranging the selling of the turkeys.

The time for making arrangements for selling turkeys for Thanksgiving is getting short. If anything is to be done it should be started immediately.

Yours for cooperation,

Gordon H. Ward

Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist

GHW/ibs

Enclosure

Turkey Pool Publicity Release #6

TURKEY POOL MARKETS HALF MILLION TURKEYS

Half a million turkeys, 200 car loads, a year are marketed by the North-West Turkey Growers Association for growers scattered over nine western states. This youthful cooperative already handles 5 per cent of the turkeys marketed in the United States. The volume of business amounts to over a million dollars a year. The quality turkeys bring the top quotations.

The Northwest Turkey Growers Association handles the selling of turkeys for growers' associations covering Idaho, Wyoming, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, Montana, and Colorado. It operates three pools covering the Thanksgiving, Christmas, and January marketing seasons. This system provides a market for the growers during the fall and winter months so that they can dispose of their birds when they are in prime condition for marketing. The association encourages the growers to feed their birds the proper ration to produce fancy quality market stock.

Because most of the farms are distant from the railroad shipping points, the turkeys are killed and dressed on the farms. The association has conducted schools to teach the members the best methods of killing and dressing the turkeys and the majority have become very skillful. The dressed turkeys marketed by the organization have proved very satisfactory to discriminating buyers in the eastern markets. The dressed birds are wrapped in parchment paper bearing the association's label. The turkeys are graded according to government standards into three grades and packed in boxes holding six to a dozen birds. Shipments are made in carload lots to the sales offices of the association, located in Los Angeles and New York.

The growers receive a cash advance payment of about half the market value at the time they deliver their turkeys to the association at the local shipping point. The final settlement is made after the turkeys have been sold. The members actually receive the selling price less the operating expenses of their organization. The growers are so well satisfied with the services rendered by the organization that the membership is steadily increasing.

If Virginia turkey growers are interested in a cooperative selling service of this type for marketing their turkeys this fall, they should get in touch with their local county agent. Selling arrangements can be made wherever there is a group of turkey growers who wish to sell their turkeys cooperatively.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

Va. Agr. & Mech. Coll. & Poly. Inst. & U.S.D.A., Coop.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Turkey Pool Publicity

Release #6

LEBANON POOL TO MARKET DRESSED TURKEYS

The Lebanon Turkey Pool in Russell county is making plans to market from 600 to 800 dressed turkeys for the Thanksgiving market. This is the first venture of this turkey pool in marketing in dressed form the turkeys produced by its members. The pool marketed live turkeys in the fall of 1931, 1932, and 1933. It is expected that many of the best turkeys produced in the county will be marketed through this dressed pool at Thanksgiving. The birds will be graded and sold according to the U. S. Government standards.

Plans are now being made for killing and dressing the turkeys so as to produce fancy carcasses. It has not been decided whether the farmers will dress their own birds under supervision of experts, or the dressing will all be done at some central point. After the birds have been thoroughly cooled to remove all the animal heat, they will be graded according to official standards and packed for shipment to northern markets for cooperative sale.

Negotiations are under way with the Land O' Lakes Cooperative Creameries to handle the sale of these dressed turkeys through the sales offices of this large cooperative in Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York. In recent years this progressive cooperative has netted its farmer-members in Minnesota higher prices for their turkeys than turkey raisers in Southwest Virginia have received for their birds. Land O' Lakes is offering to make a substantial advance payment in cash as soon as the Southwest Virginia turkeys are delivered to its sales offices on the northern markets. Present indications are that this advanced payment will be more per pound than the prices received by Southwest Virginia producers for their turkeys last Thanksgiving. Final settlement will be made for the Thanksgiving turkeys early in December on the basis of the actual prices at which they sold to retail meat markets in the northern cities, less the actual expenses of selling and marketing.

The Castlewood Turkey Pool in the northwestern part of Russell county is making plans to operate again this fall. The signup campaign is now going on and the progress reports of the committeemen indicate that the pool will handle 2 or 3 carloads of live birds for the Thanksgiving market.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

This material may be used in any way to promote interest in a turkey pool.

Gordon H. Ward

Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist

Va. Agr. & Mech. College & Poly. Inst. & U.S.D.A., Cooperating

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

EXTENSION SERVICE

Turkey Pool Publicity . Release #7

TURKEY POOLS ACTIVE IN VIRGINIA

Turkey pools are serving the turkey raisers in various parts of Virginia in helping them to secure improved markets for their birds at Thanksgiving and later at Christmas. Some of the pools are handling the turkeys alive; others are selling dressed turkeys. In Scott county a live turkey pool is operating again in the Fort Blackmore-Dungannon section of the county. Over 500 birds have already been pledged to this pool, and they hope to increase the number to a thousand for a carload shipment. In Russell county the Castlewood Turkey Pool expects to handle 3 or more cars of live turkeys to net the members top prices. In Bedford county the turkey growers are meeting this week to work out a plan for a pool shipment for the Thanksgiving market. It is anticipated that the Bedford organization will perfect plans for handling dressed turkeys for the Christmas market.

The Lebanon Turkey Pool in Russell county is handling the sale of dressed turkeys this fall. They will handle about a thousand dressed turkeys. Negotiations are under way with the State Division of Markets to have these turkeys graded according to the Federal standards before they are sold cooperatively. In Orange the Orange County Turkey Growers Association is handling the turkeys of the members on a dressed basis. These turkeys are being Federal-State graded and are being sold on the Washington market through the Southern States Marketing Cooperative at guaranteed top prices for the various grades.

Turkey growers throughout Virginia have a real opportunity to sell their birds cooperatively this fall. A turkey pool can be organized in any territory where the growers are interested. The county agent will assist the growers in finding markets for their birds, either alive or dressed. Study of the comparative returns from selling turkeys alive and dressed indicate that the producers generally net higher prices by selling their birds dressed. The dressed turkeys handled by local pools can be sold either through the Southern States Marketing Cooperative, or through the eastern sales offices of Land O' Lakes Cooperative Creameries. The Land O' Lakes Cooperative is advancing growers 16 cents a pound for top grade young toms and hens and 13 cents a pound for No. 1 young toms and hens with the advance on old birds 1 cent less. Market conditions indicate that a substantial deferred payment will be made in addition to these advances.

This publicity material may be used in any way to stimulate interest in a turkey pool.

Gordon H. Ward
Ext.Assoc.Agr.Economist

November 20, 1934

Va. Agr. & Mech. College & Poly. Inst. & U.S.D.A. Cooperating

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS STATE OF VIRGINIA

EXTENSION SERVICE

Blacksburg, Virginia
November 28, 1934

There is no Turkey Pool Publicity Release this week because no one has sent me any information regarding what the turkey pool in his territory is doing. If the publicity material is to be sent out each week through December, I will need your assistance in supplying the information for the releases. Will you please supply me with the following information about your territory?

Did you try to operate a Turkey Pool for Thanksgiving? _____

How many turkey growers were in the pool? _____. How many birds were pledged to the pool? _____. Did the pool handle the birds alive or dressed? _____. How many bids did you receive from outside buyers? _____. Were the bids satisfactory? _____

Were the bids on a graded basis? _____. What prices were bid? _____.

Was a bid accepted? _____. At what price? _____. Who bought the pool? _____. What was the local price before the pool price was announced? _____. What price did most of the farmers outside the Pool receive for their turkeys? _____. Did the pool help raise the local price? _____. What were the reactions of the growers to the pool? _____

Is a pool planned for Christmas? _____.

I will appreciate your sending me this information in the enclosed, addressed franked envelope at the earliest possible moment so that I will have some definite data for the release next week. Additional data, comments and suggestions will be gratefully received.

Yours for cooperation,

Gordon H. Ward

Gordon H. Ward
Ext. Assoc. Agr. Economist

GHW:vm
Enc.

Cooperative Marketing of Fruit

Specialists Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist, and Mr. S. K. Cassell, Assistant Agricultural Economist.

Purpose

To assist groups of growers to develop cooperative associations to help them market their fruit to better advantage in order to increase returns to growers.

Methods

At the request of the directors of the fruit exchanges at Vandalia, Winchester and Perryville, the Marketing Specialist made an analysis of the financial status of the various associations. A report on the insolvency of each exchange was made to the directors thereof with a recommendation that if they felt the need of packing and/or marketing associations new cooperatives be organized to take over the packing plants for the insolvent exchanges. The directors requested the Extension Division to make a survey to determine the attitude of the growers on the project. The Marketing Specialist assisted the county agents in the survey which showed that the growers favored community packing of apples but were opposed to cooperative selling. The county agents, a representative of the Farm Credit Administration, the Marketing Specialist and Mr. S. K. Cassell worked together explaining the project to growers and assisted in setting up the new packing associations at each point. They also proffered assistance in organizing the operations of

the packing houses and record keeping. This project required three days in the office analyzing the finances of the exchanges, five days in conference with the Farm Credit Administration in Washington and fifteen days of field work in the three counties.

The Marketing Specialist spent a day in the office working on the charter and by-laws and membership marketing agreement of the grape growers and a day in Charlottesville conferring with the directors of the association on these documents.

Several days work in the office was required to work up the analysis of the records taken in the strawberry study in 1933, and the study and report are not yet complete. A day was spent on the Shore going over the report and recommendations with the members of the strawberry growers association.

Location

Counties: Apples - Shenandoah, Frederick and Clark.

Grapes - Albemarle.

Strawberries - Northampton.

Accomplishments

Community packing associations were established at Woodstock, Winchester and Berryville which leased and operated the packing plants owned by the fruit exchanges at these points. The groups at Winchester and Berryville incorporated under the Cooperative Marketing Act but the group at Woodstock operated as a joint partnership. All three associations had successful operating seasons during the fall.

The Virginia Wine Grape Growers' Association was established by a group of grape growers in Albemarle County. The association aided the members in securing vines of the varieties of grapes most sought by the wineries and made arrangements for the sale of the grapes to wineries as soon as the vineyards came into production.

A report of the study made in 1933 of the relation between quality and pack and price of strawberries was made to the Northampton Strawberry Growers' Association in the spring of 1934.

Exhibits

Included in the Exhibits attached to this report is a copy of the Membership Packing Agreement of the apple packing associations.

Outlook

All three apple packing associations report successful seasons and the county agents report other growers are favorably impressed. The outlook is favorable for increasing the membership of the new associations to the point that the volume handled will support the payments necessary for acquiring the packing houses from the old exchanges.

The repeal of prohibition has stimulated an interest in the production of wine grapes so the grape growers cooperative will probably expand its membership. The strawberry growers have shown little interest in improving the marketing methods as suggested in Dr. Ward's report. There is a big question whether anything will develop in this project.

Needs

More time is needed to spend in the three apple counties and work with the new associations in helping them expand the membership and work out effective methods of developing adequate support for their packing activities.

Clerical help capable of completing the statistical analysis of the records taken in 1938 is greatly needed. When the analysis is completed the Marketing Specialist can complete his report. Then more time will be needed to take the full report to the Eastern Shore and go over it with the county agents and leaders to develop improved marketing methods that will appeal to the growers and win their active support.

#15411

MEMBERSHIP PACKING AGREEMENT
OF THE
FREDERICK COUNTY PACKING ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED

AGREEMENT OF _____ P. O. ADDRESS _____

This agreement between the Frederick County Packing Association, Inc., hereinafter called the "Association", and the undersigned producer, called the Member, witnesseth:

1. The Producer hereby applies for membership in the Association, and, upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board of Directors, becomes a Member of the Association. Upon signature by the Secretary of the Association, this agreement becomes a Certificate of Membership in the Association, and is NOT transferable.

