

CALIFORNIA PLANTING COTTON SEED DISTRIBUTORS  
POOL SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE  
2201 F STREET  
BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE: LLOYD HARNISH, Chairman; Tilford Cheney, Floyd Yearout, Otis Page, Karl Schneider, Les Unger.

The purpose of this report is twofold:

1. That you recommend to the Board of Directors what method of Pool Settlement will be used for 1962.
2. That you review recommendation #1 of a group of recommendations mailed to the Board in July, 1961, and in a letter read to the Board at their Annual Meeting on July 26, 1961 by Waldo Weeth, Chairman of a committee appointed by the Rancher's Cotton Oil Co. to report on the planting seed situation.

The Board requests that you study this recommendation and then make your recommendation to them at their January meeting.

Attached you will find the following:

1. Recommendations mailed to the Directors.
2. Letter read to the Directors by Waldo Weeth dated July 25, 1961
3. Manager's observations regarding recommendation #1.
4. John Turner's letter to the Directors regarding the recommendations.
5. Methods of pool settlement acted on by your committee over the years regarding the amount of the distribution and the settlement on tonnage and acreage.

In considering these recommendations, there are several important points to be kept in mind:

1. That our written agreement with the USDA places the responsibility on the Distributors to produce sufficient planting seed at all times to protect every grower for normal use and emergencies in the least possible time and at the lowest possible cost.
2. That we have the lowest priced quality planting seed in the nation except Arizona and their program is now in jeopardy; and that our seed organization is the only one of its kind in the nation that has been operating for over 30 years without disaster.
3. That the purity and quality of the seed in the various stages of increase must be maintained at all times in order that all growers may have the advantage of the latest improvements from the breeding blocks at the Shafter Station.
4. That we welcome constructive suggestions but we should not make changes unless there is a sound reason behind such suggestions.
5. That the program was organized to provide quality planting seed for all growers and not to make a profit.

WEETH COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

\* \* \* \* \*

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
CALIFORNIA PLANTING COTTON SEED DISTRIBUTORS

Prior to making these recommendations let us first preface our remarks and recommendations by first saying we are whole-heartedly in accord with the one variety law, and are very conscious of what it has meant to the California Cotton Industry. We are also very conscious of the divergence of interest and philosophy of the various co-operators which makes the problems of the California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors most complex.

With these remarks as a preface and with intentions of adding constructive advantages to the present program and to eliminate some of the iniquities, we will proceed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

The present division of incentive payments for producing and saving of cotton planting seed seems to be fairly equitable in origin and intent, but over a period of time has become badly unbalanced.

We recommend that with the beginning of the year 1961-1962, that an upward adjustment be made to the co-operating planting seed grower along the following lines, because to the best of our knowledge none have been made previously.

(a) Since the beginning of the planting seed program in or about 1925, a number of upward adjustments have been made to the co-operator to compensate for additional costs of labor, sacks, storage, insurance, interest, investment, etc.

Management and the Directors have apparently assumed the growers costs have remained static, which is not true. His costs have risen commensurate with those of the co-operator.

For Example:

According to the Cotton Planting Seed Distributors, figures from 1949-1950 to 1959-1960, an eleven year period, the extra cost of handling planting seed advanced from \$36.00 per ton to \$43.68 or \$7.68 per ton or 21 1/3 per cent. This program has been in effect for approximately 36 years. If these percentages are relative for the entire time, then approximately 65 per cent should be added to the co-operating growers original \$7.50 per ton incentive payment or approximately \$4.90 making a total initial payment of \$12.40 per ton to the grower.

(b) In the recommended costs for handling seed, our committee feels that the item of grower's incentive and pool risk should be two separate items. It represents such a large percentage of the total cost that it needs clarification.

Recommendations to the Board of Directors  
California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

That restrictions be lifted whereby it will be permissible to save seed from sprinkler irrigated fields.

Water is one of the most critical items in most areas of the cotton counties of the San Joaquin Valley. In many cases as much as 50 per cent of the water requirements can be saved with sprinkler irrigation. Some of the heaviest producing and cleanest land under deep well irrigation is discriminated against because of sprinkler irrigation.

If restrictions are lifted on sprinkler irrigation, as a safety check we would suggest the following:

1. At the time fields are inspected by the field crews of California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, if angular leaf spot is found in the field, we suggest the field be rejected for the saving of planting seed.
2. Any sprinkler irrigated field that is approved for planting seed would be kept separate and would be acid delinted.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

That restrictions be lifted, requiring that separate gins be used for sprinkler irrigated cotton if planting seed is being saved at that gin site.

