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#### Abstract

$V$ Effects of the Latin American Free Trade Association on U.S. Agricultural Exports (see page. 7. Trade among the original nine countries of the Latin American Free Trade Association (IAFTA) reached a record high of $\$ 1.4$ billion in 1966 , more than double the trade for LAFTA's first year of operation in 1961. The expansion in intra-LAFTA trade was concentrated in agricultural commodities, such as wheat, cotton, and coffee.


The United States is the main non-LAFTA supplier of agricultural commodities. Exports of U.S. farm products have increased slightly since 1955, and in 1967, they totaled $\$ 392$ million -- about onemthird of LAFTA's total agricultural imports. About half have moved under P.L. 480 programs, including barter. Wheat has been the principal commodity exported, followed by dairy products and fats and oils. Restrictive trade policies in LAFTA countries have mainly affected $U . S$. exports of wheat, cotton, fats and oils, fruits, tobacco, and feed grain. Trade preferences granted by LAFTA countries for certain LAFTA comodities have mainly hurt U.S. cotton exports. In some years, LAFTA preferences have also adversely affected U.S. exports of wheat and tallow to Colombia, vegetable oils to Peru, and fruit to Brazil and Peru. State trading and bilateral agreements of LAFTA countries have been the main trade policies affecting most U.S. wheat exports to LAFTA. U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico and Venezuela have been mainiy affected by quantitative restrictions and tariffs.

$$
\star * \therefore * *
$$

Agricultural Imports and Exports of the European Economic Communty: Calendar Years 1966 and 1967 (see page 50). Imports accounted for more than two-thirds of the agricultural trade of the European Economic Community in 1967 and were valued at $\$ 12.5$ billion, slightly below the record imports in 1966. Exports continted to increase and reached $\$ 6.2$ biliion in 1967,7 percent higher than the value of exports in 1966 . The principal agricultural commodities imported in 1967 were meats and preparations, corn, fruits, nuts and preparations, vegetables, coffee, animal feeds, and oilseeds. IntraCommunty imports of agricultural products reached $\$ 3,472$ miliion in 1967 , 28 percent of total agriculturai imports. The share of imports from the United States decifed to 12 percent in 1967 from 13 percent in 1960 . Imports from the rest of the world were 25 percent higher than in 1960 , and were 60 percent of total farm product imports in 1967. Imports of animals and animal products accounted for the largest portion of agricultural imports, with more than one-third originating within the EEG. The United States was the principal supplier of grains and preparations and accounted for nearly one-third of the total imported in 1967. EEC imports from LAFTA countries totaled $\$ 1.5$ bitiion in 1967 ;
coffee，and grains and preparations were the principal comodities imported from LAFTA couritries．Exports of agricultural products from the EEC totaled $\$ 6.2$ bilion in 1967， 7 percent higher than in 1966．The Netherlands was the largest EEC exporter and was an important supplier of vegetables and animals and animal products．

Price Level of Principal U．S．Agricultural Traje Items Declined 4.4 Percent in Fiscal Year 1968 （see page 69）．The U．S．agricultural export price index was 5.9 percent． below a year earlier，and the corresponding import index was down 1.9 percent．The indexes for the spring quarter reflected similar declines．The indexes for the pre－ ceding three quarters also reflected the downward trend of prices．Prices of only three commodities were decisively up，and those of seven ather commodities differed only slightly from year－ago levels；but the remaining 11 principal commodities suffered substantial price declines．

Selected Price Series of International Significance（see page 73）．The U．S．wheat ex－ port price declined for the fourth successive month，while Canadian and Australian wheat prices strengthened．Feed grain and soybean prices declined，while the Thai rice export price rose by 1 percent．

```
****
```

Ocean Freight Rates for Export Gxain，January－June 1968 （see page 75）． vessels continued to reflect their greater operating cost in ratas well above those of foreign flag vessels for the same routes during the first half of 1968．Grain rates from U．S．Gulf ports to the West Coast of India averaged $\$ 26.87 \mathrm{in}$ U．S．flag vessels， compared with $\$ 10.61$ in foreign flag vessels for the same movement during the second quarter of 1968．However，the ocean freight rates for transporting U．S．grain to foreign ports generally trended downard during the first half of 1968．A part of the general decline in ocean freight rates for grain is attributed to the steady increase in average carrying capacity of bulk vessels and tankers．The average capacity of bulk vessels increased by 83 percent between 1966 and 1967．Tankers have also shown significant increases in average capacity during the same period．The increases in vessel size，however，have been accompanied by increases in number．Between 1966 and 1967，the number of freighters increased by 32 ；bulk carriers and tankers increased by 265 and 86 ，respectively．

$$
\text { x } x+x
$$

U．S．Agricultural Exports by Country，Fiscal Year 1968 （see page 78）．While U．S．agri－ cultural exports were shipped to more than 150 countries in 1967／68， 15 countries accounted for three－fourths of the total farm product exports．U．S．agricultural ex－ ports to the 15 major markets showed an average annual increase since $1962 / 63$ ，although exports in 1967／68 were down from 1966／67 to Japan，Canada，the United Kingdom，West Germany，South Vietnam，France，and Belgium－Luxembourg．Partiy offsetting these de－ clines were increases to India，the Netherlands，Italy，Republic of Korea，Pakistan， Taiwan，and Brazil．Total U．S．agricultural exports in 1967／68 reached $\$ 6.3$ billion， 7 percent below the record level in 1966／67．Animals and animal products，cotton， tobacco，fruits，grains and preparations，oilseeds and products，and vegetables de－ clined，while several individual commodities reached record quantities．Exports of rice，soybeans，and oil cake and meal，rose above the previous year＇s record level． Japan，which has ranked as the largest customer for U．S．agricultural exports since 1963／64，was again the largest market in 1967／68．The European Economic Community acsourted for $\$ 1.4$ billion in 1967／68，while exports to the European Free Trade Associa－ tion totaled $\$ 653$ million．Of the 15 major export markets for U．S．agricultural exports， nine were developed countries and six were developing countries．

Principal Sources of U.S. Agricultural Imports (see page 83). Brazil remained the leading source of U.S. agricultural imports as shipments climbed in 1967/68. Mexico maintained second place for the third consecutive year. Larger imports originated from the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, the Dominican Repubilc, Argentina, Peru, the Netherlands, Italy, Turkey, Greece, Spain, Yugoslavia, and Panama. U.S. agriculturat imports from most trade blocs and regional areas increased over the previous year's levels, including imports from the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), the European Economic Community (EEC), the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), Africa, Asia, and Oceania.

## SPECIAL in this issue

effectis of the latin american free trade association on u.s. agricurtural exports.

by<br>Susan A. Eibbin 1/

## Summary

Trade among the original nine countries of the Latin American Free Trade Association (IAFTA) reached a high of $\$ 1.4$ billion in calendar year 1966 , more than double the trade for LAFTA's first year of operation in 1961. Most of the expansion in trade was in agricultural commodities, such as wheat, cotton, and coffee. Reduction of trade barriers within LAFTA helped increase trade in some cormodities, such as cotton, cattle, fruits, and fats and oils. Government controls and economic development in LAFTA countries also influenced the expansion in trade.
The United States is the main non-LAFTA supplier of agricultural commodities. U.S. agricultural exports to LAFTA have increased slightly since 1955; in 1967, they totaled $\$ 392$ million and accounted for about one-third of LAFTA's total agricultural imports. P.L. 480 programs, including barter, accounted for about half of U.S. shipments. Wheat has been the principal U.S. agricultural export, followed by dairy products and fats and oils.
U.S. agricultural markets in LAFTA have been mainly affected by domestic policies encouraging self-sufficiency in some LAFTA countries, periodic shortfalls in production in LAFTA countries, restrictive trade policies, and preferences to LAFTA suppliers.

The trade policies of LAFTA countries have mainly affected U.S. exports of wheat, cotton, fats and oils, fruits, tobacco, and feed grains. Among the LAFTA countries, the United States faces competition in wheat mainly from Argentina (Uruguay and Mexico are smaller suppliers); in vegetable oils from Argentina; in fruits from Argentina (Chile is a smaller supplier); and in cotton from Peru and Mexico. LAFTA preferences have adversely affected U.S. exports and benefited LAFTA suppliers of cotton to Chile, Ecuador, and Uruguay; wheat (in 1965) and tallow to Colombia; and edible vegetable oils to Peru (since 1965). State trading and bilateral agreements have been the main trade policies influencing U.S. wheat exports to most LAFTA countries. U.S. fruit exports to Brazil and Peru have been adversely affected by high tariffs applied by these countries to non-IAFTA suppliers. Most U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico and Venezuela are affected by quantitative restrictions and/or tariffs.
LAFTA has agreed to form a common market with the rest of Latin America between 1970 and 1985; this will provide preferential treatment and protection for Latin American trade. A Latin American Common Market could lead to an increase in trade barriers against non-L atin American countries and a loss of some U.S. agricultural markets.

1/ International Economist, Trade Statistics and Analysis Branch, Foreign Development and Trade Division, Economic Research Service.

However, if the proposed common market helps promote more rapid development in LAFTA countries, there would be an opportunity for the expansion of some dollar export markets. It is unlikely that the common market suppliers could meet all of LAFTA's need for increased agricultural imports. Achievement of the common market rill be a slow and difficult process because of the wide social, political, and economic diversity between the Latin American countries. Thus, it is likely that it will be awhile before further regional integration has any major impact on U.S. agricultural exports to LAFTA..

## Introduction

The Latin American Free Trade Association was established in 1961 to expand and diversify trade between its nine (original) members -- Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay. With the accession of Venezuela in late 1966 and Bolivia in 1967, LAFTA now includes 11 members.

At the Conference of American Republics in April 1967, lafta agreed to form a common market with the rest of Latin America between 1970 and 1985. The common market will provide preferential treatment and protection for Latin American trade. As LAFTA moves toward the common market goal, agriculture will be of special concern to the member countries. Trade in agricultural commodities accounts for about two-thirds of total intra-TAFTA trade. LAFTA members supply nearly half of their total agricultural imports.

The United States, as the main non-LAFTA supplier of agricultural comnodities, will be increasingly concerned with the impact of LAFTA policies on U.S. agricultural exports during the formation of the common market. In 1967, U.S. agricultural exports to the 11 LAFTA countries totaled $\$ 392$ million.

This article analyzes the progress of trade liberalization within LAFIA, the changing pattern of U.S. agricultural trade with LAFTA since 1955, and the effect of LAFTA trade policies on U.S. agricultural markets.

## Trade Liberaitzation Within IAFTA

The Treaty of Montevideo, which established LAFTA, requires member countries to liberalize intra-LAFTA trade through the negotiation of a Common list and National Lists. 2/ By 1973, LAFTA is to be a substantially free trade area for comodities traded between member countries. The Common List is to be negotiated every 3 years over the 12 -year period 1962-73. Each time, the List is to include 25 percent of the commodities traded within LAFTA on which members will eliminate trade restrictions by 1973. The first part of the Common List, completed in 1964, included mostly agricultural products, principally coffee, cotton, cacao, and bananas. Since agricultural commodities have accounted for about two-thirds of intra-IAFTA trade, each Common List has to include mostly primary or processed primary products. However, to protect domestic producers, most member countries have been reluctant to include major agricultural commodities, such as wheat, on a free trade list.

The National Lists are negotiated annually and consist of tariffs and other trade concessions granted by each country to all LAFTA members. The number of National List concessinns granted more than tripled from 1962 to 1968, reaching 10,000 in 1968. However, man: $\because f$ the concessions consisted only of very small duty reductions or were granted on products in which there was little or no trade among the countries. The

[^0]majority of concessions were on chemical products, machinery, and other manufactured products which account for a small percentage of total intra-LAFTA trade. 3/ In 1967, 23 percent of the total number of National List concessions were granted on agricultural commodities.

Liberalization of agricultural trade is hindered both by national interests and by the treaty's special escape clause provisions relating to agriculture. Countries can restrict agricultural imports to the amount needed to meet deficits in domestic production, provided such action does not cause a lowering of normal consumption or encourage uneconomis production. These restrictions can be applied beyond the 1973 date set for perfection of the free trade area. Countries can also take measures to equalize the prices of domestic and imported agricultural products, even if concessions have been granted on the commodities.

## Expansion of Intra-LAFTA Trade 4/

Before formation of LAFTA, trade between the original nine members reached a high of \$1 biliion, or 11 percent of their total trade, in 1953-55; it then declined to a low of $\$ 657$ million in 1961, the year LAFTA was formed (table 1). The high level of intraLAFTA trade in the early 1950 's was due to the prosperity and large foreign exchange earnings resulting from the Korean War boom and the numerous number of bilateral agreements in effect. Intra-LAFTA trade more than doubled from 1962 to 1966, reaching $\$ 1.4$ billion -- or 10 percent of LAFTA's world trade in 1966.

Table 1,--Intra-LAFTA trade compared with total LAFTA trade, calendar years 1952-66 I/


1/ Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela.
2/ From International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics.
3/ 1952-65 from Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior, Comercio Exterior de Mexico, Vol. xiii, No. 9, September 1967, p. 9, and 1960 from GATT, 24 th Session, Latin American Free Trade Association, "November 20, 1967 (unpublished).

[^1]The rise in intra-TAFTA trade was not evenly distributed among the countries. The two largest traders, Argentina and Brazil, together contributed over half of the total increase in zonal trade from 1962 to 1966 (table 2). Most of the other LAFTA countries also achieved increases in their intra-LAFTA trade, but the gains were small in absolute terms. Venezuela has been a principal Latin American supplier of intra-LAFTA exports, although its exports to LAFTA have declined since 1962.

In 1965, 89 percent of the total trade between LAFTA countries received some type of preference over imports from non-LAFTA countries, mainly lower tariffs and/or fewer quantitative restrictions. Almost all the expansion in intra-LAFTA trade of member countries from 1962-65 occurred in products receiving LAFIA concessions (table 3). Agricultural commodities, accounting for about two-thirds of intra-xAFTA trade, provided most of the expansion (fig. 1). There were large increases in intra-IAFTA trade in wheat, cotton, coffee, fats and oils, cocoa, and sugar (table 4).