2. The Association hereby agrees to receive from the member, grade and pack according to the U. S. Grades and Standards, as instructed by the Member, all the apples delivered to the Association by the Member, and the Member hereby agrees to deliver to the Association for grading and packing all the apples produced by or for him except such part thereof as may be required by the Member for his home or farm use; provided, however, that upon written application by the Member the Association will pack the apples without grading them, or will release the Member from delivering his apples to it when the Board of Directors determine that the Member's crop will not merit when sold ungraded.

3. The Association agrees to provide standard quality barrels, baskets and other packages and packing materials and to pack the Member's apples for current consumption, export or storage, in baskets or in barrels, as instructed by him.

4. It is expressly agreed that the Member retains full and complete title to his apples delivered to the Association for packing under this agreement and retains complete freedom to sell his apples as he pleases and store them where and as he pleases, provided the apples are packed by the Association as set forth in Section 2 above.

5. The Member agrees to pay the Association the full amount of the packing charges (including the cost of receiving, grading, packing, containers and packing materials, operating expenses, and reserves and deductions for the Capital Fund) on his apples and any other financial obligations he may owe the Association before removing his apples from the packing plant of the Association, or completing delivery of his apples to a buyer or buyers, or make arrangements with the Association satisfactory to it to guarantee the Association full payment of such charges and/or obligations. In order to assure the Association such payments, the Member hereby gives the Association a lien on each crop of apples produced by or for him for the amount of such packing charges and/or other financial obligations. In order to assure the Association payment of any unpaid packing charges and/or other financial obligations in regard to apples placed in storage, the Member agrees to turn over to the Association the warehouse receipt or receipts covering such apples.

6. Upon written request from the Member and in accordance with written instructions from him, the Association hereby agrees to market and sell such apples as the member so requests, whenever there may be found for the same a market, which, in its judgment, and in accordance with its rules and regulations, shall justify such selling. The Member hereby passes absolute title to such apples to the Association in order that it may have full power to pledge all or any part of such apples and borrow money on them for the purpose of paying the packing charges and/or marketing and selling costs on such apples. The Asso-

ciation agrees to re-sell such apples to the best advantage possible and pay over ratably the net proceeds therefrom as payment in full to the Member, after making deductions to cover any advances, interest on advances, costs of packages, packing charges, marketing and selling costs, and any other financial obligation the Member owes the Association.

7. The Member agrees to deliver all the apples covered by this agreement to the packing plant of the Association as soon as practicable after harvesting, as and when directed by the Association, and the Association agrees to accept deliveries. Each package of apples delivered through the Association shall be marked for identification purposes in the manner prescribed by the Association at the Member's expense. Any loss that the Association may suffer on account of inferior or damaged condition at the time of delivery shall be charged against the Member individually.

8. In order to build up a Capital Fund with which to provide adequate operating capital for financing the operations of the Association, and to pay for a packing plant and equipment when purchased by the Association, the Member hereby agrees to loan the Association, and hereby authorizes the Association to include in the packing charges whatever sum, not exceeding ten cents per barrel (or three bushels), the Board of Directors determines it is necessary to deduct for the purpose of building up the Capital Fund. The Association agrees to issue the Member each year a Certificate of Interest for the amount credited to him in the addition to the Capital Fund that year. The Association agrees to redeem these Certificates in the order in which issued when the Board of Directors determines that the Capital Fund has accumulated to ample proportions to properly finance the operations of the Association.

9. To enable the Association to borrow for the purpose of purchasing containers and packing supplies and to obtain working capital to pay packing and marketing costs, the Member agrees to execute each year at the time set by the Association a demand note in favor of the Association for the estimated amount of the cost of packing and marketing the Member's crop of apples and the Association agrees to indorse such notes only to the Farm Credit Administration or the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives for the purpose of securing funds to pay for containers and other packing supplies and to pay packing and/or marketing costs.

10. The Association agrees to furnish the Member the number of field crates necessary for picking and delivering to the Association the apples covered by this agreement, and the Member agrees to return all the field crates so loaned him, or pay the Association the cost price of the field crates not returned to it by the close of the packing season during which the field crates were loaned the Member.

11. The Association may enter into agreements with other members differing in terms from those contained herein but consistent with the by-laws of the Association without invalidating this agreement, provided that the Member at his request may sign a similar agreement as a substitute for this agreement.

12. Either party to this contract may cancel this agreement on June 1 of any year hereafter, providing all indebtedness of the party so cancelling has been paid, by notifying the other party in writing of this intention, such notice to be given during the month of May immediately prior to the effective date of cancellation. If neither of the parties hereto cancels this agreement on June 1 of any year, as aforesaid, it is hereby mutually agreed that this shall constitute conclusive evidence that the parties hereto have renewed this contract for another year. When any Member has exercised this privilege of cancellation, he shall not be readmitted to membership until until the expiration of one year and then only by affirmative vote of the Board

of Directors of the Association. Cancellation of membership shall not affect any uncompleted sales or transactions arising under this agreement.

13. If there is a lien at the time of delivery on any of the apples delivered hereunder and sold to the Association, the Member authorizes the Association to pay the holder of said lien from the proceeds derived from the sale of such apples before any payment is made to the Member hereunder.

14. Inasmuch as the remedy at law would be inadequate and inasmuch as it would be impracticable and extremely difficult to determine the actual damage resulting to the Association, should the Member fail to deliver the apples hereby agreed to be delivered and/or sold, regardless of the cause of such failure, the Member hereby agrees to pay to the Association, for all apples delivered or disposed of, by or for him, other than in accordance with the terms hereof, the sum of 25 cents per bushel on all such apples, as liquidated damages for the breach of this agreement; all parties agreeing that this agreement is one of a series dependent for its true value upon the adherence of each and all of the contracting parties to each and all of the said agreements, but the cancellation of this agreement, or the failure of the Member to comply therewith shall not affect other similar agreements.

15. If the Association brings any action whatsoever by reason of a breach or threatened breach hereof, the Member shall pay all court costs, costs for bonds and otherwise, expenses of travel, and all expenses arising out of or caused by the litigation, and reasonable attorney fees expended or incurred by it in such proceedings, and all such costs and expenses shall be included in the judgment.

16. It is agreed that the charter, the by-laws now or hereafter in effect, and this agreement constitute the entire agreement between the Association and the Member.

17. The parties agree that there are no oral or other conditions, promises, covenants, representations or inducements in addition to or at variance with any of the terms hereof; and that this agreement represents the voluntary and clear understanding of both parties fully and completely.

18. It is understood that this agreement shall become binding on both parties on the date that it is accepted by the Board of Directors of the Association.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have affixed their signatures as of the day and year written below.

Member's Signature _____
(Do not sign without reading) (Print Grower's Name here)

P. O. Address _____ Witness _____

Accepted this _____ day of _____ 193__, in accordance with a resolution of the Board of Directors.

FREDERICK COUNTY PACKING ASSOCIATION, INC.

_____ Secretary

#15,480

MEMBERSHIP PACKING AGREEMENT
OF THE
BERRYVILLE COUNTY PACKING ASSOCIATION, INC.

Agreement of _____ P. O. Address _____

This agreement between the Berryville Packing Association, Inc., hereinafter called the "Association", and the undersigned producer, called the Member, witnesseth:

1. The Producer hereby applies for membership in the Association, and upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board of Directors, becomes a Member of the Association. Upon signature by the Secretary of the Association, this agreement becomes a Certificate of Membership in the Association, and is NOT transferable.

2. The Association hereby agrees to receive from the member, grade and pack according to the U. S. Grades and Standards, as instructed by the Member, all the apples delivered to the Association by the Member, and the Member hereby agrees to deliver to the Association for grading and packing all the apples produced by or for him except such part thereof as may be required by the Member for his home or farm use; provided, however, that upon written application by the Member the Association will pack the apples without grading them, or will release the Member from delivering his apples to it when the Board of Directors determine that the Member's crop will not more when sold ungraded.

3. The Association agrees to provide standard quality barrels, baskets and other packages and packing materials and to pack the Member's apples for current consumption, export or storage, in baskets or in barrels, as instructed by him.

4. It is expressly agreed that the Member retains full and complete title to his apples delivered to the Association for packing under this agreement and retains complete freedom to sell his apples as he pleases and store them where and as he pleases, provided the apples are packed by the Association as set forth in Section 2 above.

5. The Member agrees to pay the Association the full amount of the packing charges (including the cost of receiving, grading, packing, containers and packing materials, operating expenses, and reserves and deductions for the capital fund) on his apples and any other financial obligations he may owe the Association before removing his apples from the packing plant of the Association, or completing delivery of his apples to a buyer or buyers, or make arrangements with the Association satisfactory to it to guarantee the Association full payment of such charges and/or obligations. In order to assure the Association such payments, the Member hereby gives the Association a lien on each crop of apples produced by or for him for the amount of such packing charges and/or other financial obligations. In order to assure the association payment of any unpaid packing charges and/or other financial obligations in regard to apples placed in storage, the Member agrees to turn over to the Association the warehouse receipt or receipts covering such apples.

6. Upon written request from the Member and in accordance with written instructions from him, the Association hereby agrees to market and sell such apples as the Member so requests, whenever there may be found for the same a markets which, in its judgment, and in accordance with its rules and regulations, shall justify such selling. The Member hereby passes absolute title to such

apples to the Association in order that it may have full power to pledge all or any part of such apples and borrow money on them for the purpose of paying the packing charges and/or marketing and selling costs on such apples. The Association agrees to re-sell such apples to the best advantage possible and pay over ratably the net proceeds therefrom as payment in full to the Member, after making deductions to cover any advances, interest on advances, costs of packages, packing charges, marketing and selling costs, and any other financial obligation the Member owes the Association.

7. The Member agrees to deliver all the apples covered by this Agreement to the packing plant of the Association as soon as practicable after harvesting, as and when directed by the Association, and the Association agrees to accept deliveries. Each package of apples delivered through the Association shall be marked for identification purposes in the manner prescribed by the Association at the Member's expense. Any loss that the Association may suffer on account of inferior or damaged condition at the time of delivery shall be charged against the Member individually.

8. In order to build up a Capital Fund with which to provide adequate operating capital for financing the operations of the Association, and to pay for a packing plant and equipment when purchased by the Association, the Member hereby agrees to loan the Association, and hereby authorizes the Association to include in the packing charges whatever sum, not exceeding ten cents per barrel (or three bushels), the Board of Directors determines it is necessary to deduct for the purpose of building up the Capital Fund. The Association agrees to issue the Member each year a Certificate of Interest for the amount credited to him in addition to the Capital Fund that year. The Association agrees to redeem these Certificates in the order in which issued when the Board of Directors determines that the Capital Fund has accumulated to ample proportions to properly finance the operations of the Association.

9. To enable the Association to borrow for the purpose of purchasing containers and packing supplies and to obtain working capital to pay packing and marketing costs, the Member agrees to execute each year at the time set by the Association a demand note in favor of the Association for the estimated amount of the cost of packing and marketing the Member's crop of apples and the Association agrees to indorse such notes only to the Farm Credit Administration or the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives for the purpose of securing funds to pay for containers and other packing supplies and to pay packing and/or marketing costs.

10. The Association agrees to furnish the Member the number of field crates necessary for picking and delivering to the Association the apples covered by this agreement, and the Member agrees to return all the field crates so loaned him, or pay the Association the cost price of the field crates not returned to it by the close of the packing season during which the field crates were loaned the Member.

11. The Association may enter into agreements with other members differing in terms from those contained herein but consistent with the by-laws of the Association without invalidating this agreement, provided that the Member at his request may sign a similar agreement as a substitute for this agreement.

