Angus MacKenzie, a buyer from Coast Marketing Company, which also has a financial arrangement with a Mexican grower, probably put this into proper perspective with this: "The cost per acre of growing in Culiacan is a lot less per acre, but not less per package."

MacKenzie should know whereof he speaks, because his firm also has a tomato operations in San Diego County. While San Diego growers can boast yields of 2000–2500 boxes per acre, he said, growers in Culiacan must content themselves with 500–600 marketable lugs.

This ignores even further, though, the fact that farm economists might be worrying about overseas operation and the development of farms elsewhere and the importation of foodstuffs into the United States.

Sociologists are worried about the population growth and how throughout the rest of the world people are going to have enough to eat in the future, even to the point of developing methods by which fish can be processed and flour made, and planting crops in the sea.

I really don't worry very much about the development of land in Mexico. As a matter of fact, I wish they would develop it faster.

(The newspaper article referred to follows:)

[From the California Farmer, Mar. 18, 1967]

LAND OF PROMISE—IF YOU'RE LUCKY

By Alton Pryor

You're thinking of moving your farming operation to Mexico?

If so, you might be well-advised to hang onto your homestead until you've surveyed the situation from every angle. In a mere five days' investigation of the Culiacan area of Mexico, where the winter vegetable deal flourishes, *California Farmer* feels it uncovered sufficient information to determine that Mexico doesn't necessarily house the coveted golden egg.

When boiled down to the bare truth, the information we garnered seemed to lead to a simple conclusion: "If you can't make a go of farming in California, you'll never strike it rich in Mexico."

This is not to say that money is not being made in the vegetable industry in Mexico; some growers and distributors have managed highly successful deals, but not, we feel, at the expense of the U.S. industry.

And, for every dollar made, there is very likely one lost, for it is not uncommon for an enthusiastic grower to go south, only to come back with his "tail between his legs," so to speak. It's a risky business and the problems are great.

Certainly, our statement that growers in the U.S. aren't suffering because of Mexican imports is counter to virtually all of the news stories which have circulated in this State. But we feel we can justify the statement, and intend to do so.

This writer interviewed a host of growers, distributors and agricultural association officials and no matter whom we talked to, our figures always seemed to add up to the same sum "If the U.S. has a short crop, then there is money in Mexican produce: if the U.S. has a big crop, Mexican growers fall on their faces."

To illustrate this point, let us quote Walter Holm, one of the more successful distributors of Mexican produce in Nogales, Arizona, and also a financial backer of a Mexican growing operation.

"It costs from $2 to $2.25 just to get a lug of tomatoes to the border, and this doesn't include growing costs," Holm said. These costs were verified by every other person and agency we consulted.

Consequently, when growing costs are considered, a grower has to get at least $3.10 for a 3-layer lug of tomatoes to break even.

Angus MacKenzie, a buyer for Coast Marketing Company, which also has a financial arrangement with a Mexican grower, probably put this into proper perspective with this: "The cost per acre of growing in Culiacan is a lot less per acre, but not less per package."

MacKenzie should know whereof he speaks, because his firm also has a tomato operation in San Diego County. While San Diego growers can boast yields of 2000–2500 boxes per acre, he said, growers in Culiacan must content themselves with 500–600 marketable lugs.

82-132—67——15