Reduction of trade barriers between LAFTA countries and trade preferences for LAFTA products led to part of the rise in intra-KAFTA trade, notably in the case of cotton. Also, in cextain years, preferences helped expand intra-lafra trade in wheat, cattle, fruits, and vegetable oils. Although the expansion in trade has been almost entirely in comodities receiving concessions, many factors besides trade liberalization have been responsible. Some of the trade expansion has occurred in agricultural products that were traditionally traded before the formation of LAFTA, such as wheat and tropical products. In some cases, bilateral agreements rather than trade liberalization led to increased trade. Some of the expansion also reflects the statistical addition of products receiving concessions each year and the subsequent subtraction of these products from trade without concessions, rather than new trade that would not have taken place without the concessions. The number of concessions exceeds the number of products involved, because each member country may grant a concession on the same product. In 1965, about two-thirds of the total number of concessions granted involved commodities that were not traded among the member countries.

## U.S. Agricultural Txade with LAFTA

Most U.S. exports to LAFIA are manufactured goods; agricultural commodities account for only about 10 percent of total exports (table 5). However, over half of U.S. imports from LAFTA are agricultural, mainly coffee, bananas, and cocoa beans. 5/ Since agricultural imports have far exceeded U.S. agricultural exports to LAFTA, the United States has had a negative agricultural trade balance with LAFTA. Although this trade deficit has declined since 1955, it was still above $\$ 500$ million in 1967 . The total U.S. trade balance with LAFTA (including nonagricultural trade) has been positive.

The United States is the main non-LAFTA supplier of agricultural commodities. U.S. agricultural exports to LAFTA have slowly increased since 1955 and have accounted for about one-third of LAFTA's total agricultural imports (fig 2). In 1967, the 11 LAFTA members purchased U.S. farm products worth $\$ 392$ million, representing two-thirds of the total U.S. farm exports to Latin America (table 6). This compares with an annual average of $\$ 287$ million, in exports shipped to LAFTA during 1955-59, which was 56 percent of the total exported to the region. Most of the increase in exports is accounted for by P.I. 480 programs (including barter which can be considered commercial sales). . They represented half of the total exported to LAFTA during 1956-67 (excluding Bolivia and Venezuela).

5/For a detailed account of U.S. agricultural imports from LAFTA countries, see Corley, J., "Agricultural Trade of Latin American Countries," Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, April, 1968, pp. 11-23.

* Barter may be considered comercial sales, especially from 1963 when the emphasis shifted to overseas procurement for other U.S. agencies.

Table 2.-Total trade of selected LAFTA countries as compared with their intra-LAFTA trade, calendar years 1955 and 1957-67

N.A. = Not available.

1/ Export data 1959-6I from United Nations Economic Comnission for Latin America, Statistical Bulletin for Latin Arnerica, August 1965 and other data from IAFTA Secretariat.
$2 f$ From Internati onal Monetary Fuad, International Financial Statistics.
3/ 1955 from Sidney Dell, A Latin American Common Market, 1966, pp. 219-221; 1957-60 from LAFTA Secretariat, ALALG, February 1968; and 1961-66 from GATT, 24 th Session, "Iatin American Free Trade Association, "November 1967, (unpublished).
4 Preliminary. From LAFTA Secretariat.

Table 3.--IAFTA trade under concessions and with no concessions, caiendar years 1962-65

| Country : | 1962 | ; | 1963 | : | 1964 | : | 1965 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  | -- Million doilars -- |  |  |  |  |
| ( |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total LAFTA 1/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under concessions ..................... | 321.5 |  | 446.4 |  | 573.9 |  | 686.8 |
| No concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . ., . . . . | 98.2 |  | 79.6 |  | 72.1 |  | 81.2 |
| Argentina |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 81.3 |  | 92.5 |  | 157.9 |  | 232.3 |
| No concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : | 21.7 |  | 9.5 |  | 13.1 |  | 23.7 |
| Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under concessions ................... | 112.0 |  | 147.3 |  | 161.5 |  | 183.7 |
| No concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 17.0 |  | 26.7 |  | 6.5 |  | 6.3 |
| Chile : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under concessions .................... | 55.1 |  | 93.6 |  | 116.1 |  | 123.7 |
| No concessions | 24.9 |  | 26.4 |  | 12.9 |  | 8.3 |
| Peru : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : | 33.1 |  | 54.1 |  | 48.6 |  | 64.7 |
| No concessions | 11.9 |  | 7.9 |  | 10.4 |  | 16.3 |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under concessions . ........... ...... | 5.8 |  | 19.5 |  | 31.1 |  | 36.0 |
| No concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 6.2 |  | 1.5 |  | 1.9 |  | 2.0 |
| Mexico : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : | 4.1 |  | 9.1 |  | 15.0 |  | 21.1 |
| No concessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 1.9 |  | 1.9 |  | 2.0 |  | 8.9 |
| T-mat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 1

Table 4.--Intra-IAFTA imports with concessions: Value by selected commodities and countries, calendar years 1962-65


Source: LAFTA Secretariat.

Table 5.--U.S. trade with LAFTA and total LAFTA trade, average calendar years 1955-58 and 1959-62 and annual 1963-67 1/

N.A. = Not available.

1/ Data on LAFTA exclude Bolivia and Venezuela.
$\overline{2} /$ From USDA, ERS, Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States by Country.
3/f From International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics.
$\frac{1}{4} /$ Erom USDA, ERS, Foreign Regional Analysis Division.


Tigure 2

Most P.L. 480 , exports moved under Title I sales for local currencies until the last few years, when emphasis shifted to Title IV dollar sales under long-term credits. 6 / P.L. 430 , Title III barter sales have increased considerably since 1964. Wheat has accounted for about two-thirds of total P.L, 480 shipments to LAFTA (table 7). Over half the P.I. 480 wheat has been exported under barter since 1964. Other principal P.L. 480 commodities have been nonfat dry milk and edible vegetable oils. Brazil has been the principal importer of P.L. 480 commodities, followed by Chile, Colombia, and Peru (table 8).

Venezuela and Mexico have been the leading dollar markets for U.S. farm products in LAFTA. However, commercial sales to these two countries were fairly constant from 1955 to 1967. Principal commodities sold for dollars have been wheat (exported mainly to Venezuela), dairy products, feed grains, fats and oils, cattle and hides, and fruits and vegetables.
Since 1962, cotton showed the most marked decline in sales to LAFTA. Commercial sales of edible vegetable oils and corn also declined. P.L. 480 exports of dairy products and wheat (including barter) and commercial sales of fruits increased. In 1967, the principal comodities exported to LAFIA were wheat, dairy products, and fats and oils.

[^2] into Title I.

Table 6.-U.S. agricultural exports to LAFTA compared with U.S. agricultural exports to Latin America, Government-financed programs and commercial shipments, calendaz years 1955-67

| Yeat | :Exports to Latin America: |  |  | Exports to LAFTA (ninus Venezuela and Bolivia) |  |  | Exports to laFta (including Venezuela and Bolivia) |  |  | Government-financed programs to LifTa $1 /$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ublic Law 480 prograns | Murual ecurity/ A.I.D. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Covern- $:$ Conmer : llotalmene $2 f:$ cial $:$ |  |  | Govern-: Comare: $:$ment $27:$ cial $:$: |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Title: } \\ \mathrm{I} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Tit1 | $\frac{1}{3 a r t e r}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Title } \\ \text { Ig } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | -- Million dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1955 | 50.2 | 371.7 | 422.0 | 30.8 | 102.9 | 133.8 | 44.0 | 176.8 | 220.9 | 22.4 | 4.8 | 3.4 | --- | 30.6 | --- |
| 1956 | 133.6 | 390.0 | 523.6 | 111.6 | 104.7 | 216.3 | 126.5 | 182.8 | 309.3 | 91.0 | 6.3 | 11.5 | --- | 111.2 | --- |
| 1957 | 93.9 | 481.6 | 575.6 | 75.2 | 163.4 | 238.8 | 85.2 | 244.4 | 329.9 | 52.7 | 8.1 | 10.8 | --- | 75.1 | --- |
| 1958 | 103.7 | 439.8 | 543.4 | 96.2 | 120.2 | 216.4 | 98.6 | 204.7 | 303.3 | 68.0 | 21.1 | 0.7 | --- | 96.1 | --- |
| 1959 | 95.3 | 407.9 | 503.2 | 86.1 | 97.4 | 183.4 | 88.1 | 187.7 | 275.7 | 64.3 | 10.3 | 11.4 | --" | 86.0 | --- |
| 1960 | 98.9 | 383.7 | 482.6 | 87.4 | 110.1 | 197.6 | 92.2 | 203.6 | 295.9 | 63.8 | 13.1 | 10.4 | $\because-$ | 87.3 | --- |
| 1961 | 192.6 | 298.2 | 490.8 | 178.8 | 102.8 | 279.1 | 184.8 | 194.6 | 376.9 | 136.6 | 19.4 | 22.8 | --- | 178.8 | --- |
| 1962 | 147.8 | 289.9 | 437.7 | 124.5 | 119.7 | 244.3 | 133.9 | 184.7 | 318.7 | 63.2 | 28.2 | 19.5 | 9.2 | 124.2 | --- |
| 1963 | : 174.9 | 325.1 | 500.0 | 139.9 | 129.1 | 268.9 | 157.3 | 193.6 | 350.9 | 52.7 | 39.7 | 24.9 | 17.8 | 139.9 | --- |
| 1964 | 258.4 | 345.5 | 603.9 | 221.0 | 123.0 | 344.0 | 234.7 | 208.1 | 442.7 | 118.9 | 42.9 | 30.9 | 15.1 | 214.8 | 6.1 |
| 1965 | : 162.6 | 347.2 | 509.8 | 121.5 | 141.2 | 262.7 | 135.0 | 213.8 | 348.8 | 24.7 | 32.0 | 50.9 | 2.6 | 119.3 | 1.9 |
| 1966 | 211.5 | 363.5 | 575.0 | 170.6 | 136.3 | 306.8 | 180.1 | 217.7 | 397.8 | 12.3 | 20.0 | 92.3 | 31.4 | 163.7 | 6.9 |
| 1967 | 225.4 | 356.4 | 581.8 | 163.0 | 125.6 | 288.8 | 167.2 | 215.0 | 391.7 |  | 33.5 | 77.6 | 34.1 | 160.8 | 2.2 |

[^3]Table 7.-W.S. agricultural e:iports to LAFTA $1 /$, by selected commodity, P.L, 480 programs and


## 1/ Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela.

$\overline{2} /$ Mostly wheat
$\frac{2}{3}$ Mostly wheat.
3. P.L. 480 includes mostly notifar

4/ P.L. 480 includes mostly corn
$5 /$ Mainly lard and tallow.
б/ About half under barter, which is considered commercial.
If Nearly half under barter.
名/ Includes small amounts under the Motual Security/A.I.D. programs.
g/ About half under Putual Security/A.E.D. prograns.

Table 8.--U,S, agricultural exports to selected LAFTA countries: Government-financed programs and commercial shipments,
and their world agricultural imports, calendar years 1955-67

| Country : | 1955 | 1956 : | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | $1961$ | 1962 : | 1963 | 1964 | $1965$ | $1966$ | 1967 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : | -- Million dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 0.2 | --- | $2 /$ | --- | 1.8 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 27 |
| P.L. $4801 /$ | 5.6 | 23.0 | --- | -- | 1.0 | 1.6 | 3.9 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 4.3 | 2.8 |
| Commercial | 4.0 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 3.9 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 4.4 | 2.8 |
| Total U.S. exports .............. | 9.6 | 23.6 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 1.8 73.0 | 3.9 85.0 | 2.8 75.6 | 2.3 59.8 | 97.3 | 112.7 | N.A. | N.A. |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 130.9 | 108.3 | 112.3 | 113.4 | 65.2 | 73.0 | 85.0 | 75.6 | 59.8 | 97.3 | 112.7 | N.A. | N. |
| Brazil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75.0 | 84.9 | 143.3 | 53.3 | 89.9 | 102.1 |
| P.L. $4801 /$......................... | 4.4 | 37.0 | 27.1 | 30.4 | 44.0 | 35.2 | 107.0 | 15.0 | 84.9 | 143.3 3.8 | 6.0 | 11.3 | 7.6 |
| Comonercial . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 8.8 | 5.3 | 13.6 | 9.7 | 1.7 | 9.0 | 5.2 | 19.4 | 17.1 102.0 | 3.8 147.1 | 59.3 | 101.2 | 109.7 |
| Total lis. exports .............. | 13.2 | 42.3 | 40.7 | 40.1 | 46.3 | 44.2 | 112.2 | 94.5 | 102.0 | 147.1 | 222.5 | 270.6 | N.A. |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 280.0 | 207.8 | 212.6 | 176.9 | 201.9 | 229.0 | 189.7 | 262.1 | 279.7 | 315.2 | 222.5 | 270.6 |  |
| Chile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.2 |
| P.I. $4801 /$......................... | 4.7 | 18.8 | 18.1 | 11.8 | 5.1 | 9.7 | 27.2 | 12.2 | 15.1 | 24.2 | 21.2 | 31.9 | 12.2 |
| Commercial ......................... | 8.2 | 7.7 | 8.7 | 2.6 | 5.4 | 12.1 | 7.1 | 14.8 | 6. | 6.8 | 10.4 | 40.9 | 24.9 |
| Total U.S. exports ............... | 12.9 | 26.5 | 26.8 | 14.4 | 10.5 | 21.8 | 34.3 | 27.0 | 21.8 | 31.0 | 31.6 146.0 | 40.9 | 24.9 |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 82.1 | 63.1 | 78.2 | 70.9 | 63.9 | 91.2 | 97.2 | 128.9 | 171.8 | 168.7 | 146.0 | N. A . | k.A. |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colombia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.2 | 18.2 | 20.7 | 17.8 |
| P.L. $480 \frac{1 /}{}$. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 5.9 | 13.8 | 12.4 | 10.2 | 11.3 | 12.0 | 16.7 | 10.0 | 12.1 | 13.3 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 7.1 |
| Commercial . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : | 21.4 | 15.6 | 21.2 | 15.4 | 12.3 23.6 | 12.8 24.8 | 8.4 25.1 | 10.0 | 12.1 26.0 | 29.5 | 29.6 | 32.5 | 24.9 |
| Total U.S. exports .............. | 27.3 | 29.4 | 33.6 80.2 | 25.6 67.4 | 23.6 61.7 | 24.8 57.7 | 25.1 64.3 | 24.1 57.6 | 44.5 | 65.7 | 56.6 | 86.8 | N.A. |
| Agricultural impores from the world: | 83.3 | 78.3 | 80.2 | 67.4 | 61.7 | 57.7 | 64.3 | 57.6 | 44.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Ecuador |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.9 | 14.2 | 18.2 | 20.7 | 17.8 |
| P.L. 480 .......................... | 5.9 | 13.8 | 12.4 | 10.2 | 11.3 12.3 | 12.0 12.8 | 16.7 8.4 | 14.1 10.0 | 12.9 | 13.3 | 11.4 | 11.8 | 7.1 |
| Comraercial .......................... | 21.4 | 15.6 | 21.2 | 15.4 | 12.3 23.6 | 12.8 24.8 | 8.4 25.1 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 27.5 | 29.6 | 32.5 | 25.0 |
| Total U.S. exports | 27.3 | 29.3 | 33.6 | 25.6 | 23.6 | 24.8 | 25.1 | 24.0 | 14.6 | 21.1 | 17.4 |  |  |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 12.9 | 11.0 | 10.2 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 12.7 | 14.3 | 14.6 | 21.1 | 1.7 .4 | 18.0 | N.A. |
| ( |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.8 |  | 9.1 | 11.9 | 6.8 | 1.6 |  |
| P.L. 480 | 1.8 | 8.6 | 4.3 | 29.1 | 1.2 | 54.3 | 57.3 | 55.9 | 74.4 | 63.4 | 80.0 | 71.8 | 69.7 |
| Comercial | 47.6 | 59.9 | 99.2 | 77.3 | 60.3 | 54.6 | 57.3 | 55.9 | 84.4 |  | 86.8 |  | 69.7 |
| Total U.S. exports .............. | 49.4 | 68.6 | 103.5 | 106.3 | 61.5 | 55.9 | 60.1 | 63.4 | 83.5 | 75.3 116.7 | 86.8 116.4 | 73.4 121.7 | W.A. |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 71.2 | 98.4 | 130.0 | 123.1 | 80.3 | 82.4 | 73.0 | 81.8 | 132.6 | 116.7 | 116.4 | 121.7 | N.A. |
| Paraguay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | 2.8 | 0.8 |
| P.L. 480 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 0.1 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 6.5 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.8 |
| Commercial .......................... | 0.1 | 27 | $2 /$ | $2 /$ | $2 /$ | 27 | 3/-1.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Total U.S. exports .............. | 0.2 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 5.2 | 0.4 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 1.0 |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 6.7 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 5.2 | N.A. | N.A. |