12. Either party to this contract may cancel this agreement on June 1 of any year hereafter, providing all indebtedness of the party so cancelling has been paid, by notifying the other party in writing of this intention, such notice to be given during the month of May immediately prior to the effective date of cancellation. If neither of the parties hereto cancels this

agreement on June 1 of any year, as aforesaid, it is hereby mutually agreed that this shall constitute conclusive evidence that the parties hereto have renewed this contract for another year. When any Member has exercised this privilege of cancellation, he shall not be readmitted to membership until the expiration of one year and then only by affirmative vote of the Board of Directors of the Association. Cancellation of membership shall not affect any uncompleted sales or transactions arising under this agreement.

13. If there is a lien at the time of delivery on any of the apples delivered hereunder and sold to the Association, the Member authorizes the Association to pay the holder of said lien from the proceeds derived from the sale of such apples before any payment is made to the Member hereunder.

14. Inasmuch as the remedy at law would be inadequate and inasmuch as it would be impracticable and extremely difficult to determine the actual damage resulting to the Association, should the Member fail to deliver the apples hereby agreed to be delivered and/or sold, regardless of the cause of such failure, the Member hereby agrees to pay to the Association, for all apples delivered or disposed of, by or for him, other than in accordance with the terms hereof, the sum of 25 cents per bushel on all such apples, as liquidated damages for the breach of this agreement; all parties agreeing that this agreement is one of a series dependent for its true value upon the adherence of each and all of the contracting parties to each and all of the said agreements, but the cancellation of this agreement, or the failure of the Member to comply therewith shall not affect other similar agreements.

15. If the Association brings any action whatsoever by reason or a breach or threatened breach hereof, the Member shall pay all court costs, costs for bonds and otherwise, expenses of travel, and all expenses arising out of or caused by the litigation, and reasonable attorney fees expended or incurred by it in such proceedings, and all such costs and expenses shall be included in the judgment.

16. It is agreed that the charter, the by-laws now or hereafter in effect, and this agreement constitute the entire agreement between the Association and the Member.

17. The parties agree that there are no oral or other conditions, promises, covenants, representations or inducements in addition to or at variance with any of the terms hereof; and that this agreement represents the voluntary and clear understanding of both parties fully and completely.

18. It is understood that this agreement shall become binding on both parties on the date that it is accepted by the Board of Directors of the Association.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have affixed their signatures as of the day and year written below.

Member's Signature _____
(Do not sign without reading)(Print Grower's name here)

P. O. Address _____ Witness _____

Accepted this _____ day of _____ 193__, in accordance with a resolution of the Board of Directors.

BERRYVILLE COUNTY PACKING ASSOCIATION, INC.

_____ Secretary

Cooperative Tomato Canning

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

Purpose

To assist interested farmers to develop and efficiently operate cooperative tomato canneries in order to increase returns to growers.

Methods

The development of the new canneries was started in conferences with local leaders interested in the projects. The details, including the set-up and membership marketing agreements and operating methods were worked out with these men, the county agents and the vocational agriculture teachers. The plans were then explained to the growers at local meetings. The Marketing Specialist also assisted the officers of the two cooperatives in preparing their applications for loans from the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives.

Location

Counties: Montgomery and Cumberland.

Accomplishments

Two new cooperative tomato canneries were established in the spring of 1934; one at Niner in Montgomery County and the other near Columbia in Cumberland County. The Little Meadows Cooperative Cannery at Ironto in Montgomery County approximately doubled its volume. The dry weather during

the summer, coupled with difficulty in getting plants in the spring, curtailed the volume, but in spite of these handicaps all three canneries report successful seasons. The Little Meadows and Fork of Willis canneries secured loans from the Baltimore Bank. The Fork of Willis group was the only organization borrowing money which was repaid in full.

Exhibits

Included in the exhibits are copies of the Membership Marketing Agreements of the Piney and Fork of Willis Cooperative Canneries.

Outlook

There is growing interest in cooperative canning. Additional farmers want to join the existing cannery groups and farmers in other sections are seeking the development of new canneries to operate cooperatively. Care has to be taken to avoid the development of cooperative canneries at points where existing facilities can take care of the volume produced.

Needs

The great need in connection with this project is more time in order to visit the canneries more frequently, especially just prior to and during the operating season to help the management develop and keep up to date the important records for keeping adequate accounting books. More time is also needed to develop a program for improved membership relations between the canneries and the members to secure better quality fruit to provide the raw material for a superior quality product.

#15,C3#

RINER COOPERATIVE CANNERY, INC.

Members Marketing Agreement

This agreement between the Riner Cooperative Cannery, Inc., hereinafter called the Cooperative and the undersigned, hereinafter called the Member.

Witnesseth:

1. The Cooperative agrees to buy and the Member agrees to sell to the Cooperative all the tomatoes of sound merchantable quality 2 inches in size and larger produced by or for him or acquired by him as landlord or lessor when red ripe and ready for canning. This agreement is intended by the parties to pass an absolute title to all such tomatoes as soon as the same have a potentional existence but shall be at the risk of the Member until delivery.

2. The Member agrees to deliver all the tomatoes covered by this agreement to the Cannery or to such places as the Cooperative may direct as soon as practicable after harvesting, and the Cooperative agrees to accept delivery on any week day except Saturday.

3. The Cooperatives agrees to receive, process, can, pack, store, market and sell the tomatoes delivered to it by the members and pay over ratably the net amount received therefrom as payment in full to the Member, after making deductions to cover any advances, interest upon advances, the cost of receiving, assembling, grading, processing, canning, storing, insuring, marketing, and selling such tomatoes; and for organization, operating, and maintenance expenses and reserves, but such reserves shall not exceed one per cent of the gross sales price, which reserves may be used by the Cooperative for any proper purpose.

4. The Member agrees that the Cooperative shall deduct from the moneys due him for tomatoes sold the Cooperative whatever sum per bushel of sixty pounds weight the majority of the members vote to deduct for the purpose of building up a Capital Fund with which to pay for the plant and equipment purchased by the Cooperative and to provide adequate operating capital for financing the operation of the Association. The Cooperative agrees to issue the member each year a Certificate of Interest showing the amount of the deductions placed to his credit in the Capital Fund, which certificates will be paid the member in the order in which issued when the Board of Directors determine that the Capital Fund has accumulated to ample proportions to properly finance the operations of the association.

5. Any loss that the Cooperative may suffer on account of inferior or damaged condition at delivery shall be charged against the member, individually.

6. The Cooperative shall make rules and regulations regarding the grade of tomatoes that it will accept for canning and the Member agrees to accept and abide by any such rules and regulations and to accept and abide by the grading done by the Cooperative. The member agrees that if his tomatoes are not properly graded when delivered to the Cooperative, the Cooperative shall grade them at the members expense.

7. It is agreed that the charter, the by-laws now or hereafter in effect, and this agreement constitute the entire agreement between the Cooperative and the Member.

8. The Member further agrees that the Cooperative shall have the power to borrow money for any purpose of the Cooperative on the tomatoes delivered

to the Cooperative and in its absolute discretion may pool or commingle such tomatoes or any part thereof with other tomatoes of like grade and quality; and shall exercise all other rights of ownership without limitation; and may sell or pledge for its own account, or as security for its own debts or otherwise, all or any such part of such tomatoes or bills of lading, warehouse receipts, sale accounts, or other documents covering said tomatoes, or received on account thereof.

9. The Cooperative may enter into agreements with other members differing in terms from those contained herein but consistent with the by-laws of the Cooperative without invalidating this agreement, provided that the Member at his request may sign a similar agreement as a substitute for this agreement.

10. By signing this agreement the grower applies for membership in the Cooperative and the signing hereof by the Cooperative shall constitute an acceptance hereof.

11. After the canning plant and equipment purchased by the cooperative in 1933 have been paid for, either party hereto may cancel this agreement on March 15th of any year thereafter by notifying the other party in writing of this intention, such notice to be given during the month of February immediately prior to the effective date of cancellation. If neither of the parties hereto cancels this agreement on March 15th of any year, as aforesaid, it is hereby mutually agreed that this shall constitute conclusive evidence that the parties hereto have renewed this contract for another year. When any member has exercised this privilege of cancellation he shall not be readmitted to membership until the expiration of one year and then only on a vote of the Board of Directors of the Cooperative.

12. If there is a lien on any of the tomatoes delivered hereunder, the Member authorizes the Cooperative to pay the holder of said lien from the proceeds derived from the sale of such tomatoes before any payment is made to the Member hereunder.

13. Inasmuch as the remedy at law would be inadequate and inasmuch as it would be impracticable and extremely difficult to determine the actual damage resulting to the Cooperative should the Member fail to deliver the tomatoes hereby sold, regardless of the cause of such failure, the Member hereby agrees to pay to the Cooperative for all tomatoes delivered or disposed of, by or for him, other than in accordance with the terms hereof, the sum of 10 cents per bushel on all tomatoes, as liquidated damages for the breach of this agreement; all parties agreeing that this agreement is one of a series dependent for its true value upon the adherence of each and all of the contracting parties to each and all of the said agreements, but the cancellation of this agreement, or the failure of the Member to comply therewith shall not affect other similar agreements.

14. If the Cooperative brings any action whatsoever by reason or a breach or threatened breach hereof, the Member shall pay all costs of court, costs for bonds and otherwise, expenses of travel and all expenses arising out of or caused by the litigation, and reasonable attorney fees expended or incurred by it in such proceedings and all such costs and expenses shall be included in the judgment.

15. The parties agree that there are no oral or other conditions, promises, covenants, representations or inducements in addition to or at variance with any of the terms hereof; and that this agreement represents the voluntary and clear understanding of both parties fully and completely. Read,

considered and signed at _____ this _____
day of _____ 193____.

Member's Signature_____ {_____}
(Do not sign without reading) (Print Grower's name here)

Address_____

Accepted this _____ day of _____, 193_____, in accordance with a resolution of the Board of Directors.

Riner Cooperative Cannery, Inc.

By_____ Secretary

MEMBERSHIP MARKETING AGREEMENT

OF THE

FORK OF WILLIS COOPERATIVE CANNERY, INC.

Agreement of _____ P. O. Address_____

This Agreement between the Fork of Willis Cooperative Cannery, Inc., hereinafter called the "Cooperative", and the undersigned grower, hereinafter called the "Member", WITNESSETH:-

1. The Producer hereby applies for membership in the Cooperative and upon acceptance of this Agreement by the Board of Directors becomes a Member of the Cooperative. Upon signature by the Secretary of the Cooperative, this agreement becomes a Certificate of Membership in the Cooperative, and is NOT transferable.

2. The Cooperatives agrees to buy and Member agrees to sell to the Cooperative all of the tomatoes of sound merchantable quality 2 inches in size and larger produced by or for him, when red ripe and ready for canning, according to United States Government standards, on the acreage set forth in the supplementary agreement which the Member agrees to fill out and sign when presented to him by the Cooperative each year, which supplementary agreement is hereby made an integral part of this contract. This agreement is intended by the parties to pass an absolute titale to all such tomatoes as soon as the same have a potential existence, but shall be at the risk of the Member until delivery to the Cooperative.

3. The Member agrees to deliver all the tomatoes covered by this agreement to the Cannery or to such places as the Cooperative may direct as soon as practicable after harvesting, and the Cooperative agrees to accept delivery on any week day except Saturday, not later than 4 P. M. It is also agreed that the Cooperative shall not be bound to accept from the Member during any one day more than 10 bushels of tomatoes from each acre he has under contract with the Cooperative. It is further agreed that in case of fire, strike, flood, or other providential hindrance over which the cooperative has no control and which will prevent the cannery from taking care of tomatoes, the cooperative will not be compelled to receive tomatoes from the member until such hindrance has been removed.