Suggestions:

We believe in addition to the present regulations of good housekeeping, and the discarding of seed from the first two bales after a change over etc.

1. Greater care should be exercised in getting seed out of the bottom of auger troughs under gin stands, and then if the gin is not equipped with a seep pump in lieu of the conventional conveyor screw, that this requirement be considered. A seed pump system is completely self-cleaning.

We feel it is the responsibility of the Shafter Station Personnel and the co-operating research men from the university, to give us an economical and workable set of rules that the Board of Directors of California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors can adopt that will protect the purity of the seed and keep it free of seed borne diseases. Since we are dealing with only one variety in its different stages of progression, it greatly simplifies the problem.

For example:

Anyone who has grown and processed many varieties of Certified Alfalfa Seed would find this process quite elementary in time consumption.

Recommendations to the Board of Directors  
California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

We believe the requirements of compelling any co-operator to sack planting seed, at any stage, in the progression of breeders seed to the final stage of commercial green tag prior to delinting, grading, and treating for planting purposes is unnecessary.

We do feel that the co-operator must be responsible for the identity of the seed at all times.

At the time of our committee meeting, we will be prepared with some additional recommendations for handling seed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

As we made a survey of the various co-operators planting seed processing plants, we found that most of them graded their seed after it was either machine delinted or acid delinted. Some graded the seed prior to delinting, but we don't feel this is as important to the grower as after delinting.

For the benefit of better quality and more uniformity of planting seed, we believe that a requirement for grading all seed would be in order.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

We believe any regimentation against any co-operator forcing him to handle seed in any way that would be more expensive, prior to the processing of the seed for planting purposes, and because the co-operator does not personally own all phases of the processing plant, should be deleted.

However, we do re-emphasize that the co-operator must be responsible for the purity and identity of his planting seed at all times.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

Where proper provisions have been made to handle mill seed in bulk from seed slabs, that in some cases the same loading elevators could be used to load planting seed.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

We feel a little closer check should be maintained in the total requirements of planting stock seed that is saved. We believe the supply generally has been more than necessary for even the most adverse planting conditions. At planting time in the spring, virtually all oil mills still have an ample supply of prime mill seed in their seed stacks. Since we are dealing with only one variety of cotton, and if we were to have an extremely heavy demand for planting seed for replant, this source could still be made available.

Recommendations to the Board of Directors  
California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors

RESEARCH-

CONCLUSION

It is only natural that as we grow older, we don't like to change our ways, and when new rules or regulations are suggested, the first reaction is a thought of rejection.

We clarified some statements in our opening paragraph, and now in conclusion we want to briefly state what we hope to accomplish.

1. Acknowledge growers added costs that are commensurate with those of the co-operators.
2. Remove the requirement of building expensive gins because of the method a grower uses to irrigate.
3. Remove discriminatory regulations against planting seed growers who choose to use sprinkler irrigation.
4. Remove obsolescent requirements of forcing any co-operator to sack seed prior to preparing seed for planting, but keep him charged with the responsibility of his seed identity at all times.
5. Remove unnecessary restrictions that may cost co-operator additional handling costs that do not improve the quality of seed.
6. Request grading of all planting seed after delinting to improve quality and uniformity.
7. Allow bulk loading equipment that is used on mill seed to also be used on planting seed where feasible.
8. Police more closely the total requirements of planting seed needed.

We believe if these recommendations are adopted and when the co-operators get into the new routine, a substantial saving can be made in the price of a higher quality seed, with greater and faster usage of present gins, with less discrimination against growers methods of irrigation and last, but not least, a definite recognition of the planting seed growers added cost for which in recent years, he has not been compensated.

Presented by: Waldo Weeth

WEETH'S LETTER TO DIRECTORS  
READ AT ANNUAL MEETING JULY 26, 1961

\* \* \* \* \*

July 25, 1961

California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors  
Board of Directors and Advisory Committee

Gentlemen:

We have submitted to you by mail, what we believe to be a number of constructive recommendations that the Board should adopt in order to remove present iniquities and discrimination.

We have mentioned in the report that we mailed to the Directors and advisors, that the co-operating growers have not been compensated for increased costs in the same manner that co-operators have.