See footnotes at end of table
Continued-

Table 8.--U.S. agricultural exports to selected IAFTA countries: Government-financed programs and comercial shipments,

| Country | 1955 | $\begin{array}{r} 1956 \\ \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1957 | $\begin{array}{r} 1958 \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $1959$ | $1960$ | $1961$ | $1962$ | $1963$ | 1964 | $1965$ | $1966$ | 1967 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : | -- Million dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peru |  |  | 9.1 | 12.7 | 6.5 | 9.8 | 15.1 | 12.1 | 8.5 | 16.6 | 9.3 | 18.8 | 21.5 |
| D.L. 480 | 8.1 | 4.3 | 9.1 10.4 | 12.7 9.6 | 11.5 | 8.6 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 11.1 | 19.2 | 24.6 | 18.4 | 20.7 |
| Commercial .......................... | 6.9 15.0 | 9.0 13.3 | 19.5 | 22.3 | 18.0 | 18.5 | 25.5 | 22.4 | 19.6 | 35.9 | 33.9 | 37.2 | 42.2 |
| Total U.S. exports ............... | 15.0 42.0 | 42.3 | 53.4 | 54.2 | 59.6 | 61.5 | 76.1 | 83.6 | 88.3 | 96.9 | 121.4 | 151.0 | N.A. |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 42.0 | 42.3 | 53.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uruguay |  | 0.4 | 0.8 | 27 | 15.3 | 18.2 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| P.L. 480 | 1.6 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 18.2 | 5.5 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Commercial | 1.6 | 3.6 | 5.8 | 1.2 | 16.0 | 23.6 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Total U.S. exports | 34.6 | 35.4 | 41.3 | 25.0 | 35.3 | 27.2 | 28.6 | 25.6 | 24.4 | 29.1 | 20.4 | N.A. | N.A. |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 34.6 | 35.4 | 41.3 | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bolivia |  |  |  | 2.0 | 1.7 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 13.7 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 6.3 | $\underline{2 /}$ |
| P.L. $480 \mathrm{l} /$ | 13.2 | 14.7 | 9.6 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 5.5 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 2.8 |
| Tommercial ........................... | 1.0 | 20.8 | 8.8 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 6.1 | 8.2 | 9.5 | 14.4 | 15.2 | 10.2 | 9.0 | 12.1 |
| Total U.S. exports .............. | 14.2 | 20.5 | 8.8 25.0 | 14.3 | 15.8 | 13.6 | 17.8 | 25.8 | 27.6 | 26.9 | 26.4 | N.A. | N, A. |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 25.2 | 19.7 | 25.0 | 14.3 | 15.8 | 13.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Venezuela | 2) |  | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | $2 /$ | 0.1 | 1.4 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 4.2 |
| P.L. 480 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : | 27 | 0.2 72.3 | 0.4 81.9 | 83.2 | 89.0 | 92.2 | 89.5 | 63.6 | 63.9 | 79.6 | 71.7 | 78.8 | 86.6 |
| Connercial . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 72.9 | 72.3 | 81.9 | 83.6 | 89.3 | 92.2 | 89.6 | 65.0 | 67.6 | 83.5 | 75.9 | 82.0 | 90.8 |
| Total U.S. exports . ............... | 72.9 | 146.3 | 156.3 | 165.0 | 211.1 | 192.9 | 186.6 | 172.7 | 174.4 | 176.1 | 179.6 | 152.0 | N.A. |
| Agricultural imports from the world: | 99.3 | 146.3 | 156.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

N.A. = Not available.

1/ Includes small amounts under Mutual Security/A, $1 . D$, programs, beginning in 1964.
$\overline{2} /$ Less thar $\$ 100,000$.
3/ Government exceeds total due to differences in reporting.

## Effects of IAFTA Trade Policies on Selected U.S. Exports

LAFTA countries use tariffs and non-tariff controls to restrict agricultural imports. I/ All the countries grant LAFTA suppliers duty free entry and/or preferential duties on many agricultural commodities exported by the United States.

To control imports, the Brazilian Government imposes tariffs and levies a port tax of 1 percent and an ocean freight charge of 10 percent on all imports. Several Brazilian states levy excise taxes on some agricultural imports. Excise taxes of 17 to 18 percent on fresh fruit imports apply only to non-LAFTA countries. Wheat and flour imports are handled by a government monopoly and are exempt from all import duties and charges.

Chile levies tariffs on many agricultural imports and also charges high prior deposit fees to non-LAFTA suppliers of some agricultural comodities, such as edible vegetable oils, cattle, and dried beans. The government has a monopoly over imports of wheat and flour, rice, dairy products, beef and poultry, and authorizes one private firm to handle all tobacco imports. Imports handled by the state are exempt from duties.

After having liberalized its trade policies in 1965, Colombia imposed many quantitative controls on imports in late 1966 due to balance-of-payments difficulties. Until recently, all imports required prior licensing. Due to improvement in Colombia's foreign exchange position, the Government removed the licensing requirement on almost all agricultural imports from TAFTA countries that receive duty concessions and on a few agricultural imports from non-LAFTA countries. Colombia applies a 3 -percent surcharge to non-LAFTA suppliers and a l-percent charge to fAFTA suppliers. High prior deposits are charged on many agricultural imports, and several imports are prohibited. LAFTA comodities receiving preferential duties are exempt from prior deposits and embargos.

A strict licensing system is Mexico's most effective means of controling imports. 8/ Most imports from LAFTA countries do not require a license. Generally, it is difficult for an importer to obtain a license for commodities produced domestically. Mexico also levies a 3-percent surcharge on all imports and applies quotas and embargos on some agricultural imports. A government agency can import food commodities, such as grains, beans, eggs, and milk, £ree of duties. Compared with other members, Mexico grants few LAFTA concessions on agricultural products, because it is generally cheaper for the country to import from the United States than from LAFTA countries.

Veneztela relies mainly on quantitative controls to restrict imports. Licenses and a customs surcharge of from 2 to 3.5 percent are required for most agricultural imports. To maintain domestic prices and purchases of certain indigenous products, importers of milk, soybeans, and some other commodities must purchase a specified quantity of the domestic product to receive an import license. Quotas are set for some imports, such as milk and deciduous fruit, and imports are prohibited for products in adequate domestic supply, such as coffee and rice. There is state trading in some agricultural commodities. Bean imports were placed under a government monopoly in early 1968. Since Venezuela is a relatively recent member of LAFTA, it has granted few concessions on agricultural products.

7/ Foreign Regional Analysis Division, Agricultural Policies in the Western Hemisphere, October 1967, FAER No. 36.
8/ Francis Urban, Summary and Evaluation of "Projections of Supply of and Demand for Agricultural Comodities in Mexico to 1965,1970 , and 1975, "January 1968, ERSForeign 208.

Peru uses tariffs and several quantitative controls to restrict imports. Licenses and a 4-percent tax on ocean freight are required on most imports. Imports handled by the Government are exampt from duties. The Government handles most imports of rice and some imports of breeding animals and tobacco. Since mid-1966, a Government agency has been authorized to import any food comodity considered to be in deficit. Due to balancemof-payments difficulties, Peru in March 1968, prohibited most non-essential imports of agricultural commodities, such as most fruit, coffee, and cigarettes. The embargo is scheduled to remain in effect until early 1969. A surcharge of 10 percent was placed on most imports. Agricultural imports exempt from the charge include wheat, edible vegetable oils, meat, cattle, and dairy products. This charge will be reduced in November and eliminated in early 1969.
Trade policies in LAFTA countries have mainly affected U.S. agricultural exports of wheat, cotton, fats and oils, fruits, feed grains, and tobacco.

## Wheat

Wheat is the principal agricultural commodity imported by LAFTA countries. Wheat im $\rightarrow$ ports have accounted for about 20 percent of intra-TAFTA trade. 9 / Argentina supplies almost all the wheat traded within LAFTA. Ucuguay exports small quantities occasionally, and Mexico has exported some wheat in the last few years. Brazil takes about three-fourths of the total intra-fAFTA trade in wheat. Peru is the other major wheat importer, while Chile, Venezuela, and Colombia are smaller importers.

The principal wheat-importing countries grant trade preferences to LAFTA suppliers and impose trade controls on imports (table 9). Brazil, Peru, and Venezuela have no duties on wheat imports from LAFTA countries, while Chile and Colombia have reduced duties to LAFTA substantially below those to other countries.

Intra-LAFTA trade $10 /$ in wheat increased from 1962-66, but the average for that period was about the same as during the 1956-60 period (table 10). Peru increased its imports from LAFTA during the $1961-66$ period compared with prior years. Colombia's first imports from IAFTA occurred in 1964. Ecuador's total imports of whrat have been very small. ánd have come from non-LAFTA suppliers. Mexico, Paraguay, and Uruguay also import only a small volume of wheat and offer no LAFTA concessions.
The United States supplies most of LAFTA's wheat imports from outside LAFTA. Except for 1965, the U.S. share of LAFTA's wheat market has increased since 1959 (fig. 3). Brazil and Venezuela are the largest markets, followed by Peru, Chile, and Colombia (table 11). Most of the wheat shipped to LAFTA (excluding Venezuela) has moved under P.L. 480 programs. P.L. 480 exports of wheat under barter (which since 1963 is mostly commercial) and long-term dollar credit sales have increased in the last few years. U.S. commercial sales of wheat to Venezuela rose substantially in 1966 and 1967.

LAFTA concessions generally have had little effect on intra-IAFTA trade in wheat because of the govermment controls in most LAFTA countries which make the preferences almost meaningless. 11/ Wheat imports are under a goverment monopoly in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Mexico and are exempt from all duties. The private sector imports

[^4]Table 9.-TTrade restrictions on wheat imports in selected LAFTA countries, calendar year 1968



Figure 3

N.A. $=$ Not available.

1/ Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela. 2/ Includes estimate for Paraguay, 3/ Data includes Ecuador's imports only into principal ports. Source: National trade books of individual countries.

Table 11 --Exports of wheat to selected LAFTA countries, P.E. 480 programs and
commercial shipments, calendar years $1955-67 \underline{1 / f}$


1/ Daca on LAFTA exclude Venezuela and Bolivia
$\frac{1}{3} /$ About over half under barter.
3/ Includes small amounts under liutual Security/A.I.D. programs.
4. Mostly under barter.

5/ P.L. 480 exceeds total U.S. exports due to differences in reporting and sources.
wheat in Peru, but the government exempts imports from all duties. Venezuela and Ecuador require import licenses. Ecuador also sets annual import quotas for wheat, and Venezuela permits wheat imports at a preferential exchange rate, Brazil and Peru have had bilateral wheat agreements with Argentina for many years prior to the formation of LAFTA. Brazil also had wheat agreements with Uruguay, Mexico, and other countries. Chile has recently signed an agreement with Argentina. Most LAFTA countries will probably continue for some time to mairtain state trading and exempt wheat imports from duties in order to protect donestic producers or help relieve balance-of-payments problems. However, if wheat imports were not exempt from duty sharges so that the LAFTA concessions could become effective and if LAFTA exporters had adequate supplies to take advantage of the preferences, U.S. exports would probably be adversely affected. This situation happened in Colombia in 1966. Private traders were allowed to import wheat and had to pay higher duties on wheat from the United States and other outside suppliers than from Argentina. 12/ Although Argentina and U.S. wheat cost the same before duty charges, the duty preference granted to IAFTA made U.S. wheat cost $\$ 16$ to $\$ 20$ per ton higher. A prior deposit of 16 percent was also applied against non-IAFTA suppliers. As a result of the preferences, Colombia purchased wheat from Argentina. Wheat was again placed under a government monopoly in late 1967 due to balance-ofpayments difficulties.