4. The Cooperative agrees to receive, process, can, pack, store, market and sell the tomatoes delivered to it by the members and pay over ratably the net amount received therefrom as payment in full to the Member, after making

deductions to cover any advances, interest upon advances, the cost of receiving, assembling, grading, processing, canning, storing, insuring, marketing, and selling such tomatoes; and for organization, operating, and maintenance expenses and reserves, but such reserves shall not exceed ten per cent of the gross sales price, which reserves may be used by the Cooperative for any proper purposes. It is further agreed that any loan from the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives shall be re-paid in full before the Cooperative makes any payment to the Member for the tomatoes delivered hereunder.

5. The Member agrees to loan the Cooperative for the purpose of building up the Revolving Capital Fund with which to provide adequate working capital, and to purchase a cannery and equipment when decided upon by majority vote of the members, whatever sum per bushel of sixty pounds weight the majority of the members vote to deduct from returns due the members for their tomatoes for the purpose of building up the Revolving Capital Fund. The Cooperative agrees to issue the member each year a Certificate of Interest showing the amount of the deductions placed to his credit in the Capital Fund, which certificates will be paid the member in the order in which issued when the Board of Directors determine that the Capital Fund has accumulated to such proportions to properly finance the operations of the association.

6. Any loss that the Cooperative may suffer on account of inferior or damaged condition at delivery shall be charged against the Member, individually.

7. The Cooperative shall make rules and regulations regarding the grade of tomatoes that it will accept for canning and the Member agrees to accept and abide by any such rules and regulations and to accept and abide by the grading done by the Cooperative. The member agrees that if his tomatoes are not properly graded when delivered to the Cooperative, the Cooperative shall grade them at the members expense.

8. It is agreed that the charter, the by-laws now or hereafter in effect, and this agreement constitute the entire agreement between the Cooperative and the Member.

9. The Member further agrees that the Cooperative shall have the power to borrow money for any purpose of the Cooperative on the tomatoes delivered to the Cooperative and in its absolute discretion may pool or commingle such tomatoes or any part thereof with other tomatoes of like grade and quality; and shall exercise all other rights of ownership without limitation; and may sell or pledge for its own account, or as security for its own debts or otherwise, all or any such part of such tomatoes or bills of lading, warehouse receipts, sale accounts, or other documents covering said tomatoes, or received on account thereof.

10. The Member agrees to assist the Manager of the cannery operated by the Cooperative in furnishing help for the operation of the cannery.

11. The cooperative agrees to furnish the Member the number of baskets necessary for picking and delivering to the Cooperative the tomatoes covered by this agreement and the Member agrees to return all the baskets so loaned him, or pay the Cooperative the cost price of the baskets not returned to it by the close of the canning season during which the baskets were loaned to the Member.

12. The Cooperative may enter into agreements with other members differing in terms from those contained herein but consistent with the by-laws of the Cooperative without invalidating this agreement, provided that the Member at his request may sign a similar agreement as a substitute for this agreement.

13. This agreement shall be in full force and effect continuously hereafter, but it is mutually agreed that either party hereto may cancel this agreement on March 15th of any year hereafter by notifying the other party in writing of this intention, such notice to be given during the month of February immediately prior to the effective date of cancellation. If neither of the parties hereto cancels this agreement on March 15th of any year, as aforesaid, it is hereby mutually agreed that this shall constitute conclusive evidence that the parties hereto have renewed this contract for another year. When any member has exercised this privilege of cancellation he shall not be readmitted to membership until the expiration of one year and then only on a vote of the Board of Directors of the Cooperative.

14. If there is a lien on any of the tomatoes delivered hereunder, the Member authorizes the Cooperative to pay the holder of said lien from the proceeds derived from the sale of such tomatoes before any payment is made to the Member hereunder.

15. Inasmuch as the remedy at law would be inadequate and inasmuch as it would be impracticable and extremely difficult to determine the actual damage resulting to the Cooperative should the Member fail to deliver the tomatoes hereby sold, regardless of the cause of such failure, the Member hereby agrees to pay to the Cooperative for all tomatoes delivered or disposed of, by or for him, other than in accordance with the terms hereof, the sum of 10 cents per bushel on all tomatoes, as liquidated damages for the breach of this agreement; all parties agreeing that this agreement is one of a series dependent for its true value upon the adherence of each and all of the contracting parties to each and all of the said agreements, but the cancellation of this agreement, or the failure of the Member to comply therewith shall not affect other similar agreements.

16. If the Cooperative brings any action whatsoever by reason of a breach or threatened breach hereof, the Member shall pay all costs of court, costs for bonds and otherwise, expenses of travel and all expenses arising out of or

caused by the litigation, and reasonable attorney fees expended or incurred by it in such proceedings and all such costs and expenses shall be included in the judgment.

17. The parties agree that there are no oral or other conditions, promises, covenants, representations or inducements in addition to or at variance with any of the terms hereof; and that this agreement represents the voluntary and clear understanding of both parties fully and completely. Read, considered and signed at _____ this _____ day of _____ 19__.

Member's Signature _____

Address _____ Witness _____

TOWN OF WILLIS COOPERATIVE CEMETERY, INC.

Accepted by resolution of the Board of Directors

DATE _____

_____ Secretary

Cooperative Marketing of Rabbits

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

Purposes:

To assist the rabbit growers in developing an efficient marketing cooperative handling a sufficient volume for economical operation and returning the growers prices sufficient to cover the cost of production.

Methods

This project has been carried on primarily through conferences with the county agents (primarily H. O. Lewis), A. L. Dean of the Poultry Department and leaders among the rabbit raisers. In addition, meetings have been held with the rabbit growers in Roanoke, Bedford, Franklin and Wythe counties and with the directors of the incorporated cooperative.

The new cooperative is an outgrowth of a rabbit breeders' association in the Roanoke area which became insolvent through paying top prices for poor quality meat the same as for fancy quality meat. The Marketing Specialist met with the members of the old association after analyzing the financial status of the organization and made suggestions for liquidation. Meetings were then held to interest growers in the new cooperative and circular letters were sent out explaining the project. A sufficient number of members signed the membership marketing agreement to provide the funds with which to incorporate. Most of the business has been with non-members so that a membership campaign is in order.

Location

Counties: Roanoke, Bedford, Franklin, Hythe, Botetourt, Floyd, Rockbridge, Montgomery.

Accomplishments

The Virginia Rabbit Marketing Cooperative was incorporated in the summer of 1934. The directors made arrangements with Mungate Brothers and Warne of Roanoke to handle the rabbits of the members and pay the highest prices possible in relation to market conditions. This arrangement will be converted into a completely cooperative method of operation as soon as feasible. The arrangements made provided the members an outlet for their rabbits at prices better than they would otherwise been able to obtain.

Exhibits

Included in the exhibits attached to this report are copies of the Membership Marketing Agreement of the Cooperative.

Outlook

The outlook for the further progress of the cooperative is somewhat uncertain as a result of the development of a rival organization by one of the factions in the old rabbit breeders' association. This rivalry is curtailing the volume handled by the cooperative from the Roanoke area where the largest production of rabbits exists at present. As soon as method of

providing an incentive to become a member of the cooperative is developed the volume can probably be increased to where better paying markets can be served.

Needs

The greatest need in connection with this project is more time to work with the management to work out the most feasible method of stimulating more producers to join the cooperative, and developing new outlets for larger quantities of meat. More time is also needed to carry the program into the other counties in which there are members of rabbit growers and explain the project so they will join and expand the volume of business of the cooperative.

14,822

MEMBERSHIP MARKETING AGREEMENT

OF THE

VIRGINIA RABBIT MARKETING COOPERATIVE, INC.

Agreement of _____ P. O. Address _____

This Agreement between the Virginia Rabbit Marketing Cooperative, hereinafter called the "Cooperative", and the undersigned called the "Member", witnesseth:

1. The Producer hereby applies for membership in the Cooperative and upon acceptance of this agreement by the Board of Directors becomes a Member of the Cooperative. Upon signature by the Secretary of the Cooperative, this agreement becomes a Certificate of Membership in the Cooperative, and is NOT transferable.

2. The Member Hereby agrees to sell and deliver to the Cooperative as directed by it the rabbits and/or rabbit products produced by him except such part thereof as may be required by the Member for his home or farm use; and the Cooperative agrees to receive and purchase said rabbits and/or products. Such rabbits and/or rabbit products shall be delivered by the Member at such times and to such persons and places as may be designated by the Cooperative and when so delivered shall be in such marketable condition as shall meet the qualifications specified by the Cooperative therefor; and/or the legal requirements of the State of Virginia and the United States Government for meat used in human consumption.

3. The Cooperative agrees to resell all of the rabbits and/or rabbit products delivered by the Member, either in the natural and/or processed state, and to account therefor after making the deductions authorized herein as soon as practicable after the close of each pool period in accordance with the terms of this agreement. The Board of Directors of the Cooperative is authorized to pool products delivered hereunder with other like products delivered by others and to pool the proceeds received from the rabbits and/or rabbit products sold by the Cooperative in a given town, city, or place, so that all of the Members of the Cooperative whose rabbits and/or rabbit products were sold therein will receive the same price for rabbits and/or rabbit products of the same grade and quality.

4. The Cooperative shall deduct from the proceeds of all such sales such uniform percentages as it charges other producer members for like services, which may be necessary to meet expenses incurred or to be incurred, together with such other sums as may be necessary to cover operating expense, interest, overhead, depreciation, all obligations or debts of the Cooperative lawfully incurred, as well as to create reasonable reserves or other funds reasonably estimated as essential or probably to be incurred by the Cooperative pursuant to its charter and by-laws, provided, however, the total of all such deductions, made under this contract, shall not in the aggregate exceed 3 cents per pound of meat, and at the rate of 10¢ on breeders and other rabbit products, unless such excess be first recommended to the Cooperative, by two-thirds of the Board of Directors thereof, and such recommendation be approved by an affirmative majority vote of the Members of the Cooperative, parties to this and to contracts similar to this, who are in no default at the time, attending in person and voting on such question at local meetings held for that special purpose.

5. The Member agrees to loan the Cooperative for the purpose of building up the Revolving Capital Fund with which to make advance payments to members for their rabbits and/or rabbit products upon delivery to the Cooperative and to provide

working capital, ½¢ on each pound of meat, and 2% of the value of breeders and rabbit products handled by the Cooperative for the Member, to be deducted from the returns made the Members. The Cooperative will issue the Member at the end of each fiscal year a Certificate of Interest evidencing the amount loaned the Cooperative by the Member during the year, which Certificate will be retired the Member as provided in Section 3 of Article IX of the By-Laws.

6. The Board of Directors of the Cooperative is authorized to determine the cities, towns, and places in which rabbits and/or rabbit products delivered under this and similar contracts shall be marketed. The Cooperative may process any of said rabbits and/or rabbit products and market the products derived therefrom in the manner deemed most advantageous to the Members of the Cooperative, but not unless such policy has been recommended by two-thirds of the Board of Directors and approved by affirmative vote of members producing 75% of the rabbits and/or rabbit products marketed by the Cooperative.

7. The Cooperative is hereby authorized to borrow money on the products delivered hereunder, and/or the by-products derived therefrom, and/or on any evidence of such products or by-products, and to pledge the same as the absolute owner thereof.

8. The Cooperative may enter into agreements with other Members, differing in terms from those contained herein, without invalidating this contract, provided that the Member, at his request, may sign a similar contract as a substitute for this agreement.

9. The Member agrees to the articles of incorporation of the Cooperative, the by-laws now in force or that may hereafter be adopted, and agrees that the Board of Directors of the Cooperative may prescribe rules and regulations relative to the production, handling, delivering, and the marketing of the rabbits and/or rabbit products produced by its Members, and the Member agrees to be bound by such rules and regulations.