That is only part of the iniquities. According to the 58,354 acres planted last year of purple tag, 15,462 acres were rejected or an average of 26.5%. Some co-operators lost as high as 64% of their acreage. Normally there is only one variety to contend with, so isolation is no problem, it is strictly a case of weeds, field appearance or sprinkler irrigation.

As a comparison, California Crop Improvement Association, under California State Laws of Seed Certification, inspected in excess of 185,000 acres, (three times the acreage of cotton planting seed) of all varieties of seed with a multiple of problems varying from mixtures, isolation, volunteers, weeds, field appearance, disease, etc. and the highest rejection does not exceed 10 or 12%, which would be Sorghums or Sudan that are extremely bad about cross pollinating to less than 2 or 3% for various cereal grains. In other words, rejections on field inspection of cotton acreage for planting seed will run about 3 times as high as for seed certification.

Even though this field inspection seems unduly severe, the cotton grower would not be entitled to complain if these same strict regulations held true for all co-operators, but they do not. For example there is no requirement saying how high the purity must be.

As a comparison, under C.C.I.A. Seed Certification, Alfalfa seed must be 85% germination or better, and 99.5% purity and better after all processing is completed. Under C.C.I.A. regulations, the end result is a much higher, more uniform quality of seed.

It is our understanding that samples are drawn of cotton planting seed as it is saved. These samples are stored until the seed saving period is over. In due course of time an analysis is run on these samples, and that test is to represent the tonnage of planting seed that may be stored in bulk in sizeable tonnages, and later is delinted, and in most cases graded, but not mandatory, also treated but not mandatory, maybe two or three treatments but no further testing as to germination or purity. In mechanical harvesting, often times some picking machines are bad about cracking seed. If the seed is not

graded, then cracked, thin, or immature seed all goes in the planting seed bag together.

Inspection crews have been extremely tough on growers, but when the planting seed reaches the co-operator, then regulations become extremely lax.

#### EXTRA GINNING COSTS

These are based on the honor system and generally represent the maximum cost of doing a job. Since this program was not set up to operate on a competitive basis, it is gradually working in the direction of some war time government contracts of "Cost plus", with the costs representing the most inefficient co-operator with the independent grower on each end of the chain being clipped unnecessarily.

#### NOT TO MAKE MONEY

It has been preached many times that the co-operating planting seed grower is not supposed to make money on growing planting seed. He is supposed to get all of his advantages in the additional attributes of the newer strain of cotton. Sometimes it may be two or three years before those attributes are recognized by the mill trade in monetary advantages, and by that time all growers have the same advantage and the planting seed grower is growing still a newer strain that will have its day. What is good for the Goose is good for the Gander.

We are not presenting these facts just for the sake of argument, but in the interest of justice and in the preservation of this valuable public variety of cotton. There will always be enough natural unavoidable iniquities without injecting some that we now have, and they are becoming more and more apparent.

To try and defend some of these publicly takes time, money, and effort, that could best be spent more constructively.

#### RESEARCH

For example, for a period of years now, sizeable contributions have been made annually to the Shafter Station for much needed equipment. Only those closest to this organization have been entirely aware of this expenditure. In most cases, these grants have been made by the Board of Directors from funds obtained on the sale of surplus seed. We are sure the great majority of the growers would be whole-heartedly in favor of what was done, but they would like to feel they were part of the act. Even though the grants were made from surplus seed sales, indirectly the grower paid the bill and should have been given credit for the donation.

A one page bulletin could be printed for every Gin bulletin board, stating the nature, need, and amount of the grant which would immediately tie a grower's interest to the Shafter Station, and his investment in the Acala 4-42.

This year because of interest in Delta Pine "Slicker Leaf" out of state sales of surplus 442 planting seed has dwindled to a small fraction of the former demand.

Now without any fore warning, a direct charge of \$10.00 per ton is assessed against planting seed for Research. It becomes public information, now, what indirectly growers have been paying for all along.

#### A. LOCAL PLANTING SEED CASE

In our community, a small group of us growers were growing planting seed, and according to the District Manager of the Line Company, we were ginning with, figured at one time, we produced about 1/6 of all the green tag planting seed. Today we do not produce any, and unless we are needed, we have no intentions of renewing the planting seed venture.

We used to average from \$5.50 to \$6.50 per acre gross for the approved cotton planting seed acreage. We always had the best of friendship and public relations with that Company. They paid off according to the rules of California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, so we had no reason to be unhappy with the Company.