## Cotton

After wheat, cotton accounts for the largest volume of agricultural trade among IAFTA countries. Yeru has supplied at least two-thirds of the cotton. Mexico's exports of cotton have increased considerably, and now account for nearly one-third of the total intra-LAFTA supply. Smaller exporters are Paraguay and, occasionally, Colombia. Chile is LAFTA's major cotton importer. The cotton-importing countries grant trade concessions to LAFTA suppliers and place controls on imports (table 12). Intra-IAFTA trade in cotton increased by two thirds from 1962-65 and was considerably above the level of 1955-61 (table 13). Since 1961, LAFTA countries have supplied almost all of LAFTA's total imports of cotton, compared with about ha1f during most of the 1955-6l period. The largest increases in intra-LAFTA imports have occurred in Chile and Argentina.
The United States is the main non-LAFTA supplier of cotton to LAFTA countries. Chile has been the principal U.S. market, while Colombia, Ecuador, and Uruguay have provided smaller markets (table 14). A major part of U.S. shipments have gone under P.L. 480 programs, mainly Title I sales for local currencies and Title III barter sales, from 1963 considered commercial. Since 1961, U.S. cotton exports to LAFTA have declined markedly. U.S. shipments averaged \$2.8 miliion from 1962-67, compared with $\$ 12.8$ million from 1956-61.

LAFTA trade preferences have been important causes of the increase in intra-LAFTA trade in cotton and the decline of U.S. markets in Chile, Uruguay, and Ecuador. Unlike wheat, cotton imports are not under government monopolies and are not exempt from duties; thus, the discriminatory charges against outside suppliers have been effective. Chilean preferences to LAFTA have practically eliminated the traditional U.S, market in Chile and have enabled Mexico and Peru to supply most of Chile's increased requirements. 13/ Chile's imports from the United States dropped from $\$ 7.7$ million in 1961 to $\$ 228,000$ in 1966 , while its imports from LAFTA increased from $\$ 6.8$ million to

12 Hudson, John and Rudbeck, James, 'Latin American Import Folicies and U.S. Agricultural Exports -- Two Case Studies: Colombia and Brazil," March 22, 1967, (unpublished), pp. 10-13.
13/ Rowan, Waldo, "U.S. Shares in Chile's Growing Agricultural Market," Foreign Agriculture, October 30, 1967.

Table 12,--Trade restrictions on cotton imports in selected LAFTA countries, calendar year 1968


I/There is a 60 percent duty on cotton of 30 to 32 millimeters (mm).
2/Valued on a f.o.b. basis.
3/Less than 29 mm.
4/More than 29 mm .
$\underline{5} /$ There also is a duty of 8.4 percent of the f.o.b, value.
$\$ 17.7$ million (fig. 4). U.S, exports of cotton to Colombia have declined beginning in 1959, when that country became nearly self-sufficient in cotton production and began exporting it.

## Fats and Oi1s

Intra-LAFTA trade in fats and oils is very small. Most of LAFTA's imports have been supplied by third countries, such as the United States. Argentina is the principal LAFTA supplier of edible vegetable oils (mainly olive oil and sunflower seed oil) and tallow to other member countries.

The main LAFTA markets for Argentine exports of edible vegetable oils are Brazil, Chile, and Peru. These countries grant preferences to IAFTA suppliers and impose trade controls on imports of vegetable oils (table 15).

Table 13--Imports of cotton by selected LAFTA ccuntries; value by origin, calendar years $1955-6$ b

| Country $\quad:$ | 1955 : | $1956:$ | $1957 \quad$ : | $1958:$ | 1959 : | $1960 \quad:$ | 1961 : | $1962 \quad:$ | 1963 : | $1964 \quad \begin{gathered}\text { : } \\ \\ \\ \end{gathered}$ | $1965 \quad:$ | 1966 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ; | -- $1_{2} 000$ dollars ${ }^{--}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chile |  |  |  |  | 7,038 | 15,481 | 6,231 | 17,997 | 26,814 | 18,791 | 21,513 | 17,716 |
| LAFTA $1 / . . . . . . .$. : | 10,293 | 17,681 | 9,667 | 2,544 8,459 | 7,038 1,353 | 15,481 | 7,695 | 2,316 | 4,325 | 275 | 144 | 228 |
| United States .... | 3,799 | 2,702 | 7,581 | 8,459 | 1,353 311 | 7,98 | 7,69 | 2, 1 | 38 | --- | ---- | 17.944 |
| other ........... | 1,303 | . 137 | 17,649 | 11,099 | 8,702 | 23,544 | 14,527 | 20,314 | 31,177 | 19,066 | 21,657 | 17,944 |
| Total......... : | 15,395 | 20,520 | 17,649 | 11,099 | 8,102 | 23, 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ergentina |  |  |  | 474 | 5,218 | 4,574 | 4,619 | 4,958 | 3,778 | 10,162 | 16,744 | 12,130 |
| LAFTA $1 / . . . . . .$. | 1,147 | 1,296 | 4,282 | 4.4 | 5,218 | 4, | $2 /$ | --- | --- | 27 | 5 | $\underline{27}$ |
| United States .... |  | $8 \frac{21}{7}$ | 399 | --7 | --- | --- | $\underline{\square}$ |  | --- |  | 16,744 | - |
| other ........... | 1,703 2,850 | 817 2,013 | 399 4,681 | 600 | 5,218 | 4,574 | 4,619 | 4,958 | 3,778 | 10,162 |  | 12,130 |
| Total .......... | 2,850 | 2,013 | 4,681 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uruguay |  |  |  | 487 | 982 | 267 | 1,330 | 1,423 | 3,2\%8 | 5,771 | 2,649 | 3,333 |
| IAFTA $1 /$......... | 5,986 | 3,716 | 7. 218 | 29 | 3,755 | 1,098 | 3,921 | 815 | --- | --- | 1,169 | 2,664 |
| United States ....: | 21 | 290 | 3,218 | 5 298 | 2,086 | 3,860 | - 451 | 1,207 | lil | 116 | 1,169 | 2,664 |
| 0rher ............ | 52 | 2,238 | 181 3.830 | 6,476 | 6, 823 | 5,225 | 5,702 | 3,445 | 3,359 | 5,887 | 3,818 | 5,997 |
| Total .......... | 6,038 | 6,244 | 3,830 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ecuador |  |  | 8 | 89 | 128 | 202 | 296 | 1,081 | 1,008 | 1,320 | 644 | $4 / 260$ |
| IAFTA $1 / . . . . . . .$. | 368 | 148 | 8 | 80 | 134 | 2 | 920 | 39 | 2 | - | -- | --- |
| United States ....: | 405 | 291 | 2 | 80 | 134 | 58 | 112 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 7 | --- |
| Other ............. | 149 | $3 / 439$ | 13 | 170 | 262 | 262 | 1,328 | 1,121 | 1,013 | 1,333 | 651 | $4 / 260$ |
| Total .......... | 3/922 | 3/439 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42,533 4/34,385 |  |
| Total LAFTA $1 /$ |  |  |  |  |  | 21,254 | 13,358 | 25,773 | 35,372 | 36,788 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.AFTA ...... | 18,214 | 25,917 | 14,686 | 14,596 |  | 9,055 | 12,536 | 3,357 | 5,042 | 1,600 | 4,778 | 4/3,485 |
| United States ....: | 6,014 | 10,363 | 18,237 | 14,596 6,181 | 7,187 | 4,026 | 12, 943 | 1,465 | 520 | 170 | 1,175 | 4/2,665 |
| other ............ | 3,330 | 3,120 | 1,164 34,087 | 6,181 25,368 | 25,115 | 34,335 | 26,837 | 30,595 | 40,134 | 38,558 | 48,486 | $4 / 40,53$ |
| Total .......... | 3/27,558 | 3/39,400 | 34,087 | 25,368 |  |  | 26,837 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yenezuela $1 /$ |  |  | 217 | 60 | 3 | --- | 72 | 736 | 1,642 | 3,161 | 5,167 | 3,459 |
| LAFTA . . . . . . . . . . | 6 375 | 1278 | 1.744 |  | 3 | 61 | 2,526 | 245 | 1,132 | 1,312 | 1,476 | 561 |
| United States .... | 375 | 278 | 1,744 | 2,901 | - |  | 292 | 342 | 323 | 777 | 236 | 561 |
| Other ............ | 193 | 425 | 1,966 | 3,492 | 6 | 64 | 2,890 | 1,323 | 3,097 | 5,250 | 6,879 | 4,074 |
| Total .......... | 574 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  | -- Percent -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 5 | 10 | 8 |
| percentage of total | 21 | 25 | 53 | 56 | 28 | 26 | 44 | 10 | 12 | S | 10 |  |

N.A. = Not available

1/Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela. 2/Less than $\$ 1,000$. 3/ Tncludes imports only into principal ports. 4/ Estimated
Source: National trade books of individual countries.

Table 14.--Exports of cotcon to selected LaFTA con-mies, P.L. 480 programs and
comaercial shipments, calendar years 1955-67 1/


1/ Data on LAFTA exclude Bolivia and Venezuela
$\underline{2} /$ About half under barter
3 Includes over half under Mutual Securicy/A.I.D.
$\frac{4}{5}$ Includes about half under Mutual Security/A.l.D. programs and the other half under barter
5/f Mostly under barter
6/ Includes small amount under sutual security/A.I.D. programs. The remainder is mostly under barter.
7/ P.L. 480 exceeds total exports due to differences in reporting and sources.

## CHILE'S IMPORTS OF COTTON, VALUE BY ORIGIN



Figure 4

Since 1955, intra-LAFTA trade in vegetable oils has fluctuated (table 16). Brazil's imports from LAFTA were higher from 1962-66 than from 1955-61. Peru's imports did not increase until 1966, while Chile's imports from the region have declined since 1959.

The United States has been the principal supplier of edible vegetable oils (soybean and cottonseed oils) to LAFTA. More than half has gone under P.L. 480 programs in most years since 1955. Major U.S, markets are Brazil, Peru, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela (table 17). U.S. exports to Brazil have increased since 1961 and were much higher than during the 1955-6I period. Exports to Peru have remained at about the same level since 1958. Chile has been a somewhat iregular market, mainly due to the country's efforts to become self-sufficient in the production of edible oils.

So far, the only case where LAFTA concessions have adversely affected U.S. exports of vegetable oils has been in Peru sance 1965. Before then, the United States was the major supplier, and Peru imported only small amounts of vegetable oils from Argentina. A 20 -percent duty applied to the United States, compared with a G-percent duty to LAFTA countries caused Peru to increase substantially its imports of sunflower seed oil from Argentina in 1966 and 1967. Argentina then replaced the United States as Peru's leading supplier. 14/

Colombia and Brazil are the main LAFTA markets for Argentine exports of tallow. Chile and Per: have provided smaller markets. These countries grant the trade preferences to LAFTA suppliers and impose controls on imports (table 18).

[^5]Table 15.--Trade restrictions on vegetable oil imports in selected IAFTA countries, calendar year 1968


N.A. = Not available.

Includes soybean, cottonseed, ground nut, sunflower seedand rape oils and olive oil. 2/ Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela. $3 /$ Less than \$1,000. 4/ Excludes Ecuador For 1955 and 1956
Source: National trade books of individual countries.

Table 17,--Exports of soybean and cottonseed oils to selected LAFTA countries, P.L. 480 programs and
comercial shipments, calendar years 1955-67 1/

1/ Data on LAFTA exclude Venezuela and Bolivia.
2/ Yostly under barcer
3/ Ircludes some under Mutual Security/A.I.D. prograns
4/ P.L. 480 exceeds total U.S. exports due to differences in reporting and sources.

Table 18.-Trade restrictions on tallow imports in selected LAFTA countries, calendar year 1968


I/ Based on f.o.b. value.
$\frac{2}{3} /$ There is no duty for Paraguay.
3/ The surcharge will be reduced to 5 percent on November 30,1968 and eliminated early in 1969.
Intra-LAFTA imports of tallow rose during 1961-66 compared with 1955-60 (table 19). Colombia contributed most of the increase. Chile and Peru decreased their total imports and those from member countries.
The United States has been the main supplier of tallow to LAFTA. Principal U.S. markets are Colombia, Ecuador, and Venezuela (table 20). Until 1959, Mexico was also a major market. U.S. tallnw exports to Ecuador and Colombia have remained at about the same level since 1961.
Since 1961, the United States has been losing its share of the Colombian tallow market, mainly to Argentina. 15/ The United States maintained its aggregate volume of exports due to P.L. 480 sales and the "usual marketing requirement," which ties a certain level of commercial purchases to P.L. 480 Title I sales. Colombia has applied much higher import charges on tallow imports from non-IAFTA countries than from member

15/Hudson, op.cit., p. 19.

Table 19.--Imports of tallow $\underline{l} /$ by selected LAFTA countries: Value by origin, calendar years $1955-66$

N.A. = Not available.

1/ Mostly inedible for U.S. data.
$\overline{2} /$ Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela.
$3 /$ Less than $\$ 1,000$
4/ Estimated.
Source: From national trade books of individual countries.



1 Data on LAFTA exclude Venezuela and Bolivia
2/ All under Mutual Security/A.I.D. programs.
3/ Includes a small amount under A.I.D. programs.
suppliers. However, until 1966, these concessions had no practical significance, because all tallow was imported by a goverment agency and was exempt from duties and charges. The private sector began importing tallow in 1966, and now the discriminatory import charges and quantitative restrictions are effective. Most of the loss in the U.S. share of the Colombian market has been due to the higher price of U.S. tallow relative to tallow from Argentina and other suppliers. Even when all imports were duty free, the U.S. was not able to meet Argentine prices. However, the preferential treatment granted to LAFTA suppliers has further weakened the U.S. competitive position in Colombia.

Mexico does not import tallow from LAFTA and offers no preferential duties to regional slopliers. A highly restrictive licensing policy applied to help promote domestic production of oilseeds has practically eliminated U.S. trade in inedible tallow and sharply reduced U.S. exports of lard to Mexico. 16/

## Fruits

Fruits are one of the principal agricultural products traded among the LAFTA members. IAFTA countries supply almost all their total imports of fruit from all sources. Tropical fruit and deciduous fruit (apples and pears) each account for about half the total intra-IAFTA trade in fruit. Principal suppliers of tropical fruit are Brazil and Ecuador. The major LAFTA supplier of deciduous fruit is Argentina, while Chile is a smaller exporter. The major importers of tropicai fruit are Argentina and Chile. Brazil is the major LAFTA market for deciduous fruis. and Peru and Venezuela provide smaller markets. Several LAFTA countries grant trade preferences to LAFTA suppliers of fruit and also impose restrictions on some fruit imports (table 2l).