10. This agreement shall be in full force and effect continuously hereafter, subject to legal limitations, if any, but either party hereto may cancel this contract at the expiration of two years from the date hereof or at the end of any succeeding year by notifying the other party in writing thirty days in advance thereof, provided that such cancellation shall not affect any uncompleted sales or transactions arising under this agreement and provided that the Member is not then indebted to the Cooperative. If neither of the parties cancels this agreement as aforesaid, it is hereby mutually agreed that this shall constitute conclusive evidence that the parties hereto have renewed this contract for another year. The provisions of this agreement may be altered or amended, and this and similar agreements can be cancelled by affirmative vote of the members producing 75% of the rabbits and rabbit products marketed by the Cooperative.

11. Inasmuch as it is now and ever will be extremely difficult to determine the actual damage to the Cooperative should the Member fail to deliver all of his rabbits and/or rabbit products as herein provided, the Member agrees to pay the Cooperative 5 cents per pound for meat, $1 per head on breeders and 50 cents per pound of Angora wool, delivered, consigned, marketed, sold, or withheld by or for him other than in accordance with the terms of this agreement,as liquidated damages, all parties agreeing that this contract is one of a series dependent for its true value upon the adherence of each and all the Members to each and all of the said contract.

12. If the Cooperative brings any action whatsoever by reason of a breach or threatened breach hereof, the Member shall pay all costs of court, cost for bond and otherwise, expenses of travel and all expenses arising out of or caused by the litigation, and reasonable attorney fees expended or incurred by it in any such proceeding, and all such costs and expenses shall be included in the judgment.

13. The parties agree that there are no oral or other conditions, promises, covenants, representations, or inducements in addition to or at variance with any terms hereof and that this agreement represents the voluntary and clear understanding of both parties fully and completely.

14. It is understood that this agreement shall become binding on both parties on the date that it is accepted by the Board of Directors of the Cooperative.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have affixed their signatures as of the day and year written below.

VIRGINIA RABBIT MARKETING COOPERATIVE, INCORPORATED

Member _____

P. O. Address _____ By _____

Witness _____ Date _____

Cooperative Purchasing

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

Purpose

To assist in the development of an integrated system of retail and wholesale cooperative purchasing associations, to purchase quality supplies at a saving to the members.

Methods

Integration of Farmers' Cooperative Fertilizer Purchasers With Halifax and Pittsylvania Purchasing Associations

During the winter and spring the Marketing Specialist spent seven days at various times conferring with the directors and officers of the three organizations separately and jointly in helping to work out the basis upon which the Halifax and Pittsylvania purchasing associations secured the fertilizer for their members through the Kenbridge co-op. The work was carried on in close cooperation with the county agents, Rusey Glenn, vocational agriculture teacher at Kenbridge, and the Southern States Cooperative. The Marketing Specialist assisted the Kenbridge organization in securing a loan from the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives for financing its purchase of ingredients.

Establishment of Lower Peninsula Cooperative Farm Bureau

The destruction of the warehouse of the Planters Trading Company of Phoebus by fire forced the liquidation of that farmers service organization.

The leaders wanted to develop a Farm Bureau but had no finances. The Southern States Cooperative had a service store in Newport News which was losing money. Through personal conferences with the local leaders and the county agent and then with Southern States Cooperative, a plan was worked out for consolidating the Farm Bureau and the Southern States Cooperative store into the Lower Peninsula Farm Bureau. This consolidation was effected by a joint conference of leaders in the two cooperatives. The Marketing Specialist attended two meetings of farmers and members to help build up membership support. The Marketing Specialist also conferred with the directors of the Farm Bureau and will continue to do so to help work out the problem of serving Newport News without a loss. In all, six days were spent on this project during the year.

Augusta Cooperative Farm Bureau

Through conferences and personal assistance to the manager, the Marketing Specialist helped this progressive Farm Bureau to install a system for keeping track of each member's purchases with a minimum cost so that at the end of the year a patronage dividend can be distributed in proportion to the purchases bought by each member. Certificates of Indebtedness are issued each member for the annual membership dues paid and patronage dividends. Records of purchases and certificates issued each member are kept in a visible ledger.

Rockingham Cooperative Farm Bureau

At a conference with the Manager regarding carrying on membership education through community meetings held jointly with the Valley of Virginia Milk Producers Association it was determined to postpone the meetings until the County Agent would have time free from the A. A. A. program to assist with the meetings.

Frederick Cooperative Farm Bureau

Through a conference with the general manager and meeting with the Board of Directors authorization was secured for the manager to confer with Southern States Cooperative regarding elimination of competition between Southern States Cooperative and the Farm Bureau in Frederick County. Unfortunately, the Southern States Cooperative had made commitments covering the Winchester store until the spring of 1938 so that no progress has yet been made in eliminating the competition.

Fair-Lee Mills

After a conference with the county agent, the marketing specialist held four different conferences with the directors of the Fair-Lee Mills of Herndon and worked out with them a procedure for converting their mill into a cooperative organization to mix feeds and purchase supplies for the members and patrons. Unfortunately one of the largest stockholders and directors is a big business man with interests in Pennsylvania and a farm near Herndon. He demands a large return on his investment in the mill and

oppose the conversion into a cooperative and has thus far held up the project.

Pulaski Cooperative Exchange

In conjunction with the County Agent, the Marketing Specialist conferred with the manager of the Exchange regarding securing a loan from the Baltimore Bank for Cooperatives with which to repay a bank loan and provide more working capital. No audit of the Exchange books had been made for some years and the loan application was held up pending the making of an audit.

Location

Counties:

Lower Peninsula Cooperative Farm Bureau - Warwick, Elizabeth City and York.

Augusta Cooperative Farm Bureau - Augusta.

Rockingham Cooperative Farm Bureau - Rockingham.

Frederick Cooperative Farm Bureau - Frederick.

Farmers Cooperative Fertilizer Purchasers - Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Brunswick, Dinwiddie.

Halifax Purchasing Association - Halifax.

Pittsylvania Purchasing Association - Pittsylvania.

Fair-Lee Mills - Fairfax, Loudoun.

Pulaski Cooperative Exchange - Pulaski.

Accomplishments

The establishment of integrated relations between the mixing operations of the Farmers' Cooperative Fertiliser Purchasers and the retail distribution operations of the Halifax and Pittsylvania Purchasing Associations which resulted in the former earning patronage dividends of over $5 per ton and the payment of cash patronage dividends of $2.50 per ton, in addition to providing premium quality fertilizer at the standard price.

The establishment of the Lower Peninsula Cooperative Farm Bureau with warehouses at Hampton and Newport News. The warehouse at Hampton shows a gain and the one at Newport News a loss, so the latter will probably be discontinued.

The putting into operation of a model system of patronage records and Certificates of Indebtedness for membership dues and patronage refunds by the Augusta Cooperative Farm Bureau.

Outlook

The Cooperative Purchasing project has been neglected during the past year as a result of pressing work in the fluid milk markets. The Purchasing project deserves more attention but whether it will receive it depends upon developments in securing the reinstatement of the Milk Control Law.

Needs

The greatest need in connection with this project is more time in which to contact local cooperative purchasing associations and study their problems and then work out a program for helping them solve these difficulties. The

Marketing Specialist hopes, in cooperation with the Division of Markets, to induce more cooperative purchasing associations to have annual audits made by the auditor of the Division of Markets so that we can secure average figures on operating costs and discuss these with each Board of Directors and Manager in comparison with the figures for that cooperative. Another real need is the promotion of better understanding and closer relations between local purchasing associations and the Southern States Cooperative. The Marketing Specialist will try a conference of directors and managers of local cooperatives and Farm Bureau with the Southern States Cooperative officers this year to see what can be accomplished along this line.

Virginia Farm Economics

Specialists Employed on this Project

All members of the department, whether extension, research or teaching.

Purpose

To furnish timely economic information and to report recent results of important research work to farmers and farm leaders in Virginia.

Method

This publication was started in the summer of 1931 and for about two years was published as a monthly publication. During the past year it has been published when we thought enough important material had been gathered to justify its publication.

Location

This publication is mailed out to farmers and farm leaders throughout this state and to a limited number of farm leaders in other states.

Accomplishments

We started publication with 2000 copies of each issue. Virginia Farm Economics has had a slow but consistent growth until now we are publishing 2500 copies of each issue.

Outlook

We plan to continue publication of Virginia Farm Economics and to enlarge its circulation as new requests arise.

Radio Talks

Specialists Employed on this Project

By all members of the department.

Purpose

To furnish the radio audience with timely economic information.

Method

Once a month two ten minute radio talks are given over WDBJ, Roanoke. This station is connected by wire to the local broadcasting studio at V. P. I.

Accomplishments

During the past year 10 radio talks on economic topics have been given by members of this department.

Outlook

We plan to continue this feature of our program.

The A. A. A. Program

Specialists Employed on this Project

Mr. J. L. Nanton spent practically all of his available time in assisting with the development of the A. A. A. program in this state. Mr. Nanton left on about October 1 on a leave of absence to finish his work for a Ph.D. degree at Cornell University. Since that time Mr. S. H. Cassell has been doing the work which was previously done by Mr. Nanton.

Results

Table I shows the commodities on which work was done. It also shows the days of time spent monthly on these commodities by Mr. Nanton and Mr. Cassell and the percentage spent on such commodities for the entire year.

Table II is a report on Virginia fire-cured tobacco contracts. This report shows 11,775 contracts received from 24 counties. These contracts had a base acreage of 93,670 acres and a base production of 82,842,040 pounds. The rental payment in 1934 was approximately $409,824. The adjustment payment computed on an allotted production of 43,906,824 pounds selling at the maximum permitted under the contract (21¢ per pound) should be approximately $922,487 for the year 1934.

Table III is a report on Virginia flue-cured tobacco contracts. This report shows 4,306 contracts received from 21 counties. These contracts

had a base acreage of 28,302 acres and a base production of 20,450,120 pounds. The rental payment in 1954 was approximately $84,000. The first adjustment payment will be approximately $82,000 and the second adjustment payment about $85,000.

Table 4 is a report on Virginia Burley tobacco contracts. This report shows 5,795 contracts received from 16 counties. These contracts had a base acreage of 10,817 acres and a base production of 10,130,948 pounds. The rental payment in 1954 was approximately $75,400. The first adjustment payment will be approximately $140,200 and the second adjustment payment about $216,000.

Table 5 is a report on Virginia sun-cured tobacco contracts. This report shows 278 contracts received from 9 counties. These contracts had a base acreage of 1,099 and a base production of approximately 812,227 pounds. The rental payment was about $1,900 in 1954. The first adjustment payment will be about $10,600 and the second adjustment payment approximately $7,200.

Table 6 shows a summary of rental and adjustment payments on tobacco in Virginia by types expected to be paid for reduction of acreage of the 1954 crop. This table shows a total of 36,487 rented acres with a total rental payment of $672,004 or an average of $18.42 per rented acre for all types of tobacco.

Adjustment payments for all types of tobacco totalled $1,470,175 and averaged $40.30 per rented acre. Estimates of total adjustment and rental

payments are $2,000,179 or an average of $80.45 per rented acre. The estimates of total payments per rented acre by types of tobacco are $66.67 for flue-cured, $37.01 for fire-cured, $118.41 for Burley and $67.82 for dark-air (sun cured) with an average of $80.45 per rented acre for all types.

Table 7 is a report of cotton contracts received at the state office showing the number of contracts, base acres, base production and acres rented. The number of cotton contracts were 4,841 with an adjusted base acreage of 60,618 acres and an adjusted base production of 16,702,880 pounds and a total of acres rented to the Secretary of 23,465 acres. Rental payments will approximate $224,888 for the 1954 crop. Parity payments will be $660,810 as a minimum for the 1954 crop.