As grower restrictions became tougher, and then when our sprinkler acreage was thrown out, that complicated the problem some more. The Company even built another gin to take care of that acreage. We were finally forced down on planting seed acreage to the point where it became a nuisance to most of us and a hindrance to our normal operation. Furthermore, the additional revenue had dwindled to a point where it made one mad instead of obtaining a small amount of satisfaction or pleasure from the effort.

Due to economic pressures, our next effort naturally started moving in the direction of getting more from the gin seed, which ultimately ended in seven of our group building a \$300,000 Co-operative Gin.

I have personally been on both sides of the fence. During the past seven months, our committee has swapped figures, and stories. It has been very enlightening to say the least. During the last two months, I have personally visited each of the Co-operative Gins that save planting seed. I personally have been growing and processing certified seeds of various kinds for 31 years, and have a sizeable plant of my own. In ten or fifteen minutes of observation of these various gins that save planting seed, I knew most of their

problems and a great deal about the efficiency of these individual units.

While I did not visit Company plants, I do know from experience that where all the seed goes to central locations for delinting, grading, and treating, they will be more efficient than the small units that were built for local needs.

Without giving away trade secrets, net returns on handling planting seed varied widely depending on the efficiency of the local units. Those variations averaged from a little over \$20.00 per ton net above the best patronage oil mill returns to a net of \$60.00 per ton. These net returns are paid to grower members in terms of dividends. For an efficient co-operator there is definitely a great deal more money in planting seed than in mill seed, yes, even if you owned the most efficient oil mill.

When anyone says a planting seed grower is not supposed to make any money on growing planting seed, we wonder if a raspberry might not be in order.

Getting back to our original point where we recommended that the co-operating growers incentive payment should be adjusted upward commensurate with that of the co-operator which would give the grower approximately \$12.50 per ton above Gin Seed price instead of the present \$7.50, we are being very conservative.

Furthermore, if greater caution is used in preventing padding of extra ginning costs, then the cost of higher more uniform quality planting seed can be made available to all growers at more reasonable prices.

Thank you,

s/Waldo Weeth

**MANAGER'S OBSERVATIONS REGARDING  
RECOMENDATION NO. 1**

\* \* \* \* \*

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

1. That the Grower's Return be increased.
  - A. That the split of the first \$7.50 to the Grower and the balance 50-50 be increased to at least the first \$12.40. This is not the place to get the Grower more money. On this basis the Grower would not have received \$12.40 for four out of the past twelve years and the Cooperator would not have received anything four out of the past twelve years.
  - B. The pool settlement has always been on a tonnage and acreage percentage basis on the theory that if a Grower kept his fields clean and did his part, he was entitled to some return if for no reason of his own he could save no seed.
  - C. Many splits have been discussed and some tried. First \$5.00 and balance 50-50. This made the Cooperators share out of proportion to the Grower. \$7.50 was settled on and the balance was discussed on an 80-20, 60-40, with 75% on tonnage and 25% on approved acreage, which seemed to be the most equitable. It has remained at this rate as there have been no complaints until now.
  - D. This matter is in the hands of the Pool Settlement Committee.
2. The Price and Extra Charge Committee has discussed this matter each year.
  - A. Their decision has been that a grower is entitled to a return for the extra weeding that it takes to qualify a field, but not for his normal weeding costs.
  - B. They have increased the Grower's Incentive and Pool Risk several times to assist the grower.
  - C. There are two ways that the Grower may receive more money:
    1. Take part from the Pool Risk and add it to the extra charges and deduct from the Pool Risk to keep price the same. The danger here is if the Pool Risk gets too low, the settlement can turn out in red ink. Who would pay this?
    2. Add to the price of seed.

JOHN TURNER

Letter Regarding Weeth's Recommendations

\* \* \* \* \*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Agricultural Research Service

U. S. Cotton-Field Station  
Route 1, Box 17  
Shafter, California

July 25, 1961

Seed Distributor Directors  
California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors  
2201 "F" Street  
Bakersfield, California

Regarding: Recommendations presented from Waldo Weeth's committee.

Gentlemen:

After studying Mr. Weeth's proposals, here is my thinking on the various recommendations:

1) This first recommendation is concerning possible inequities with growers payments versus cooperators payments. I am sure this is not the intent of the organizations and if differences are found I am sure the growers payment can be adjusted. What must be kept in mind in this regard is the fact that the purpose of the Seed Organization is to multiply pure seed as efficiently as possible with no intent that either the cooperators or pure seed growers make a profit, since cotton seed is only a by-product in the cotton program and not to be looked upon in the same light as pure seed production for such as corn, grain crops or alfalfa.