Of the main IAFIA importers of nontropical fruit, Peru was the oniy country that strbstantiaily increased its imports from other members during 1962-66 compared with 1955-61 (table 22). Brazii and Venezuela maintained about the same level of imports from LAFTA. The United States is the principal non-LAFTA supplier of fresh and canned fruit, prunes, and dried raisins to LAFTA. Major U.S. markets include Mexico, Venezuela, and Peru (table 23).

LAFTA concessions have helped expand Chilean and Argentine exports of fruit to Peru. 17/ Chile is Peru's main LAFTA supplier of fruit. LAFTA concessions and a bilateral agreement have mainly affected Argentine exports of fruit to Brazil. For some time, Argentina has supplied Brazil with apples and pears in exchange for Brazilian bananas and citrus fruit.
U.S. fruit exports to Brazil and Peru have been adversely affected by high tariffs and other charges applied by these countries to non-LAFTA suppliers. Since the production season for fruit in Argentina and Chile differs from that in the United States, U.S. exports should not be affected by LAFTA preferences during the part of the year when LAFTA suppliers do not export fruit. Untill mid-1966, U.S. fruit exports to Brazil were also restrictied by licensing policies. Since March 1968, Peru has prohibited most fruit imports as well as other imports to help relieve balance-of-payments difficulties.

16/ Magleby, Richard, "Restrictions on Intra-North American Agricultural Trade; Inventory and Analysis," paper presented at the Conference on Pooling Agricultural Resources to Attain a North American Common Market for Meeting World Food Needs, Lowa State University, Ames, Iowa, October 3, 1967.
1.7/ Hall, Howard, Feru: Market and Competition for U.S. Farn Products, ERS-Foreign 157, June 1966, pp. 29-30.

Table 2h--Trade restrictions on fruit imports in selected LAFTA countries, calendar year 1968


Table 22 . --Imports of fruits by selected LAFTA countries: value by origin, calendar years 1955-66


Table 22.--Imports of fruits by selected LAFTA countries: value by origin, calendar years 1955-66-continued


Table 22.--Imports of fruits by selected LAFTA countries: Value by origin, calendar years i955-66-continued


Note: Conversion rates used are as follows: Chile (gold pesos/dol.) 1955-60, 4.85461; Colombia (dols./peso, selling rate) 1955-56, 0.3984; 1957, 0.1675; 1958, 0.1385; 1959, 0.1563; 1961, $0.1492 ; 1962$-64, 0.1111; Ecuador (sucres/dot.) 1955-60, 15; 1961-65, 18; Mexico (pesos/dol.) 1955-66, 12.5; Peru (soles/dol.) 1955, 19; 1956, 19.05; 1957, 19.17; 1958, 24.63; 1959, 27.71; 1960-66, 26.82; Venezuela (balivars/doi.; import rate) $1955-60, \frac{1}{3.35}$ (wheat always converced at this rate); 1961, 3.61; 1962, 3.96; 1963, 4.40; 1964-66, 4.50. N.A. = Not available.
N.A. $=$ Not available.
1/ Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela. 2/ Data include Ecuador's imports only into principal ports. 3/Less than $\$ 1,000$.

Source: From national trade books of individual countries.

Table 23.--U.S. exports of fruit to selected LAFCA countries, calendar years 1955-67 $1 /$


[^6]Quantitative restrictions influence Venezuela's imports from both IAFTA and the United States. Imports of deciduous fruit are limited by quota controls. Importers who try to stimulate Venezuelan exports of tropical fruits may receive an additional quota. Imports of citrus fruits are prohibited or reserved solely for state trading.

Mexico does not import fruit from LAFTA and offers no concessions. U.S exports of fruit to Mexico have been adversely affected by high duties, severe licensing restrictions, and other quantitative controls.

## Other Commodities

Trade policies in some LAFTA countries have adversely affected other principal agricultural commodities in addition to wheat, cotton, fats and oils, and fruits. For example, restrictive licensing has hindered U.S. exports of feed grains to Peru and tobacco to Mexico. The Mexican Government has a monopoly over corn imports and has limited imports from the United States to amounts needed to meet shortfalls in domestic production.

## Effects of a Future Common Market on U.S. Trade with LAFTA

A Latin American Common Narket could lead to an increase in LAFTA trade barriers against agricultural imports from the United States. During the formation of the common tarket, Latin American countries are supposed to establish common external tariffs and provide trade preferences for products produced in the region. If common external tariffs are derived by averaging existing duties in LAFTA countries, the United States could face higher duties than now exist on some commodities, such as grains. The granting of preferences to Latin American suppliers could also increase the degree of discrimination now applied against imports from third countries.

While the common market could lead to increased intra-LAFTA trade and a loss of some U.S. agricultural markets in LAFTA, regional integration could also lead to expansion of other U.S. agricultural exports. Studies have indicated that as per capita incomes rise in the less-developed countries, their demand For commercial agricultural imports also increases. If the common market leads to more rapid development in LAFTA countries, there would be an opportunity for the expansion of dollar export markets. It is unlikely that the common market suppliers could meet all of LAFTA's need for increased agricultural imports during a period of growth. The agricultural economies of most Latin American countries are relatively underdeveloped, and the region has the highest population growth rate in the world.

Achievement of a Latin American Common Market will be a slow and difficult process because of the wide social, political, and economic diversity between the Latin American countries. 18/ Thus, it is likely that it will be a while before further regional integration has any major impact on U.S. agricultural exports to LAFTA. LAFTA probably will continue for some time to import nearly half its agricultural imports from nonmember countries.

[^7]Table 24.--Imports of cattle by selected LAFTA countries: Value by origin, calendar years 1955-66

| Country | : | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 : | 1959 : | 1960 | $1961:$ | 1962 | $1963$ | $1964$ | $1965$ | 1966 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | -- 1,000 dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chile | : |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29,875 | 23,837 | 17,982 | 26,639 | 19,456 | 18,493 |
| LAFTA 1/ | : | 2,205 | 3,918 | 6,103 | 5,948 | 7,195 30 | 22,041 | 29,875 3 |  | 17,982 | 26,63 | 19,456 | 18, 52 |
| United States |  | 188 | 105 | 111 | 30 | 53 | 38 | 60 | 51 | 89 | -..- | 1,301 | 358 |
| Other Total |  | 188 2,393 | 105 4,023 | 6,227 | 6,021 | 7,278 | 22,079 | 29,938 | 23,925 | 18,077 | 26,639 | 20,757 | 18,903 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peru | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LAFTA 1/ | : | 38 | 295 | 8.66 | 759 | 148 | 94 | 342 | 5,899 | 17,701 | 6,265 $2 /$ | 9,370 | 13,535 |
| United States | : | $\begin{array}{r}109 \\ \hline 1849\end{array}$ | -60 | 157 4,026 | 43 3.955 | 24 1.443 | 85 1,386 | 313 3,535 | 171 5,664 | 17 1,898 | $6 \frac{27}{99}$ | 406 | 2,483 |
| Other |  | 1,649 | 2,542 | 4,026 5,049 | 3,955 4,757 | 1,443 1,615 | 1,386 1,565 | 3,535 4,190 | 5,664 11,734 | 1,898 19,636 | 6,960 | 10,364 | 16,548 |
| -ncal |  | 1,796 | 2,897 | 5,049 | 4,757 | 1,615 | 1,565 | 4,190 | 11,734 | 19,636 | 6,960 | 10,364 |  |
| Mexics | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| IAAFTA $1 / . .$. | : |  |  |  | 1,832 |  | 3,187 | 3,003 | 2,902 | 3,599 | 3,319 | 4,356 | 5,709 |
| United States | : | 2,033 233 | 2,286 140 | 5,205 29 | 1,832 73 | 2,441 292 | 3, 245 | 3,456 | 2, 554 | 3,719 | 627 | 878 | 1,146 |
| other . <br> Tota1 |  | 2,266 | 2,426 | 5,234 | 1,905 | 2,733 | 3,432 | 3,459 | 3,556 | 4,318 | 3,946 | 5,234 | 6,855 |
|  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total LAFTA $1 /$ | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N,A. |
| LAFTA |  | 3,620 | 6,158 | 8,176 | 6,980 | 7,909 | 22,553 | 30,962 | 31,059 | 37,857 3,999 | 3,758 | 6,318 | N.A. |
| United States |  | 3,132 | 3,071 | 5,705 | 2,115 | 2,602 | 4,015 | 4,130 | 3,674 | 3,999 | 3,758 | 5,254 | N.A. |
| Other |  | 3,792 | 3,796 | 5,081 | 4,340 | 2,029 | 3,775 | 5,891 40,983 | 7,561 42,294 | 3,525 45,381 | 2,822 40,852 | 5,254 42,575 | N.A. |
| Total | : | 10,544 | 13,025 | 18,962 | 13,435 | 12,540 | 30,343 | 40,983 | 42,294 | 45,381 | 40,852 | 42,575 | N.A. |

## N.A. $=$ Not available.

1/ Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela.

Source: National trade books of individual countries.

Table 25..-Total imports of selected comoditfes by selected Lafich countries: Value by origin, ca'endar years $1955-66$



See footnotes at end of table.

Table 25.--Total imports of selected commodities, by selected LAFTA countries: Value by origin, calendar years $1955-66-\operatorname{continued}$

| Commadity | : | 1955 : | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | $1959:$ | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ; |  | -- 1,000 dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wheat flout | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lafta $1 / \mathrm{t}$ | : |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62 | 26 | 81 | 10 | 9 | N.A. |
| LAFTA |  | 19,973 | 2,212 | 1,928 | 1,301 | . 43 | 6.188 | 5. 295 | 4,197 | 4,808 | 8,652 | 6,309 | N,A. |
| United States |  | 703 | 2,822 | 3,275 | 8,325 | 7,686 | 6,129 | $\begin{array}{r}5,295 \\ \hline 869\end{array}$ | 4,197 | 4,808 | 8,652 | 6,792 | N,A. |
| Other |  | 766 | 3,179 | 76 5.279 | 1,022 | 505 8,234 | 523 6,840 | 869 6,226 | 3,676 7,899 | 1,524 | 9,222 | 7,110 | N.A. |
| Total | , | 4/21,442 | 4/8,213 | 5,279 | 10,648 | 8,234 | 6,840 | 6,226 | 7,899 | 6,424 | 9,222 | 7,110 |  |
| Rice | ; |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total LAFTA $1 /:$ | : |  |  |  |  |  | 41 |  | 536 | 961 | 2,643 | 6,785 | $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{A}$. |
| LAFTA ...... |  | 22 | 4 | 4,411 | 6. 327 | 403 $\mathbf{1}, 076$ | 6,731 | 1,069 | 1,386 | 1,694 | 7,473 | 10,645 | $N, A$. |
| United States |  | 494 4 | 5 4 4 | 312 | 6,199 | 1,076 298 | 2,197 | 3,220 | 13 | 1, 16 | 1,206 | 14 | N,A. |
| other... <br> Total |  | 4 520 | 64 | 4,728 | 6,639 | 1,777 | 8,969 | 8,490 | 1,935 | 2,671 | 11,322 | 17,444 | N.A. |

N.A. $=$ Not available

1/Excludes Bolivia and Venezuela.
$\overline{2} /$ Less than $\$ 1,000$.
3/ Estimated.
4/ Includes Ecuador ${ }^{\top} s$ imports only inco principal parts.
Source: From country trade boaks of individual courtries.

Table $26 .-U . S$. exports of selected agricultural commodities to selected LAFTA countries, P.L. 480 programs and
commercial shipannts, calendar years 1955-67 1/f


Table $26--U . S$. exports of selected agricultural comodities to selected LAFTA countries, p, L. 480 prograns and commercial shipments, calendar years $1955-67 \mathrm{1} /--$ Continued


Table 26.--U.S. exparts ai selected agricultural commodities to selected LAFTA countries, p.L. 480 programs and commercial shipments, calendar years 1955-67 1/-Continued

| Type si shipment and commodity | : | $1955:$ | $1956:$ | $1957:$ | $1958$ | 1959 : | $1960:$ | $1961$ | $1962$ | 1963 | 1964 | $1965:$ | $1966:$ | 1967 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | -- 1,000 dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Toral-Gontinued: | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| טried peas: | ; |  |  |  | 441 | 235 | 392 | 408 | 143 | 85 | 1,121 | 68 | 53 | 424 |
| brazil |  | 150 | 20 | 85 135 |  | 52 | $\begin{array}{r}74 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 90 | 233 | 324 | 270 | 316 | 220 | 504 |
| Peru ..... |  | 11 | 23 | 135 | 88 73 | 22 | 74 54 | 600 | 108 | 168 | 666 | 380 | 249 | 110 |
| Orher |  | 199 | 163 | 297 | 602 | 309 | 520 | 1.,098 | 484 | 577 | 2,057 | 764 | 522 | 1,038 |
| Tocal |  | 360 1.550 | 206 1,325 | 297 1,339 | 1,502 | 1,828 | 1,181 | 1,522 | 1,750 | 1,871 | 2,344 | 1,493 | 2,014 | 2,237 |
| Venezuela .... | .: | 1,550 | 1,325 | 1,339 | 1,550 | 1,828 | 1,281 | 1,522 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dried beans: | : |  |  |  |  |  | 4,365 | 1,777 | 513 | 1,967 | 1,774 | 323 | 1,077 | 1,053 |
| Mexics.. |  | 1,665 | 1,592 | 1,333 | 5,785 | 6,985 | 4 | 1,747 | 5 | 9 | 541 | 105 | 8 | 103 |
| Colombia |  | 1 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 1,066 | 1 | 24 | 1,709 | 8 | 429 | 126 | --- | 328 |
| Brazil ... |  | 20 | 15 | 55 | 9 | 1, 14 | 39 | 10 | , 10 | 13 | 39 | 92 | 96 | 2, $\begin{array}{r}546 \\ 2,030\end{array}$ |
| Other Total |  | 1,686 | 1,632 | 1,389 | 5,796 | 8,066 | 4,409 | 2,034 | 2,239 | 1,997 | 2,783 | 646 2,123 | 1,181 3,596 | 2,030 3,044 |
| Venezuela .... |  | 490 | 557 | 627 | 588 | 1,353 | 1,774 | 4,068 | 2,136 | 3,126 | 2,285 | 2,123 | 3,596 | , 04 |

:
1/ Data on LAFTA exclute Bolivia and Venezuela.
$\frac{1}{2} /$ Mostiy all under barter.
$\frac{2 /}{3}$ Mostly all under barter.
$\frac{3}{4}$ ) Nostly under Mutual Security/A.I.D. programs.
$\underline{5}$ P.L. 480 exceeds sotal duw co differences in reporting.