Methods

The time of Messrs. Manton and Cassell while working on the A. A. A. projects will be divided into days in the office and days in the field. The days spent in the field were largely in overnight trips to Washington to get first hand knowledge of the tobacco, cotton and corn-hog production reduction programs. The days in the office were spent answering correspondence, interpreting rulings and clearing contracts.

The meetings attended were largely to explain some new A. A. A. program about to be launched or some phase of compliance in the program already

underway. Twelve thousand letters were written by Mr. Hatton and 5000 by Mr. Cassell since Mr. Hatton went to Cornell. Nearly all of the letters written were in connection with tobacco or cotton contracts and were concerned with rental and adjustment payments. Forty-six different circular letters were interpretations of rulings or explanations for the use of new forms.

Table 1.- Percentage of Time Spent Monthly by Commodities and Percentage of Time By Commodities For the Year

COMMODITIES

Percentage by Months

Months	Cotton	Corn-Hog	Tobacco			
			Flue	Fire	Burley	Dark-Air
January	-	20	80	-	-	-
February	-	-	100	-	-	-
March	10	-	50	30	10	-
April	20	-	60	20	20	-
May	-	-	30	40	20	10
June	15	-	10	30	40	5
July	20	10	20	20	20	10
August	10	-	30	20	30	10
September	5	-	20	30	30	5
October	-	-	30	33	30	7
November	-	-	29	33	29	9
December	-	-	-	-	-	-
Percentage by Year	9%	8%	44%	21%	17%	4%

Table X.- Report on Virginia Flue-Cured Tobacco Contracts

County	Total Contracts: Number Contracts	Base Acreage	Base Production
Amelia	118	605.5	414,062
Appomattox	10	51.0	31,975
Brunswick	619	4804.0	3,220,192
Campbell	224	1350.5	974,080
Charlotte	615	3304.7	2,199,180
Chesterfield	96	548.6	344,128
Cumberland	14	116.1	64,888
Carvell	2	7.1	4,205
Dinwiddie	576	3799.2	2,534,292
Franklin	406	2144.6	1,342,209
Greenville	71	518.2	368,576
Halifax	2227	21489.0	15,897,338
Henry	221	1434.9	978,321
Lunenburg	748	5447.5	3,838,779
Mecklenburg	1781	12838.4	10,205,121
Nottoway	151	1003.3	720,648
Nansemond	11	84.0	80,857
Patrick	401	2339.0	1,478,806
Pittsylvania	2116	17028.3	12,402,299
Prince Edward	127	880.1	665,518
Surry	46	274.9	178,585
Southampton	9	59.6	40,709
Prince George	2	9.7	5,040
Bedford	4	10.5	6,189
Total	11,775	93809.7	69,868,042

Rented acres approximately 25% of base acres 23417.4
At $17.00 $402,804.80
Total Rental Payment in 1934.

Approximately 75% of the base production - 48,906,029.
the allotted production.
Sale of allotted production at 11¢ per lb.
(maximum permitted under contract) $ 5,380,272.03
The Adjustment Payment - 10¢ - $ 321,027.20
for the year 1934.

Table 5.- Report on Virginia Fire-Cured Tobacco Contracts

County	Total Contracts: Number Contracts	Total Contracts: Base Acreage	Total Contracts: Base Production
Amelia	514	1198.8	912,726
Amherst	465	2268.7	1,979,889
Appomattox	821	3865.5	2,709,822
Chesterfield	8	47.0	30,082
Bedford	757	2830.9	2,108,478
Buckingham	480	2070.0	1,456,560
Campbell	589	3397.5	2,249,821
Charlotte	640	3712.0	2,609,856
Cumberland	431	1810.5	1,413,668
Dinwiddie	576	869.4	621,621
Franklin	36	90.0	68,000
Lunenburg	226	819.8	589,088
Nelson	139	779.1	560,178
Nottoway	212	952.0	727,144
Prince Edward	648	2794.8	2,118,888
Brunswick	309	950.0	702,130
Middlesex	2		
Halifax	2	19.4	10,248
Mecklenburg	10	41.0	27,978
Pittsylvania	49	236.8	179,713
Powhatan	23	77.0	52,620
Total	6300	27301.5	20,490,188

Rental Payments approximately $86,000.
First adjustment approximately $92,000.
Second adjustment approximately $68,000.

Table 6.-- Report on Virginia Burley Tobacco Contracts

County	Total Contracts		
	Number Contracts	Base Acreage	Base Production
Bland	10	20.6	29,169
Buchanan	19	15.2	12,160
Brunswick	5		
Dickenson	14	28.0	21,448
Fluvanna	2	0.6	834
Grayson	16	7.2	7,560
Halifax	1		
Lee	997	1884.8	1,857,472
Pulaski	9		
Russell	1132	2128.0	2,110,976
Scott	1386	2282.0	2,021,032
Smyth	824	826.0	870,526
Tazewell	82	82.5	87,035
Washington	1973	3722.2	3,654,177
Wise	10	15.0	12,045
Wythe	1	.4	322
Total	6782	10817.0	10,130,946

Rental payments approximately $75,600 in 1934.
First Adjustment approximately $148,500 in 1934.
Second Adjustment approximately $216,000 in 1935.

Table 8.- Report on Virginia Sun-Cured Tobacco Contracts

County	Number Contracts	Base Acreage	Base Production
Amelia	11	44.4	28,184
Caroline	23	98.2	61,320
Chesterfield	10	24.1	13,360
Cumberland	2	5.9	6,310
Florence	79	194.6	122,912
Goochland	156	401.7	244,180
Hanover	37	80.8	72,720
Louisa	46	122.8	102,041
Powhatan	5	9.0	6,120
Total	375	1000.2	612,227

Approximately $9,000 was paid in rental payments.
$10,888.32 - first payment.
$ 7,200.64 - second payment.

Table 6.- Estimate of Summaries of Rental and Adjustment Payments on Tobacco in Virginia by Types for the 1954 Crop

Type of Tobacco	Rented Acres	Rental Payment	Rental Payment per Rented Acre	First Adjustment Payment	First Adjustment Payment per Rented Acre	Second Adjustment Payment	Second Adjustment Payment per Rented Acre	Total Rental and Adjustment Payments	Total Payments per Rented Acre
Flue-Cured	25,417	409,804	17.80	922,057	39.37	—	—	1,331,861	56.87
Fire-Cured	7,075	84,900	12.00	92,000	13.00	85,000	12.01	261,900	37.01
Burley 1/	3,670	73,400	20.00	145,200	49.56	216,000	58.85	434,600	118.41
Sun-Cured	325	3,900	12.00	10,552	32.46	7,386	22.73	21,838	67.29
Total or Average	34,487	572,004	16.59	1,169,789	33.92	306,386	8.94	2,050,179	59.45

1/ This is an average for the 50 and 33 1/3 percent reduction.

Table 7.-- Report of Cotton Contracts Received at State Office showing Total Number, Base Acres, Base Production and Acres Rented.

County	Contracts Number	Base Acreage Allotted Acres	Base Production Allotted Pounds	Acres Rented to Secretary Acres
Amelia	1	7	1,687	3
Brunswick	783	9854	2,548,000	3,827
Charlotte	94	684	167,000	274
Chesterfield	4	16	4,000	9
Dinwiddie	127	988	226,000	981
Greensville	621	11,822	3,195,000	4,288
Halifax	85	675	119,000	210
Isle of Wight	190	1,815	418,000	544
Lunenburg	145	1,854	416,000	612
Mecklenburg	845	11,405	2,961,200	4,285
Middlesex	6	87	17,100	28
Nansemond	861	6,277	2,049,700	2,932
Norfolk	44	508	142,000	202
Nottoway	14	89	20,000	40
Pittsylvania	3	14	2,200	3
Princess Anne	71	478	165,000	198
Prince George	7	32	9,125	11
Southampton	749	12,088	3,282,000	4,201
Sussex	221	2,839	826,000	959
Totals	4541	60,636	16,702,809	23,492

Rental Payments approximately $228,000 in 1934.
Parity Payment $66,610 as a minimum in 1934.

Miscellaneous Activities

1. By the Farm Management Demonstrator, Mr. W. J. Buchelle, Jr.

(a) The specialist was called on by the Farm Credit Administration to spend several days in February with Mr. Britt in working up cost of production information on various Virginia crops.

(b) On January 17 Mr. Buchelle delivered a radio talk from Washington on the Land-Grant College program over N. B. C. The subject of the talk was "Marketing Early Potatoes in Virginia".

(c) At the request of Mr. V. B. Perry the specialist closed out the Jamestown 4-H Club camp records and made up operating statements for the camp. These statements were furnished the camp's Board of Directors for their annual meeting. The specialist also assisted the camp manager, Mr. L. E. Parker, in setting up the books for the 1934 camp.

(d) At the request of Director Hutcheson, the specialist attended the early potato marketing agreement meeting at Accomac, Virginia, April 18.

(e) The specialist testified and presented evidence at the A. A. A. Irish potato hearing at Painter, Virginia, November 30-31.

Miscellaneous Services

1. By Dr. Gordon H. Ward, Associate Agricultural Economist.

In December, 1933, Dr. Ward spent two days in Baltimore conferring with the Production Credit Corporation regarding the development of Production Credit Associations in the truck crop sections on the Eastern Shore and around Norfolk in time to help finance the 1934 operations. Two days were spent on the Eastern Shore in Northampton and Accomac counties conferring with the county agents and local farm leaders regarding the establishment of the Production Credit Association and explaining the matter at a farmers mass meeting. Dr. Ward's offers of further assistance were not accepted because the Baltimore Production Credit Corporation sent two field men into Virginia to explain the project to the county agents and farmers and assist with the establishment of the district Production Credit Associations. The Production Credit Associations on the Shore and in the Norfolk area were established in time to aid materially in financing 1934 operations.

Dark Tobacco Marketing Associations- At various times during the year Dr. Ward conferred with officers of the Dark Fired Tobacco Marketing Association regarding various operating problems. In the fall of 1934 he spent two days at the Association headquarters in Farmville and made an audit and financial report to the Directors. Portions of the report were printed in the Tobacco Grower, the paper published by the Association to educate the membership.

Outlook Meetings:- Due to the pressure of work on the A. A. A. programs, very few outlook meetings were held. Mr. Ward presented the Agricultural Outlook to farmers and members of the Advisory Board of Grayson County in December, to a similar group at Tappahannock at a Farmers' Institute and at the annual convention of the Canners' Association in Luray later in the winter.

Tomato Marketing:- At the request of former leaders in the Conn River Tomato Association, Mr. Ward spent a day with County Agent Hubbard conferring with these men in regard to improved methods of marketing, looking forward to a possible re-organization of the Association in the future.

Egg Marketing:- During the spring and summer several conferences were held with County Agent Cox and officials of the City Produce Exchange in Harrisonburg to explain to these officials methods by which the Exchange could be converted into a cooperative, if they wished to make the conversion. To date, nothing has developed out of these conferences.

Poultry Institutes:- In February Mr. Ward took part in the Poultry Institute at Fairfax at the request of County Agent Derr and the Southern States Marketing Cooperative to explain the cost of producing eggs as found by the V. P. I. Experiment Station survey.

Agricultural Conference Board:- During the winter Mr. Ward conferred with leaders of the Board in regard to the legislative program of the Board and participated in a conference of Board members during the legislative

session. At the request of the president Dr. Ward arranged the program for the annual meeting of the Board held in Blacksburg the first of August. The attendance was very good and there was an active discussion of topics of current importance to Virginia farmers led by authorities.

Rural Rehabilitation:- In the spring Dr. Ward attended the Richmond conference on rural rehabilitation Virginia Emergency Relief Administration. Assistance in cooperative organization work among the rehabilitation farmers was offered but no call for aid has been received.