2 and 3) These deal with the question of saving seed from sprinkler irrigated fields. This is a temporary restriction where the Distributors have followed very closely the recommendations of the Pathology Department at Davis and the Experiment Station at Shafter. Our thought was that some extra restrictions and hardships for a very few years among the growers and ginners could eradicate this disease and therefore would be much less costly than engaging on a time consuming and perhaps an unrewarding breeding effort for obtaining blight resistance. These measures have really paid off. At the end of this season, it may be that these restrictions can be either eliminated or minimized considerably.

4 to 7) These deal with the manner of sacking, processing and handling of pure seed. The items presented may need to be restudied and perhaps greater efficiency may result from some modifications. However, the organization must do everything possible to maintain the identity of white and purple tag seed since we expect to continue giving improvements in the seed releases from the station.

8) This deals with the question of how much reserve seed is justified. This has been a very difficult question to answer. If our organization is willing to forget the potential sale of any seed any year outside of the San Joaquin Valley, it may be possible to reduce the total seed saved. On the other hand, the seed saving committee must be somewhat of a "crystal ball gazer" as to the constantly changing government programs affecting acreage and make sure sufficient seed of known quality are saved.

These are my only thoughts on the proposed recommendations at the present time. If any findings are brought to light with these or other recommendations, I will be glad to study the feasibility of such suggestions in light of the major purposes of the breeding and seed increase program. This joint endeavor between the government and cotton industry has for many years been a most beneficial arrangement for the good of the growers and all phases of the cotton industry through the textiles. Certainly none of us would care to jeopardize the success of such a program. Yet anytime improvements can be made we should all give full consideration and study how to instigate such improvements.

Yours to serve,

s/John H. Turner  
Agronomist-In-Charge

JHT/bb

cc: Dr. Barker  
Dr. Love  
Dr. Aldrich

**SEED POOL SETTLEMENTS**

\* \* \* \* \*

SEED POOL SETTLEMENTS

1. \$15.75 is the amount of settlement used in the acreage and tonnage split.
2. The figures below show the various methods the committee has tried over the years.

1935- Cooperators limited to \$5.00-balance to grower	Cooperator	\$5.00	
	Grower	<u>10.75</u>	\$ 15.75
1936- Cooperator & Grower 50-50 up to \$10.00. Balance to Grower.	Cooperator	\$5.00	
	Grower	<u>10.75</u>	\$ 15.75
1938- First \$5.00 to grower- balance 50-50	Cooperator	\$5.37	
	Grower	<u>10.38</u>	\$ 15.75
1952- First \$7.50 to grower. Balance 50-50	Cooperator	\$4.12	
	Grower	<u>11.62</u>	\$ 15.75
1954- First \$7.50 to grower. Next \$5.00 to Cooperator. Balance 50-50.	Cooperator	\$6.62	
	Grower	<u>9.13</u>	\$ 15.75

3. The last split gave the cooperator an amount out of proportion to the grower, when we started figuring the pools. By unanimous agreement of the committee and Directors, it was dropped and we reverted to the first \$7.50 to the Grower and the balance 50-50.
4. This seems to be the most equitable with the 75% on tonnage and 25% on approved acres. It has remained this way without complaint until Mr. Weeth proposed the first \$12.40 to the grower and the balance 50-50.
5. It is the opinion of management that this formula should not be changed.
6. If it is determined that the grower should get more money, it should be put into the extra charges as a guarantee. This would be up to the Extra Charges and Seed Price Committee.
7. If the \$7.50 were increased to \$12.40 the grower could not have received this amount in four of the past 12 years and the cooperator would have received nothing in four of the past 12 years.
8. \$7.50 seems to be the correct breaking point. If it is increased, the Cooperator receives less and if it is decreased the Cooperator gets more.