## SPECIAL in this issue

AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF THE FUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY; CALENDAR YEARS 1966 AND 1967
by
Joseph R. Corley 1/
Total trade of the European Economic Communty reached a record $\$ 111$ biliion in 1967. Slightly more than half was made up of exports, giving the DEC a favorable trade balance of $\$ 1.2$ billion, solely to the credit of West Gennany (table 27). The imports of the remaining five countries exceeded exports, although the trade balance of Belgium-Luxembourg was nearly even. Imports of France, Italy, and the Netherlands exceeded exports by more than $\$ 1$ bilition each.

Agricultural trade of the EEC totaled $\$ 18.7$ billion, 17 percent of total trade. Imports accounting for more than two-thirds of agricultural trade were valued at $\$ 12.5$ billion, slightiy below the record imports in 1966. Exports continued to increase, and reached $\$ 6.2$ billion in 1967, 7 percent higher than the 1966 value. The increase in exports more than offset the decline in fmports.

The principal agricultural comodities imported in 1967 were meats and preparations, maize (corn), fruits, nuts and preparations, vegetables and preparations, coffee, animal feeds, and oflseeds. The major export items were meats and preparations, dairy products, fruits, nuts and preparations, beverages (undistilled), and crude vegetable materials.

Intra-Community imports (imports from other EEC countries) of agricultural products reached $\$ 3,472$ milifon in 1967 and comprised 28 percent of total agricultural imports, up from 25 percent in 1966 and 18 percent in 1960 . At the same time, the share of imports from the United States declined to 12 percent in 1967 from 13 percent in 1960, although total imports from the United States were up 35 percent. Imports of farm products from the rest of the world were 25 percent higher than in 1960 , while the share of these other countries declfned to 60 percent in 1967 from 69 percent in 1960. Total agricultural imports of the EEC have increased 144 percent since 1960 . Of that increase, the imports from the EEC increased 125 percent (fig. 5).

The EEC countries have improved their trade importance to each other, relative to that of the other world countries. From the outset, the European Comon Market's agricultural policy was oriented toward bringing the EEC to a greater degree of self-sufficiencs by improving farm income and increasing farm production through increased efficiency. To achieve this, the EEC's agricultural commission, beginning in 1962, instituted a system of variable levies on imported agricultural commodities that were competitive with those produced in the EEC. These incIuded rice, grains, pork, beef, veal,

[^8]Table 27.--Total and agricultural trade of the EEC, calendar year 1967


1/ Main Economic Indicators, OECD, March 1968.
2/ United Nations data.


Figure
poultry and eggs, and dairy products. The fmport levies are designed to increase the cost or the inport value to prevent foreign products from entering the Common Market at a lower price than the internal seliing price. These import levies may be adjusted in accordance with the changes in domestic prices of the EEC.

For instance, the threshold price, used as a basis for calculating the levy on imported grains, is fixed at a level that will bring the selling price of imported grains up to the level of the target price in the region of the Communty with the least adequate domestic supplies. (Target prices are fixed before the winter sowing and come finto force at the beginning of the marketing season for that crop. Countries can determine target prices for separate regions when the difference between the selling price in the region and the overall target price exceeds 5 percent). The minimum import price for pig meat, eggs, and poultry coming from non-Communty countries is referred to as the sluice gate price. 2/

While the Comunity policy permitted each EEC country to apply levies to imports from EEC countries as well as third countries at the outset, provisions were made to gradually eliminate the internal EEC levies and eventually bring about a common pricing system among the EEC countries. Under this provision, grains, pork, poultry products, and eggs imported among EEC countries became duty-free in July 1967, rice in September 1967, and dafry products and beef and veal in April 1968.

Among the principal commodities subject to the EEC import levies, the share of dairy products imported from EEC countries has risen steadjly and substantially since 1962 (table 29). Whereas the EEC had provided 55 percent of its imports of dairy products In 1962, the share increased to 73 percent in 1967. Imports of meat and meat products (including poultry) remained relatively stable from 1962 through 1966, but rose about 4 percentage points to 44 percent in 1967. The U.S. share of corn imports by the EEC was substantial from 1962 through 1967, although a marked drop occurred in 1967. From 1962 through 1966, the U.S. share of EEC corn imports rose from 45 to 54 percent, but declined to 41 percent in 1967. A prime factor causing this decline, however, was the reduction in U.S. corn exports in 1967. In addition, world supplies were up; this was reflected in the increased world share of EEC corn imports in 1967, which rose from 33 percent in 1.966 to 47 percent in 1967. Before 1967, the world share had been on the decline, falling from 54 percent in 1962 to 33 percent in 1966. Efforts toward self~ sufficiency in corn production in the EEC contributed to a rising share of the EEC's corn imports originating within the EEC, as evidenced by the rising share from 2 percent in 1962 to 14 percent in 1965 and 12 percent in 1967.

Production of the principal farm comodities that fejl under the EEC levy system has expanded (table 28). Among the feed grains, France a1d Italy are the leading corn producers. Even though France's corn production dropped slightly from 1966, it was 40 percent above the $1960-64$ average. Italian corn production has shown a slight increase over the 1960-64 average. Due to the locational disadvantage of the Italian farmer to the EEC market, Italy continues to receive a concessional subsidy from its corn exports to encourage larger production and trade with the other EEC countries. Oats and barley production has expanded considerably -- oat production in 1967 was 9 percent higher than the 1960-64 average, while 1967 barley production leaped 47 percent above the 1960-64 average.

With the increased feed grain production in the EEC, the demand for feed grains and feed ingredients has also grown, as evidenced by the substantial rise in production of andmal products. Total meat production has expanded in each of the countries, so that the 1967 EEC total of over 20 million pounds was 10 percent above the 1961-65 average

[^9]Table 28.--Production of selected commodities in the EEG, average 1960-64, annual 1966-67

| Country and calendar year |  | eat 1/ | Lard | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & : ~ M i l k ~ \\ & : \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Rice | Rye | Wheat | Corn | Oats | Barley |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & : M \mathrm{Mil} \\ & : \underline{1 b} \end{aligned}$ |  | Mil. | Mil.1b. | 1,000 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I,000 } \\ & \text { m.t. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { m.t. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { m.t. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { m.t. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { m.t. } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | Ib. |  | m.t. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Belgium-Luxembourg: Average 1960-64 2/ |  |  |  |  | --- | 145 | 842 | --- | 455 | 478 |
|  |  | 1,08.4 | 45 | 8,664 | --- | 145 83 | 689 |  | 324 | 523 |
| 1966 |  | 1,124 1,220 | 52 59 | 8,823 8,934 | --- | 83 98 | 689 888 | --- | 410 | 670 |
| 1967 3/ |  | 1,220 | 59 | 8,934 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| France: | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average 1960-64 2/ | : | 6,910 | 155 | 54,162 | 121 | 373 | 11,746 | 2,625 | 2,620 2,578 | 6,239 7,421 |
| 1966 |  | 7,331 | 168 | 55,422 | 100 | 356 362 | 11,297 14,383 | 4,331 3,679 | 2,578 2,758 | 7,421 $\mathbf{9 , 7 2 4}$ |
| 1967 3/ |  | 7,696 | 181 | 57,775 | 115 | 362 | 14,383 | 3,679 |  |  |
| West Germany: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |  | 3,433 |
| Average 1960-64 2/ | : | 6,584 | 570 | 45,368 | --- | 3, 2,696 | 4,533 | 127 | 2,340 | 3,869 |
| 1966 | : | 6,852 | 596 | 47,084 | --- | 2,696 3,162 | 5,819 | 196 |  | 4,734 |
| 1967 3/ | : | 7,010 | 617 | 47,872 | --- | 3,162 |  |  |  |  |
| Italy: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 525 | 266 |
| Average 1960-64 2/ $1966 . . . . .$. | : | 2,449 | 45 | $4 / 21,872$ $4 / 22,826$ | 635 616 | 89 83 | 8,261 9,406 | 3,732 3,510 | 525 477 | 253 |
| 1967 3/ | : | 2,658 | 47 | 4/24,046 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Netherlands: | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average 1960-64 2/ | : | 1,573 | 35 | 15,597 | --- | 354 | 583 | ---- | 325 | 416 |
|  | : | 1,764 | 39 | 15,952 | --- | 190 | 597 | ---- | 357 | 447 |
| $1966 \ldots$ |  | 1,876 | 42 | 16,634 | --- | 239 | 739 | --- | 365 | 447 |
| Total EEC: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average 1960-64 2/ |  | 18,540 | 850 | 145,663 | 756 | 4,186 | 26,163 | 6,396 | 6,236 | 10,790 |
| 1966 |  | 19,616 | 900 | 150,107 | 716 | 3,408 | 26,522 | 7,968 | 6,076 | 12,482 |
| 1967 3/ |  | 20,460 | 946 | 154,261 | 895 | 3,943 | 31,393 | 7,705 | 6,807 | 15,870 |

$\underline{1 /}$ Includes beef, veal, lamb, mution, goat, and horse meat. $2 /$ Meat, lard, and milk production are shown for average 1961-65. 3/Preliminary. $4 /$ Includes sheep and goat milk.

Source: World Agricultural Production and Trade, FAS, U.S. Dept. Agri., monthly issues, March, April, May, and June 1968.

Table 29.-Tmports of selected variable levy products by the EEC, calendar years 1962-67 and percentage change since 1962 , by origin

| Origin and commodity | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | $: 1965$ | $1966$ | 2967 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | -- 1,000 dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| EEG: : $\quad 2,000$ doliass |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat and preps. | 181,442 | 259,620 | 402,484 | 400,064 | 421,502 | 489,034 |
| Dairy products ...: | 232,162 | 252,793 | 251,500 | 330,469 | 377,484 | 419,545 |
| Corı . . . . . . . . . . | 5,818 | 29,736 | 59,574 | 103,125 | 98,823 | 76,888 |
| United States: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat and preps. . . | 71,217 | 48,155 | 73,753 | 71,155 | 67,888 | 54,844 |
| Dairy products ...: | 5,403 | 18,334 | 51,704 | 38,202 | 12,786 | 1,967 |
| Corn . . . . . . . . . . | 168,204 | 237,394 | 266,762 | 379,953 | 412,947 | 269,709 |
| Other World: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat and preps. . . : | 211,230 | 356,736 | 715,227 | 531,164 | 575,901 | 575,866 |
| Dairy products ... | 187,203 | 184,877 | 142,270 | 162,433 | 166,408 | 156,131 |
| Corn ............. | 201,427 | 291,324 | 220,023 | 244,032 | 253,151 | 299,062 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat and preps. ..: | 463,889 | 664,511 | 1,191,464 | I, 002, 383 | 1,065,291 | 1,119,744 |
| Dairy products ...: | 424,768 | 456,004 | 445,474 | 531,104 | 556,678 | 577,643 |
| Corn | 375,449 | 505,937 | 546,359 | 727,110 | 764,921 | 645,659 |
| : |  | -- Percentage distribution -- |  |  |  |  |
| EEC: : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat and preps. ..: | 39.1 | 39.1 | 33.8 | 39.9 | 39.6 | 43.7 |
| Dairy products ...: | 54.7 | 55.4 | 50.5 | 62.2 | 67.8 | 72.6 |
| Corn . . . . . . . . . . | 1.5 | 5.9 | 10.9 | 14.2 | 12.9 | 11.9 |
| U. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat and preps. ..: | 15.4 | 7.2 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 4.9 |
| Dairy products ...: | 1.3 | 4.0 | 11.6 | 7.2 | 2.3 | 0.3 |
| Corn . . . . . . . . . . : | 44.8 | 47.0 | 48.8 | 52.3 | 54.0 | 41.2 |
| ( |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other World: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meat and preps. . . | 45.5 | 53.7 | 60.0 | 53.0 | 54.0 | 51.4 |
| Dairy products ...: | 44.1 | 40.5 | 31.9 | 30.6 | 29.9 | 27.1 |
| Corn $\ldots . . . . . .$. | 53.6 | 57.6 | 40.3 | 33.5 | 33.1 | 46.9 |

production. Although lard has shown substantial growth, its expansion was a result of the increased animal slaughter. Milk production totaled 155 militon pounds in 1967, 6 percent above the 1061-65 average.

While the EEC has had varying degrees of success in seeking self-sufficiency in many agricultural products, dairy and poultry production has become excessive. Putter exports by the EEC reached a total value of $\$ 55$ miliion in 1967. In 1962, EEC butter exports totaled $\$ 25 \mathrm{million}$; for the 6 -year period 1962-67, they rose to a high of $\$ 57$ million in 1965. Poultry exports totaling $\$ 59$ milition in 1962 had expanded to \$123 million in 1966 and $\$ 119$ million in 1967 (table 30).

## Agricultural Imports of the EEC

The United States and the Latin American Free Trade Association were the principal third-country suppiiers of agricultural products, accounting for 36 percent of the EEC's agricultural imports in 1967. Intra-Communty imports totaled $\$ 3,235$ million in 1967, with the Netherlands and France the major sources among the EEC countries. West Germany was by far the largest importer of farm products from other EEC countries. In 1967, its EEC imports totaled $\$ 1,634$ milifon, 37 percent of EEC's total intra-Communty imports.

Imports of agricultural products by the EEC comprised about two-thirds of their agricultural trade and totaled $\$ 12,526$ million in 1967 (tables 31 and 32 ). The principal import comodities were animal products, grains and preparations, fruits and nuts, coffee, tea and cocoa, vegetables, anfmal feeds, and oilseeds and otlseed products. About three-fourths of the EEC imports originated from third countries or non-EEC countries, while the remaining one-fourth were intra-Community imports.