Co-op Mill:- One day was spent in Fluvanna County in the fall conferring with the County Agent and a committee of farmers regarding the establishment of a cooperative flour and feed mill which would also handle the marketing of eggs and poultry. Little interest was shown by the mass of the farmers and apparently nothing has developed.

Marketing Dry Beans:- In the fall of 1934 Dr. Ward attended a conference at Galax and discussed with the vocational agriculture teachers, the county agent and members of the Southern States Cooperative Galax Service Advisory Board, the store manager and the Southern States Cooperative District Manager, methods of cooperatively processing and marketing the dry edible beans produced in Grayson and Carroll counties.

Sweet Potato Co-ops:- During the year assistance was rendered the Nice Sweet Potato Curing Association in revising their membership marketing agreement. During the fall of 1934 two days were spent with the county agent

of Caroline County and vocational agriculture teacher working out and putting into operation a simple yet efficient system of accounting for the Sparta Farmers Cooperative which operates a sweet potato curing house and markets sweet potatoes cured by the individual members. Further assistance will be rendered this association during the coming year.

Radio Talks and Articles:- As a result of the curtailment of radio broadcasting by V. P. I., the number of radio talks Dr. Ward prepared during the year was much smaller than during previous years. Dr. Ward says he has never had any response from any radio talk given. He does not know whether this is the result of the type of talks he gives on cooperative activity and current topics in the field of dairy, poultry and egg marketing and cooperative credit, or whether it is the result of the small territory covered by the Roanoke station. He sometimes questions whether the results justify the effort.

During the year Dr. Ward continued the preparation of monthly articles on cooperative topics for Extension Division News and the preparation of the Dairy, Egg and Poultry market reviews for Virginia Farm Economics. In addition, he prepared a series of articles dealing with the history and accomplishments of various Virginia cooperatives for release to the press through the Virginia Chamber of Commerce. These articles were used by many papers all over the state and gave cooperatives much favorable publicity with both farm and urban people. A summary article is being prepared for the Commonwealth, monthly magazine of the

Virginia Chamber of Commerce. In addition he prepared an article on the Rockingham Cooperative Farm Bureau which appeared in Cooperation, an article on the Southern States Cooperative for the Cooperative Marketing Journal, a review of Dairy Products under the A. A. A. for the Journal of Farm Economics, and news notes on Virginia cooperatives for the Cooperative Marketing Journal.

Talk on Consumers Cooperatives- As a result of the growing interest in cooperation, among both farm and city people, Dr. Ward was asked to discuss cooperative purchasing before the Blacksburg chapter of the American Association of University Women. Special emphasis was placed upon purchase of goods of dependable, uniform high quality at reasonable cost through cooperative associations.

Miscellaneous Activities

1. Dr. H. H. Young, Head of Department.

February 6, 1934	- Inspected Subsistence Homestead Project at Greenville, Tennessee.
March 9, 1934	- Talked to Farm Account School in Salem, Virginia. Met Mr. George Patterson and helped make plans for Land Bank Appraisers' School.
March 13-14, 1934	- Attended conference of Federal Emergency Relief Administration representatives at Atlanta, Georgia.
March 26, 1934	- Addressed Land Bank Appraisers' School at Blacksburg.
March 28, 1934	- Attended Land Utilization Conference at Washington, D. C. Plans discussed for a program in Virginia.
March 29-31, 1934	- Assisted in organizing and teaching a land bank appraisers' school at Lynchburg and Suffolk.
April 2-7, 1934	- Made trip through Piedmont Virginia to help locate submarginal land.
April 12, 1934	- Gave paper before the annual meeting of the Virginia Social Science Association.
May 12, 1934	- Inspecting submarginal land in Franklin County.
June 30, 1934	- Addressed a teachers' conference at the Virginia State College for negroes at Ettrick, Virginia.
July 10, 1934	- Conference with the Land Planning Division of the A. A. A.
August 6, 1934	- Interview with Mr. J. F. Andrew with respect to state project leader of sub-marginal land retirement.
August	- Addressed Agricultural Teachers' Conference.
August 10-Sept.27, 1934	- Attended International Economic Conference at Bad Nizza, Germany, toured Germany and Great Britain.
Oct. 28 - Nov. 3, 1934	- Attended annual outlook conference at Washington, D.C.

Land Planning

Specialist Employed on this Project

Dr. H. H. Young, Head of Department.

Purpose

To assist the Land Policy Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the State Planning Board in formulating and carrying out a policy with respect to land utilization in Virginia.

Methods Used and Results Obtained

In the spring of 1934 a local land planning committee was appointed at V. P. I. with Dr. Young as chairman, the purpose of which was to cooperate and act in an advisory capacity with the Land Policy Section of the A. A. A. and the State Planning Board. This committee met with representatives from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in Washington and at Blacksburg, as well as in Richmond, and also met with representatives from the State Planning Board in Richmond. A number of land inspection tours were made in the spring and early summer of 1934.

In July, 1934, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration decided to make a preliminary land utilization survey in order that it might present information requested by the president in the preparation of a report on land utilization and policy which it is likely that the president will present to the National Congress when it meets this winter. Mr. W. H. Pippin was hired by the Land Policy Section of the A. A. A. as State Land Planning Consultant. Mr. Pippin, in cooperation with others, immediately gathered information with respect to land utilization, made a land utilization map of

map of Virginia and prepared a report which has been submitted to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Since Mr. Pippin prepared and submitted this report he has been engaged in studying agricultural trends by counties. This material will be available to the Land Policy Section of the A. A. A. and also to local extension and research workers in Virginia. Since Mr. Pippin has been hired the work of the local land planning committee has been principally advisory.

On the recommendation of the local land planning committee, Mr. J. P. Andrews of Charlottesville was employed by the Land Policy Section of the A. A. A. as State Project Leader. Mr. Andrews is now engaged in surveying and in obtaining options on submarginal land in Buckingham County. Due to the high prices obtained for tobacco this year Mr. Andrews is having considerable difficulty in obtaining options on land at reasonable prices.

Outlook

The continuation of this work depends entirely upon the decisions reached by the Land Policy Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Organization of the Department

The extension work in agricultural economics is being conducted by five men.

Dr. H. R. Young, who is head of the department, devotes one-fourth of his time to extension work, one-fourth to experiment station work, and one-half to college teaching. A large part of the extension time has been taken up during the past year in consultation with other members of the department with the idea in mind of trying to help them plan and execute their work to better advantage. The index number of farm prices, which appear in Virginia Farm Economics, are kept up-to-date by Dr. Young, who also writes most of the general articles on economics appearing in that publication. He also delivers a radio talk each month on "Timely Economic Information". Most of the work of this department on the farm development project has been done by him.

Dr. Young was granted temporary leave of absence October 4, 1933, to work with the Farm Credit Administration in the Second Federal Land Bank District. Dr. Young returned to his work at V. P. I. on January 8, 1934.

Dr. Gordon H. Ward is on full time extension work in marketing. Some of his time is spent in outlook work. He also writes the dairy, poultry and egg market reviews which appear in Virginia Farm Economics. During the past year Dr. Ward has done a most excellent piece of work.

Mr. W. J. Nuckolls, Jr. is the farm management demonstrator. He is on full time extension work and spends all of his time on farm management. During the past year Mr. Nuckolls has done a very excellent job.

The time of Mr. J. L. Manton is equally divided between the extension division and the experiment station. During the past year, from December 1, 1934 until about October 1, Mr. Manton's extension time was devoted entirely to the A. A. A. program. Since about October 1, Mr. Manton has been at Cornell University on leave of absence for the purpose of completing his work for the Ph.D. degree. We expect Mr. Manton back about February 1, 1935, with his work for the doctor's degree fully completed. Mr. Manton is a very capable man and has done very excellent work.

The time of Mr. S. M. Cassell who came to us in November, 1933 is equally divided between the experiment station and the extension division. During December, 1933 and January and part of February, 1934, Mr. Cassell was stationed in Abingdon, Virginia and was working on the Burley tobacco program in Washington County.

From July 1 to September 15 Mr. Cassell's time was spent in the field assisting with the checking of acreage compliance under the Corn-Hog, wheat, and tobacco programs. He also assisted Mr. Nuckolls in putting out the AAA farm account books and spent two weeks assisting Dr. Ward in the organization of cooperative fruit packing associations in the Valley of Virginia. Since September 15, Mr. Cassell has spent all of his time in the office

doing the work of the state agent on the tobacco adjustment reduction program.

Mr. Cassell is the youngest man on our staff. He is very capable and conscientious.

The head of the department is very favorably impressed by the fine cooperative spirit shown by all members of the department.

Outlook for the Future

During the last four years there has been a consistent yearly increase in the amount of economic extension work carried on in this department. Not only was there a continued healthy growth in the size of the majority of the regular projects, but a considerable amount of the economic work of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration placed/added burden on to the personnel of the extension staff. Due probably to the increased experience of the extension staff, the increased amount of work was carried on, together with the regular work, without as much loss in efficiency as would be expected.

The necessity for carrying on the A. A. A. program is, however, seriously interfering with the normal rate of growth of some of our other projects.

The demand for farm management extension work continues to increase annually. This will undoubtedly continue to be the case in the future. Inventory and credit statements and enterprise accounts have proven to be a good starting point for establishing complete farm account work. Inasmuch as farmers who learn their profits and losses on one enterprise often begin to wonder about what will be shown by accounts on other enterprises and their farm business as a whole. To take care of this demand the complete farm account book is available and its use in a locality generally leads to a demand for a farm management survey of the region.

The A. A. A. through its account book, is giving us probably the greatest opportunity ever offered for projecting farm management and farm accounting generally into county extension programs. The way our department is now

organized it will not be possible for us to extend the farm management program much further without an increase in personnel. Right now, we need very badly the services of one more full-time farm management extension man. It seems doubtful, even with the addition of another man, how we would be able to meet the demands for farm management work which are now being made upon us.

A serious factor limiting expansion of farm management extension work is the lack of clerical assistance in summarizing the reports. The addition of one half-time extension clerk to the staff would assist materially in returning results to farmers on time, and a large part of the value of economic extension work to farmers consists in its timeliness. It is rather poor economy to use a high salaried specialist to do work which can be done just as well by 35¢ an hour clerks.

Under the tireless efforts of Dr. Ward, the marketing extension program has grown rapidly and consistently. There is a great deal of evidence that cooperative marketing and purchasing is steadily gaining ground in this state.

Marketing work during the past year has been as much handicapped by lack of personnel as has the farm management program. During the year many opportunities to be of service to farmers in cooperative marketing were lost, owing to the inability of the Marketing Specialist to be in two or three places at one time.

It seems likely that the work called for under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration will be just as heavy during the coming year as it has been in the past. If this program is to be continued it is necessary, of course, that the work be well done.

If the demands for farm management and marketing work continue to be as heavy as they were this past year it will not be possible for us to meet these demands in the way they should be met with our present personnel.

We have the following recommendations to make at this time concerning the economic extension program:

1. During the last few years we have tried out the scheme of having the time of two of our men's work equally divided between the extension division and the experiment station. While this plan has many advantages and is generally favored by the men themselves, it is very difficult to maintain. We recommend, therefore, that as soon as the work of the extension division and the experiment will permit it, that either Mr. Cassell or Mr. Hunton be placed on full-time extension, the other being placed on full-time research.

2. In order to improve the quality of our work, we believe in giving our men every opportunity possible for improving themselves. Mr. Hunton will probably finish his work for the Doctor's degree in February, 1935. It seems likely that Mr. Cassell may be offered an assistantship at Cornell

University starting around July 1, 1938. Should this occur, we recommend that Mr. Cassell be given leave of absence sufficiently long to enable him to complete his work for the Doctor's degree.