## SEED POOL SETTLEMENTS

Comparison of returns to growers from various formulas  
in figuring Pool Settlements

Actual Pool Settlement Example:

<u>Grower</u>	<u>Total Tons</u>	365.95	<u>Total Acres</u>	810	<u>Spread</u>	\$11.65
	<u>Tons</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>% of Total Acres</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Tonnage</u>	
A	222.13	600	74		60.70	
B	121.68	160	19		33.25	
C	22.14	50	7		6.05	

### Settlement on Acreage % Basis

A	74% of 365.95 tons	270.80	X \$ 11.65	\$ 3,154.82
B	19% of 365.95 tons	69.53	X \$ 11.65	810.02
C	7% of 365.95 tons	25.62	X \$ 11.65	298.47

### Settlement on Actual Tons Produced

A	222.13	X	\$ 11.65	\$ 2,587.81
B	121.68	X	\$ 11.65	1,417.57
C	22.14	X	\$ 11.65	257.93

### Settlement on 50% Acreage and 50% Tonnage Basis

A	Tons on acreage %	270.80	x $\frac{1}{2}$ spread	\$ 1,577.41	
	Actual tons	222.13	x $\frac{1}{2}$ spread	<u>1,293.91</u>	\$ 2,871.32
B	Tons on acreage %	69.53	x $\frac{1}{2}$ spread	\$ 405.01	
	Actual tons	121.68	x $\frac{1}{2}$ spread	<u>708.78</u>	\$ 1,113.79
C	Tons on acreage %	25.62	x $\frac{1}{2}$ spread	\$ 149.23	
	Actual tons	22.14	x $\frac{1}{2}$ spread	<u>128.96</u>	\$ 278.19

### Settlement on 20% acreage and 80% Tonnage Basis

A	20% Acreage: 270.8 X \$11.65 X 20%	\$ 630.97	
	80% Tonnage: 222.13 tons X 80% X \$11.65	<u>2,070.25</u>	\$ 2,701.22
B	20% Acreage: 69.5 X \$11.65 X 20%	\$ 162.01	
	80% Tonnage: 121.68 tons X 80% X \$11.65	<u>1,134.06</u>	\$ 1,296.07
C	20% Acreage: 25.7 X \$11.65 X 20%	\$ 59.69	
	80% Tonnage: 22.14 tons X 80% X \$11.65	<u>206.34</u>	\$ 266.03

(continued)

Page 2  
Seed Pool Settlements  
Comparisons

Settlement 25% approved acres 75% actual tons

Settlement \$11.65 x 365.95 total tons \$4,263.32 total dollars.

75% of \$4,263.32 = \$3,197.49 ÷ 365.95 total tons = 8.73  
25% of \$4,263.32 = \$1,065.83 ÷ 810 total tons = 1.32

A	25% acreage: 600 x \$ 1.31 = \$ 792.00	
	75% tonnage: 222.13 x 8.73 = <u>1,939.19</u>	\$ 2,731.19
B	25% acreage: 160 x \$ 1.32 = \$ 211.20	
	75% tonnage: 121.68 x 8.73 = <u>1,062.26</u>	\$ 1,273.46
C	25% acreage: 50 x \$ 1.32 = \$ 66.00	
	75% tonnage: 22.14 x 8.73 = <u>193.28</u>	\$ 259.28

**CALIFORNIA'S  
1961  
ACALA 4-42  
COTTON PLANTING SEED  
\$.075 PER POUND  
(fuzzy basis)**



Extra Costs of Producing a Pound of  
Cotton Planting Seed

EXTRA GINNING	\$.003750
SACKS & TWINE	.005325
HAULING	.005000
STORAGE	.001875
INTEREST	.001850
TAXES	.001250
INSURANCE	.001875
RESEARCH	.005000
DISTRIBUTORS HANDLING CHARGE	.003250
AVERAGE PRICE OF COTTONSEED PAID TO GROWER	.026195
GROWERS INCENTIVE & POOL RISK	.019630
	<u>\$.075</u>

BRED FOR YOUR SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONDITIONS  
BY THE U. S. COTTON FIELD STATION, SHAFTER, CALIF.

COOPERATING WITH

CALIFORNIA PLANTING COTTON SEED DISTRIBUTORS  
2201 F STREET BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA

This high quality ACALA 4-42 cotton planting seed is produced in the San Joaquin Valley, The World's Largest One Variety District, through cooperative agreements with the United States Department of Agriculture, Shafter Experiment Station, the University of California, the California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, and cooperating cotton companies.

For the first time, an item for Research has been added to the price of ACALA 4-42 cotton planting seed. All San Joaquin Valley growers will help support Research this year in the amount of one-half cent per pound on each pound purchased.

Commercial planting seed in other cotton areas of the U. S. range from \$285 to \$400 per ton.