Animals and animal products.--EEC imports of animals and animal products reached $\$ 3,240 \mathrm{mfllion}$ in 1967, siightly less than $\ddagger \mathrm{n}$ 1966. Intra-Community imports accounted for the largest share and were 14 percent above the 1966 leve1. France and the Netherlands were the princtpal EEC origins for antma1s and animal products.

Table 30.--Poultry exports of the EEC by country of origin in calendar years 1962-67 1/

| Country | 1962 | : 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -- 1,000 dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| Belgium-Luxembourg | 3,418 | 6,118 | 6,349 | 14,396 | 17,832 | 18,547 |
| France | 12,231 | 14,030 | 17,694 | 17,674 | 15,336 | 10,835 |
| West Germany | 475 | 533 | 241 | 102 | 761 | 672 |
| Italy | 584 | 207 | 309 | 1,133 | 1,968 | 1,226 |
| Netherlands | 42,100 | 49,578 | 55,528 | 80,174 | 87,066 | 87,966 |
| Total | 58,808 | 70,466 | 80,121 | 113,479 | 122,963 | 119,246 |

1/ Includes fresh, chilled, and frozen poultry.
 at...ar $\because$ esin 1961 and 1967


1) Ser explanation of tablets om pape bR.
$\underline{\underline{2}}^{f}$ Exeludes fued grains, which are included under prains and preparations.

Table 32.~ European Economic Commity: Agricultural imports by commodity groups, origin,
and country of destination, calendar year 1967


Ste footnutes at ent of table.
Continued-

Table 32.--Eucopean Econamic Conanuaty: Arricultural imonets by commadty froups, orifin,



See explanation of tables on pare 68.
Excludes feed grains, which are included under grains and preparations.

Meat imports including poultry totaled $\$ 1,120 \mathrm{~m} 1110 \mathrm{n}$ in 1967,5 percent more than in 1966. Fresh, chlled, or frozen meats totaled $\$ 993 \mathrm{~m}$. 1110 and accounted for the largest share of meat imports. Beef and veal fmports were nearly $\$ 484$ million, pork was $\$ 208 \mathrm{million}$, and poultry totaled $\$ 139 \mathrm{million}$. Intra-Community imports were 44 percent of total imports and amounted to $\$ 436 \mathrm{millifon}$. The Netherlands exported most of the fresh meat to the other EEC countries in 1967, supplying about 46 percent of the intra-Communicy imports of beef and veal, and about four-fifths (78 percent) of the fresh poultry.

Imports from the United States totaled $\$ 51$ million. Two-thirds of the fresh meat imports from the United States were fresh edible offals (variety meats). Among other third countries, Argentina and Demark were large suppliers. Nearly three-fourths of the fresh meat imports from Argentina were beef and veal, while two-thirds of the fresh meats from Denmark were beef and veal.

Intra-Communty imports of dairy products, mainly from France and the Netherlands, accounted for 73 percent of total dairy product imports. Switzerland and Demark were the largest non-EEC sources, supplying mainly cheese and curd. Dairy imports from the United States were valued at less than $\$ 1$ mililon.

The EEC's IIve animal imports reached $\$ 443$ million in 1967, 11 percent higher than in 1966. Catcle and hogs accounted for the largest portion. Intra-Community imports of cattle and hogs tutaled $\$ 131$ million, 30 percent of the animal imports by the EEC countries. Austria and Denmark were also large suppliers. Live animal imports from the United States amounted ta only 1 percent of total live animal imparts.

Gratns and preparations.--West Germany was the major importer of grains and preparations, followed by Italy and the Netherlands. The United States was the principal supplier. In 1967, imports from the United states totaled $\$ 483$ million, down 32 percent from 1966. Feed grains accounted for 73 percent of the imports from the United States, and wheat and flour fmports, 22 percent. Rice and other grain preparations accounted for the remaining 5 percent.

Intra-Conmunity trade in grains and preparations increased in 1967 to $\$ 426$ milifon from $\$ 403$ million in 1966, with France supplying two-thirds of the totai. EEC imports of feed grains from France -- mostly barley and corn -- totaled $\$ 202$ million.

West German imports of feed grains reached $\$ 570$ million in 1967, with the EEC and the United States the principal suppliers.

EEC imports of grains and prefarations from third countries, excluding the united States, totaled $\$ 687$ million. Of this total, LAFTA countries -- notably Argentina -supplied grafns and preparations valued at $\$ 300$ million in 1967.

Total imports of grains and preparations by the European Economic Commity declined 9 percent to $\$ 3,596$ million in 1967. While imports from third countries declined 13 percent in 1967 from 1966, intra-Community imports rose 6 percent. The common grain price, reached in July 1967 (with the exception of the special concession to Italy) probably assisted the continuat growth in the intra-Communtty trade of the EEC.

Fruits and nuts.--Fruits and nuts, with imports valuad at $\$ 1,437 \mathrm{milifon}$ in 1967 , ranked as the third largest commodity group imported by the EEC. Intra-Conmanity , trade, totaling $\$ 426 \mathrm{mfllion}$, ascounted for the largest share of the total -- 30 percent, compared with 28 percent in 1966. Italy accounted for $\$ 298$ militon, or 70 percent of the 1967 total. Among the third country suppliers, fmports from Spain totaled $\$ 179$ million. Imports from the Associated Overseas Countries (EEC-AOC) totaled $\$ 168 \mathrm{mfllion}$, and imports from the European Associates (Greece and Turkey) were valued at $\$ 99$ million.

Citrus fruits accounted for 27 percent of total fruits and nuts imported. Oranges and tangerines came principally from Spain, Morocco, Israel, Algeria, and South Africa. Italy, the United States, Israel, and Spain were principal suppliers of lemons and grapefruit. Banana imports totaled $\$ 265$ million and originated from Latin America and the EEC Associated Overseas Countries. Martinique, a Latin American country, was the major AOC supplier. Intra-Community imports of apples totaled $\$ 82$ million; Italy and France were the principal exporters. Total apple imports in 1967 were valued at $\$ 128$ million.

Of total preserved fruit imports, 28 percent originated within the EEC; the United States ranked second, supplying 14 percent. Japan was the major Asian source, accounting for EEC imports totaling nearly $\$ 8$ million. Israel supplied $\$ 7$ million of the EEC's preserved fruit imports.

Vegetables.--Imports of vegetables by the EEC totaled $\$ 797$ million, siightly higher than in 1966. More than half originated from within the EEC, primarily the Netherlands and Italy. Vegetable imports from the Netheriands by the other five EEC countries totaled $\$ 207$ million, compared with $\$ 195$ million in 1966 . The Netherlands has become a major supplier of vegetables (mostly fresh vegetables) for the EEC as weil as other Western European countries. Italy and Belgium-Luxembourg were also large suppliers. In addition to EEC intra-Comaunity trade, imports from Morocco, Taiwan, and Thailand boosted the share supplied by the Other African and Asian Countries. Vegetable imports by the EEC from the U.S. totaled $\$ 16$ million, 2 percent of total vegetable imports. Over half ( $\$ 9$ million) were dry leguminous vegetables (dried peas and beans).

Of total vegetables imported by the EEC, four-fifths were fresh vegetables. Imports of fresh tomatoes alone totaled $\$ 129$ million, with the Netherlands and Norsco the principal sources.

Sugar and honey.--Sugar and honey imports by the EEC accounted for only 1 percent of total agricultural imports in 1967 , with the bulk of the total being sugar ( 90 percent). The Associated Overseas Countries were the major source, supplying nearly half of the EEC's sugar imports. Intra-Community trade in refined sugar totaled $\$ 25$ million, or about two-thirds of the intra-Community trade in sugar and honey. Eastern Europe and Latin America accounted for much of the remainder. Suger imports from Cuba accounted for about 5 percent of the EEC sugar imports.

Coffee, tea, and cocoa.-- Imports of coffee by the EEC countries, totaling $\$ 686$ million, originated primarily in Latin American countries. Among the LAFTA members, Brazil supplied coffee imports valued at $\$ 163$ million; and Colombia, imports valued at $\$ 80$ million. El Salvador and Guatemala were the major Central American Conmon Market (CACM) countries supplying coffee to the EEC. Coffee imports from the African AOC totaled $\$ 141$ million. Imports from the Ivory Coast -- the largest African source -. were valued at $\$ 54$ million.

Cocoa imports by the EEC were valued at $\$ 258$ million in 1967 . The EEC-AOC countries of Africa supplied cocoa to the EEC valued at $\$ 113$ million, nearly half of the total cocoa imports. The Ivory Coast and Cameroon were the two main suppliers, contributing $\$ 98$ million, or 87 percent of the African AOC total.

Imports of tea and mate totaled $\$ 44$ million in 1967 and were principally from Asian origins. Ceylon, India, and Indonesia were the main suppliers. Combined, these countries accounted for nearly 72 percent of the EEC's tea and mate imports.

Animal feeds.--Animal feed imports by the EEC were valued at $\$ 779$ million in 1967 , about the same as in 1966. Animal feeds exclude corn, oats, barley, and sorghum grains, but include hay fodder, straw, vegetable products, brans, oil cake and meal, meat and fish meal fodder, food and feed wastes, waste of other vegetable products, and beet pulp.

The United States was the major source of animal feed. in 1967, accounting for 28 percent of the EEC's total animal feed imports. Oil cake and meal were the principal U.S. animal feed products imported, accompanied by sizable quantities of food waste products and beet pulp. West Germany and the Netherlands accounted for more than half the total receipts from the United States.

Animal feed imports from LAFTA countries totaled $\$ 212$ million. Oil cake and meal, and meat and fish meal were the major animal feeds imported from LAFTA. Argentina and Brazil accounted for 93 percent of LAFTA shipments of animal feeds to the EEC. Peru, a major processor and exporter of fish meal, supplied the EEC with fish meal valued at $\$ 71$ million in 1967.

Fats and oils.--Imports of fats and oils ly the EEC totaled $\$ 511$ million in 1967,3 percent higher than in 1966. Intra-Community imports, the major source of fat and oil imports, totaled $\$ 114$ million -- 12 percent higher than in 1966. Most of the increase in the intra-Community trade is due to the increase in the rising production of cattle and hogs in the EEC countries. Hog numbers rose 1 percent from 1966 to 1967 , but by early 1968 -- at 41 million head -- they were 7 percent higher than in 1967. Production of animal fats has increased with the rise in hog slaughter.

Other origins of fats and oils (totaling $\$ 124$ million in "other" columa in tables 31 and 32) included Eastern Europe, with EEC imports totaling $\$ 56$ million, and Other Europe -- notably Spain -- with EEC imports totaling $\$ 39$ million. Fat and oil imports (c.i.f. value) from the United States were $\$ 40$ million, compared with $\$ 94$ million from the EEC-ADC countries. Tallow was the major import from the United States. Peanut oil imports from Senegal, valued at $\$ 51$ million, accounted for the larjest AOC share. Imports of sunflower seed oil from Eastern Europe totaled $\$ 48$ million, notably from Russia. Tonal EEC imports of vegetable oils were valued at $\$ 498$ miliion.

Tobacco.--Tobacco imports by the European Economic Communty totalei $\$ 379$ million in 1967, 8 percent higher than in 1966. West Germany, by far the major buyer in 1967, imported tobacco valued at $\$ 214$ million -- 56 percent of the EEC's total tobacco imports.

The United States was the major source of EEC tobacco imports. Its share totaled \$ 154 million in 1967. The EEC-associated countries of Greece and Turkey supplied tobacco valued at $\$ 63$ million. Rhodesia was a major supplier prior to the United Nations sanctions imposed in late 1966. As a result, EEC imports of Rhodesian tobacco reached only $\$ 7$ million in 1967 , compared with $\$ 17$ million in 1966 (table 33).

Imports of raw and manufactured tobacco by the EEC have continued to increase, reaching more than $\$ 461$ million in value in 1967 for a 28 -percent increase over 1963 . Imports of raw tobacco from the United States have increased more slowly, rising 23 percent since 1963. Increased overseas supplies, higher taxes, the increased use of lower quality tobacco mixtures in filter cigarettes, and changes in other manutacturing procedures have tended to reduce the demand for more expensive U.S. tobaccos.

Oilseeds.--Imports of oilseeds by the European Economic Community totaled $\$ 769$ million in 1967, 8 percent lower than in 1966. Much of the decline occurred in imports from Other African Countries, which dropped to $\$ 112$ million in 1967 from $\$ 149$ million in 1966. In addition, declines occurred in imports from Other Asian Countries and in those from the United States. However, the decines in imports from the linited States were slight -- only $\$ 5$ million.

Soybeans in 1967 accounted for 53 percent of oilseed imports from the United States. West Germany, Iraly, and the Netherlands were the major markets.

Table 33.-- Tobacco imports by the EEC, calendar years 1962-67

| Origin | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -- Metric tons -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| United States | 66,927 | 69,650 | 67,492 | 72,279 | 75,070 | 86,089 |
| Rhodesia 1/ | 22,866 | 23,371 | 26,762 | 29,776 | 21,395 | 11,597 |
| Greece | 30,878 | 21,455 | 26,692 | 29,883 | 32,184 | 31,393 |
| Turkey | 25,001 | 10,127 | 9,087 | 8,404 | 13,753 | 13,709 |
| Total | 145,672 | 124,603 | 130,033 | 140,342 | 142,402 | 142,783 |
| Total imports | 273,219 | 263,586 | 274,730 | 277,206 | 283,545 | 301,008 |

I/ Beginning in 1965, United Nations data showed Rhodesia, Zambia, and Malawi as separate countries. These were combined in 1965-67 to maintain comparability with earlier years when they were shown as one country -- Rhodesia and Nyasaland. In 1967, EEC tobacco impores from Rhodesia were 6,924 metric tons.

Source: United Nations.

Anong the African countries, imports of peanuts from Nigeria totaled $\$ 56$ million, while the AOC countries of Senegal and Niger together accounted for $\$ 64$ million.