3. Another full-time man should be employed to do farm management extension work.

4. The half-time of one clerk should be provided to assist in the clerical work incident to the extension program.

5. As soon as it is possible to do so and still be consistent with the state law, the salary received by Miss Nettie Spoure should be raised so that it is comparable with that paid other persons who are doing the same kind of work that she is now doing. It may be possible that Miss Spoure's salary can be raised by changing her status from that of stenographer to that of secretary. If this can be done legally, we recommend that this step be taken.

H. H. Young

SUMMARY

	Days in field	Days in office	Farm Loans: Annual (give date)	Farm Loans: Sale (give date)	Farm Loans: Written par (give date)	No. Agents visited	No. agencies without agents called	Meetings Executive Committee: Number	Meetings Executive Committee: Attendance	Other Meetings: Number	Other Meetings: Attendance	Committee employing agents for first time: Farm Agents	Committee employing agents for first time: Home Dem. Agents	Agents appointed	Agents discontinued	Letters written	Different circular letters written	No. circular letters sent out	Bulletins sent out	Clubs Visited: Boys' or girls'	Clubs Visited: Men's or women's	Demonstrations given	Boards of Supervisors met	School Boards or other undertaking organizations met	Mile Traveled: Auto	Mile Traveled: Rail	Mile Traveled: Other
Jan.	9	18	1		4					1	14					48			2101						540		
Feb.	5	19				2				1	40					57			2100						1018	235	
Mar.	14	12				2				11	280					82			67						2070	1025	
Apr.	10	15				2				1	60					65	1	115							1328		
May	1	24				1										60				7					225		
June	7	19				1		1	7							70									1468		
July	3	20	3					1	7	1	40					83			2400								
August	20	6	3													38			2300						1138	300	3500
Sept.	28		2																						1361	800	4000
Oct.	5	16	4			5	1			5	150					80									902		
Nov.	6	19	2							5	90					50			2300						878		
Total	101	172	15			4	13	1	2	14	21	964				884	1	115	11175						10924	2060	7500
Ave.	8.6	14.5	1.3			.3	1.1	.08	.2	1.2	1.8	78.7				45.6	.08	9.6	931.3						911.2	171.6	625

REPORT HERE WORK OF THE

NAME

TITLE

DATE

= 79 =

Form No. E-202

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

MONTHLY REPORT OF STATE OR DISTRICT AGENT, OR SPECIALIST

Name _____ Post Office _____ Month _____ 19____

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTION.—Under the heading "Nature of Work" classify field supervision as relating to: (1) Office organization, records, and reports; (2) maintenance and training of personnel; (3) program determination; (4) program analysis; (5) subject-matter assistance; (6) publicity; (7) other work specified.

DATE	COUNTY	AGENT VISITED	NATURE OF WORK

WORK IN COUNTIES WITHOUT AGENTS

DATE	COUNTY	NATURE OF WORK

NOTE.—This report is to be made out in duplicate at the last day of each month by State and District Agents and one copy sent to Assistant Director or State Home Demonstration Agent, as case may be.
Salary will be held until this report is received.

(OVER)

W. J. Rochelle, Jr.

SUMMARY

	Days in field	Days in office	Farm Loans: Annual (give dates)	Farm Loans: Sick (give dates)	Farm Loans: Without pay (give dates)	No. Assns visited	No. counties visited outside assns visited	Meetings Executive Committee: Number	Meetings Executive Committee: Attendance	Other Meetings: Number	Other Meetings: Attendance	Counties employing agents for first time	Farm Agents	Home Dem. Agents	Assns organized	Assns dissolved	Letters written	Different circular letters written	No. circular letters sent out	Bulletins sent out	Clubs Visited: Boys' or girls'	Clubs Visited: Men's or women's	Demonstrations given	Boards of Supervisors met	School Boards or other entertaining organizations met	Miles Traveled: Auto	Miles Traveled: Rail	Miles Traveled: Other
Dec. 1933	1	16	9														18	1	750	750						180		
Jan. 1934	9	16	2			9											27	1	250	2458						1110	708	
Feb.	1	24				1											45	2	260	185							444	
Mar.	5	21				5											40	7	60	500						395		
Apr.	22	8				19				2	175						47	5	615	275						3769		
May	27					22	1	23	1250								20	6	270				23			2253		
June	21	9				9				2	400						25	1	175							2227		30
July	10	7	6			5											17									1289		
Aug.	20	8				10											25									2210		
Sept.	10	12	2			4											20									627		
Oct.	16	13	2			10											20	5	475							1556		42
Nov.	14	8	3			2				1	500						27									976		88
Total	143	135	23			116	1	23	1250	5	1075						460	22	3460	5402			23			19360	1144	164
Ave.	11.9	11.2	1.9			9.8	.08	4.4	104.2	.4	89.6						38.3	1.8	288	450.2			4.4			1613.3	95.3	13.3

REPORT HERE WORK OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NAME

TITLE

DATE

- 99 -

Form No. E-202

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

MONTHLY REPORT OF STATE OR DISTRICT AGENT, OR SPECIALIST

Name _____ Post Office _____ Month _____ 19__

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTION.—Under the heading "Nature of Work" classify field supervision as relating to: (1) Office organization, records, and reports; (2) maintenance and training of personnel; (3) program determination; (4) program analysis; (5) subject-matter assistance; (6) publicity; (7) other work specified.

DATE	COUNTY	AGENT VISITED	NATURE OF WORK

WORK IN COUNTIES WITHOUT AGENTS

DATE	COUNTY	NATURE OF WORK

NOTE.—This report is to be made out in duplicate on the last day of each month by State and District Agents and one copy sent to Assistant Director or State Home Demonstration Agent, as case may be.
Salary will be held until this report is received.

(OVER)

REPORT HERE WORK OF SPECIAL INTEREST

SUMMARY

| | | |

Form No. E-202

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

MONTHLY REPORT OF STATE OR DISTRICT AGENT, OR SPECIALIST

Name _____ Post Office _____ Month _____ 19____

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTION.—Under the heading "Nature of Work" classify field supervision as relating to: (1) Office organization, records, and reports; (2) maintenance and training of personnel; (3) program determination; (4) program analysis; (5) subject-matter assistance; (6) publicity; (7) other work specified.

DATE	COUNTY	AGENT VISITED	NATURE OF WORK

WORK IN COUNTIES WITHOUT AGENTS

DATE	COUNTY	NATURE OF WORK

NOTE.—This report is to be made out in duplicate on the last day of each month by State and District Agents and one copy sent to Assistant Director or State Home Demonstration Agent, as case may be.
Salary will be held until this report is received.

(OVER)

J. L. MAXTON

SUMMARY

	Days in field	Days in office	Days Leave: Annual (give dates)	Days Leave: Sick (give dates)	Days Leave: Without pay (give dates)	No. Agents visited	No. agencies without agents visited	Meetings Executive Committee: Number	Meetings Executive Committee: Attendance	Other Meetings: Number	Other Meetings: Attendance	Committee conferences with agents for 2nd time: Farm Agents	Committee conferences with agents for 2nd time: Home Dem. Agents	Agents appointed	Agents discontinued	Letters written	Different circular letters written	No. circular letters sent out	Bulletins sent out	Clubs Visited: Boys' or girls'	Clubs Visited: Men's or women's	Demonstrations given	Boards of Supervisors met	School Boards or other controlling organizations met	Miles Traveled: Auto	Miles Traveled: Rail	Miles Traveled: Other
Jan. 1924	3	20								4	800	1				800									800		
Feb.	2	25								2	40					600	4	200							200	600	
Mar.	3	26														1000									90	400	
Apr.	5	23								5	400					1000	5	18000							800	1000	
May	6	21														2000	12	9000								1800	
June	2	26								1	20					2000	10	600								600	
July	4	8								4	200	8				1000	5	600							600	600	
Aug.	2	6								3	200					1000	5	600							280	280	
Sept.	2	6	3							2	80	2				1000	5	280								800	
Oct.			12																								
Nov.					15																						
Dec.					15																						
Total	29	163	15		30					19	2120	11				12000	46	20380							2040	5480	
Average	2.4	13.6	1.2		2.5					1.6	176.6	.9				1000	3.8	1698.8							170	456.2	

REPORT HERE YOUR WORK OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NAME

TYPE

DATE

Form No. E-202

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

MONTHLY REPORT OF STATE OR DISTRICT AGENT, OR SPECIALIST

Name _____ Post Office _____ Month _____ 19___

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTION.— Under the heading "Nature of Work" classify field supervision as relating to: (1) Office organization, records, and reports; (2) maintenance and training of personnel; (3) program determination; (4) program analysis; (5) subject-matter assistance; (6) publicity; (7) other work specified.

DATE	COUNTY	AGENT VISITED	NATURE OF WORK

WORK IN COUNTIES WITHOUT AGENTS

DATE	COUNTY	NATURE OF WORK

NOTE.—This report is to be made out in duplicate on the last day of each month by State and District Agents and one copy sent to Assistant Director or State Home Demonstration Agent, as case may be.
Salary will be held until this report is received.

(OVER)

S. E. Council

SUMMARY

	Days in field	Days in office	Days Leave: Annual (give dates)	Days Leave: Sick (give dates)	Days Leave: Without pay (give dates)	No. Agents visited	No. months without agents visited	Meetings Executive Committee: Number	Meetings Executive Committee: Attendance	Other Meetings: Number	Other Meetings: Attendance	Campaign employing agents for first time: Farm Agents	Campaign employing agents for first time: Home Dem. Agents	Agents discontinued	Agents appointed	Letters written	Different circular letters written	No. circular letters sent out	Bulletins sent out	Clubs Visited: Boys' or girls'	Clubs Visited: Men's or women's	Demonstrations given	Boards of Supervisors met	School Boards or other conferences or organizations met	Miles Travelled: Auto	Miles Travelled: Rail	Miles Travelled: Other
Dec. 1935	9	1								5	250					2									213		
Jan. 1936	2	25								2	1039					281	5	2949							84		
Feb.	26	0				2				23	900	2				900									915		
Mar.	14	5								34	738					5									1765		
April	20	6				10				7	110					10									1176		
May.	23	6	8			24	6			7	125					25							5		1468		
Sept.	8	16	1	1	1	16	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	770	2	175							385		
Oct.	2	27	1	1	1	1	1	1	14	2	700	1	1	1	1	1000	10	700	1	1	1	1	1		880	130	105
Nov.	3	21														2000	10	1000							308	568	
Total	101	105	4	2		2	86	10	2	16	69	3853	4	2	2	2	5195	230	4876	1	1	1	6	1	7622	718	105
Ave.	11	12	.6	.2		.2	9.5	1.1	.2	1.8	7.6	428	.6	.2	.2	.2	577	25.5	541.6	.1	.1	.1	.6	.1	846.8	79.8	11.6

REPORT HERE WORK OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NAME

TITLE

DATE

Form No. E-202

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS
STATE OF VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE AND POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COOPERATING

EXTENSION SERVICE

MONTHLY REPORT OF STATE OR DISTRICT AGENT, OR SPECIALIST

Name _____ Post Office _____ Month _____ 19____

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTION.—Under the heading "Nature of Work" classify field supervision as relating to: (1) Office organization, records, and reports; (2) maintenance and training of personnel; (3) program determination; (4) program analysis; (5) subject-matter assistance; (6) publicity; (7) other work specified.

DATE	COUNTY	AGENT VISITED	NATURE OF WORK

WORK IN COUNTIES WITHOUT AGENTS

DATE	COUNTY	NATURE OF WORK

NOTE.—This report is to be made out in duplicate on the last day of each month by State and District Agents and one copy sent to Assistant Director or State Home Demonstration Agent, as case may be.
Salary will be held until this report is received.

(OVER)