Cotton.--iotal imports by the EEC amounted to $\$ 607$ million in 1967,4 percent below 19.5. Imports of cotton originated primarily in the LAFTA countries. Brazil ( $\$ 68$ million), Mexico ( $\$ 49$ million), and Peru ( $\$ 24$ million) were the principal LAFTA suppliers. Among the countries included in "Other" (where EEC cotton imports valued at $\$ 147$ million originated), Turkey and the Soviet Union were major suppliers. Imports from Turkey totaled $\$ 75$ million, while imports from the Soviet Union were valued at $\$ 36$ million.

EEC cotton imports from the United States totaled $\$ 91$ million in 1967,14 percent higher than in 1966. The U.S. share of cotton imports by the EEC rose to 14 percent in 1967 from 13 percent in 1966. The increased EEC imports of cotton textiles from developing countries such as Hong Kong, Taiwan, and India have reduced their demands on world raw cotton supplies. In addition, the steady rise in the use of synthetic substitutes has dulled the demand for cotton. The static economic conditions in the EEC countries in 1967 further slowed mill activity there. EEC imports of textiles and products were at a 5 -year low in 1967 (table 34).

Other.--Imports of products classified as "other" in tables 31 and 32 totaled $\$ 1,266$ million, with $\$ 563$ million or 44 perce.t originating within the EEC. These products include such items as spices, food preparations (sauces, soups, yeast, etc.), nonalcoholic and alcoholic beverages, rubber, vegetable fibers, plants, seeds, flowers, essential oils, and starches. Imports of crude vegetable materials -- such as plants, seeds, and flowers -- totaled $\$ 375$ million; imports of alcoholic beverages amounted to \$280 million; and rubber imports totaled $\$ 184$ million. West Germany was the largest importer of these commodities, with 53 percent originating within the community.

Table 34.--EEC imports of tobacco manufactures and textiles, by country, calendar years 1963-67

| Commodity and year |  | France | Belgium.Luxembourg |  | West : Germany : | Italy | Total EEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | -- Million dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tobacco, raw and manufactures | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ; |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1963 | : | 50.7 | 36.9 | 60.0 | 166.1 | 45.5 | 359.2 |
| 1964 |  | 49.7 | 44.7 | 74.8 | 179.8 | 38.6 | 387.6 |
| 1965 |  | 50.1 | 49.6 | 80.8 | 192.1 | 25.2 | 397.8 |
| 1966 |  | 55.7 | 48.3 | 80.3 | 212.4 | 27.8 | 424.5 |
| 1967 |  | 57.7 | 57.0 | 88.7 | 218.5 | 39.4 | 461.3 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Textiles and | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| manufactures | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1963 | : | 524.5 | 315.0 | 143.1 | 465.4 | 499.9 | 1,947.9 |
| 1964 |  | 507.1 | 370.2 | 153.4 | 497.3 | 508.4 | 2,036.4 |
| 1965 |  | 446.8 | 328.3 | 133.7 | 469.0 | 421.4 | 1,799.2 |
| 1966 |  | 507.9 | 334.2 | 135.2 | 464.3 | 535.6 | 1,977.2 |
| 1967 |  | 410.0 | 273.6 | 127.6 | 423.9 | 500.3 | 1,735.4 |

Source: Monthly Statistics, Statistical Office of the European Communities, Brusseis, Belgium.

The share of "other" imports from the United States was small, only 2 percent of the total. However, these "other" products are not the type ardinarily exported from the United States. Many, such as rubber, are tropical products. Others, such as cut flowers and plants, are produced in quantity in the EEC and are not imported great distances.

## Exports of Agricultural Produces

The European Economic Community exported agricultural products valued at $\$ 6,195 \mathrm{million}$ in 1967, 7 percent higher than in 1966 (table 35). The Netherlands was the largest exporter of agricuttural products, followed by France and Italy. Animals and animal products was the largest commodity group, with grains and preparations being the second most important.

Exports from the Netherlands totaled $\$ 1,994$ million in 1967 (tables 36 and 37 ). Animals and animal products accounted for 42 percent of the total value of agricultural exports from the Netherlands. The Netherlands is also a large supplier of vegetables; in 1967, such exports amounted to $\$ 311$ million and ranked second in value after animals and animal products. Coffee, tea, and cocoa exports ranked third.

The Netheriands is an important supplier of animal products and vegetables for the other EEC countries. In 1967, Dutch agricultural exports to the EEC accounted for 60 percent of their total exports of farm products. West Germany was the principal market for the Netherlands exports. EFTA countries, especially the United Kingdom, were also major recipients of animal products from the Netherlands. Fresh and frozen meats were the principal animal products exported from the Netherlands, followed by dairy products, notably milk and cream.

Table 35.--Agricultural exports of the EEC to selected destinations, calendar years 1960-67


Exports from France totaled $\$ 1,858$ million, 30 percent of total EEC exports. Shipments of grains and preparations totaled $\$ 576$ million, and animal products totaled $\$ 544$ million. The other EEC countries represented the major destination for French exports; in 1967, such shipments totaled $\$ 989$ million and accounted for 53 percent of total French agricultural exports. West Germany was France's largest EEC market. West German receipts of French grains totaled $\$ 159$ million, and imports of French animal products were valued at $\$ 150$ million. French exports to EFTA countries totaled $\$ 287$ million, with the United Kingdom and Switzerland each receiving about 43 percent of the total to EFTA countries.

Fruits and vegetables accounted for 61 percent of Italy's $\$ 998$ million worth of agricuitural exports. Intra-Comunity shipments of fruits and vegetables moved principally to West Germany and France. Nevertheless, Italian fruit and nut exports to the remaining EEC countries totaled $\$ 275$ million. Exports of apples, citrus fruit, stone fruit, pears, and fresh grapes to the EEC totaled $\$ 247$ million, 87 percent of Italy's total exports of these fruits. EFTA countries received the largest share of Italy's exports to third countries. Switzerland was the principal EFTA market.

Agricultural exports from West Germany and Belgium-Luxembourg each totaled nearly $\$ 700$ million. Animals and animal products, totaling $\$ 291$ million from Belgium-Luxembourg and $\$ 240$ million from West Germany, were the principal commodities exported. IntraCommunity exports accounted for the largest part of their total exports, and shipments to EFTA countries accounted for the largest share of their exports to third countries.

The United States is a relatively large market for EEC exports of farm products to thixd countries; such shipments totaled $\$ 329$ million in 1967 , 10 percent higher than in 1966. Exports to the United States in 1967 had a total value greater than those to either the AOC countries, Eastern Europe, or Asian countries. But in terms of total exports of farm products, the U.S. share was only 5 percent.

EEC agricultural exports have increased 83 percent since 1960 , for an average annual increase of 13 percent. Growth in intra-Commanity exports of farm products has been

Table 36.--European Economic Comunity: Agricultural exports, by commodity groups and destinations, calendar years 1966 and 1967

| Year and commedity proups | Destination of exports $1 /$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | United States | EEC-ADC | EFTA | CONECON: | Ocher Eurupe | Other Asia | EEC | Other | Total |
| -- 1,000 dollars (E.O.b.) -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1967 | 110,103 |  | 235,437 | 23,322 | 50,716 | 43,735 | 1,282,022 | 136,054 | 2,010,638 |
| Animals and antual products .... |  | 74,249 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grains and preparation | 6, 526 | [1,626 | 166, 711 | 30, 333 | $4 \%, 5 \times 0$ | 54,057 | 434,521 | 109,902 | 900,216 |
| Fruits and nuts | 9,157 | 4,976 | 156,846 | 28,711 | 11,602 | 2,011 | 412,186 | 9,736 | 635,225 |
| Vegutiabliti .... | 29,601 | 20,725 | 140, 345 | 3,172 | 15,087 | 14,256 | 411,181 | 24,264 | 658,631 |
| Sugar and honey | 3,277 | 25,883 | 12,187 | 592 | 1,688 | 10,562 | 37,895 | 9,301 | 101,385 |
| Corlew, tea, and eseua | 22,901 | 1,016 | 41,937 | 1,569 | 7,187 | 13,638 | 49,723 | 10,188 | 148,159 |
| Animal freds $2 / \ldots .$. | 1,247 | 3,322 | 40,033 | 9,959 | 6,413 | 4,825 | 138,775 | 9,331 | 223,905 |
| Fats and ails. | 11,854 | 13,296 | 39,831 | 4,194 | 12,333 | 30,021 | 111,900 | 25,732 | 249,161 |
| Tobaceo, umanufastured | 89 | 58 | 6,987 | 577 | 436 | 24 | 18,380 | 31 | 26,582 |
| Oilsteds, ete. | 471 | 6,233 | 2,583 | 1,487 | 437 | 304 | 19,118 | 505233 | $\begin{aligned} & 31,138 \\ & 34,327 \end{aligned}$ |
| Cotton | 24 | 70 | B,031 | 1,052 | 1,012 | 262 | 23,643 |  |  |
| ocher | 133,383 | 37, 348 | 270,636 | 19,659 | 32,183 | 40, 304 | 565,241 | 76,320 | 1,175,374 |
| Totil | 328,633 | 244,001 | 1,131,564 | 12:4,624 | 1,5,635 | 263,999 | 3,504,585 | 412,097 | 6,195,141 |
| 1966 : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Animals and animal products: | 108,310 | 78,142 | 229,478 | 22,77B | 42,930 | 81,086 | 1,104,774 | 135,224 | 1,802,722 |
| Grains and preparationt .. | 5,200 | 47,727 | 157,962 | 126, 143 | 40,522 | 36,339 | 391,039 | 73,589 | 878,821 |
| Fruits and nuts ........ | 8,035 | 5,362 | 142,148 | 25,059 | 9,132 | 2,417 | 376,124 | 9,125 | 577,602 |
| Vegetables | 24,568 | 21,951 | 140,179 | 3,450 | 13,45) | 15,010 | 399,645 | 20,986 | 639,248 |
| Sugat and ituley | 1,426 | 35,229 | 12,261 | 849 | 1,199 | 8,944 | 42,688 | 18,669 | 121,365 |
| Coffer, tia, and cocua | 9,025 | 930 | 34,308 | 992 | 3,830 | 10,685 | 42,014 | 6,143 | 107,927 |
| Animal intods $2 / 7$. | 883 | 3,151 | 39,992 | 5,490 | f, 390 | 4,178 | 140,842 | 7,541 | 208,467 |
| Fats and oils ${ }^{\text {a }}$. | 12,358 | 16,945 | 42,359 | 3,343 | 14,424 | 27,934 | 96,435 | 26,381 | 240,683 |
| Tubacen, unmanufactured | 686 | 1 | 7,639 | 172 | 25 | 4 | 17,380 | 174 | 26,081 |
| Oilscuds, etc. ... | 746 | 7,012 | 4,559 | 1,121 | 469 | 246 | 18,517 | 1,241 | 34,011 |
| Cortion | 14 | 34 | 5,648 | 548 | 354 | 56 | 18,917 | 106 | 25,677 |
| other | 12.:姐 | 34, 32d | 243,230 | 18,105 | 29,145 | 33, 892 | S38,096 | 98,018 | 1,121,062 |
| Tatal | 298,499 | 251,012 | 1,060,363 | 208,450 | 160,879 | 220,795 | 3,186,471 | 397,197 | 5,783,666 |

$\frac{1 /}{2}$ Sexe explanatiun oi tables on page 68
$\underline{2}$ Exeludes Fews ;rints, willicil are included under prains and preparations.

Table 37.-European Economic Community: Agricultural exports, by commodity groups, origin, and country or region of destitation, calendar year 1967


See footnotes at end of table.
Continued--

Table 37 .- European Economic comomity: Agricultural exports, by commodity groups, origin, and runtr: or regian if destinahian, calentar yuar 1967-Continued

| Orikin and commodity proups |  | Destination of exports $1 /$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | United : EEC-AOCStates |  | EFIA | CONECON | Other Europe | orher <br> Asia | EEC | Other | Total |
| - 1, 000 dojlars (f, of, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) -- |  | - 1,000 dojlars ( $f=0, b_{*}$ ) -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Italy Animals and animal products .... |  | 20,633 | 32 ? | 21,202 | $2,768$ | $3,338$ | 3,398 | 27,813 | 10,584 | $90,063$$86,913$ |
|  |  | 11,729 |  | 19,987 |  |  | 21,150 | 25,195 |  |
| Grains and preparations ......... |  |  | 1,169 |  | 1,692 | $4,313$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,678 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 274,654 | -7,235 | 432,490 |
| Fruits and nuts |  | 4,533 |  | 108,168 | 28,548 | 623 | 6,065 | 82,700 | 9,780 | 172,973 |
| Vegetables |  | $\begin{array}{r} 17,335 \\ 959 \end{array}$ | 4,797 | 51,266 | $407$ | 1 | 13 | 1,032 | 25 | 2,106 |
| Sugar and honey .................. |  |  | 7 | 76 4,366 | 79 | 501 | 279 | 1,647 | 171 | 7,672 |
| Coffers, tea, and cocoa .......... |  | 622 | 1 | 5,402 | 683 | 487 | 874 | 5,454 | 1,240 | $\begin{aligned} & 14,583 \\ & 16,299 \end{aligned}$ |
| Animal Feeds $2 /$ $\qquad$ <br> Fats and oils $\square$ |  | 442 | 68 | 1,614 | 433 | 673 | 934 | 3,121 | 2,726 |  |
|  |  | 6,730 |  |  | 573 | 397 | ...- | 7,499 | 10 | 9,751 |
| Tobacco, unmanufactured ......... |  | 58 |  | 1,272 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 232 | 20 | 455 |
| Oilseeds, etc. |  |  | 2 | 107 | 13 | 125 | --- | 4 | 51 | 184 |
| Cotton |  |  | 746 | 46,678 | 2,123 | 2,558 | 1,800 | 79,484 | 11,233 | 164,897 |
| Other .. |  | $\frac{20,275}{72,757}$ | $\begin{array}{r}746 \\ \hline, 831\end{array}$ | 251,883 | 30,941 | 18,271 | 34,647 | 504, 789 | 68,270 | 998,385 |
| Total |  | 72,751 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Netherlands | : | 56,944 | 16,253 | 115,447 | 6,667 | $19,424$ | $\begin{array}{r} 54,049 \\ 2,048 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 509,738 \\ 70181 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 67,132 \\ 4.755 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 845,654 \\ 97,827 \end{array}$ |
| Animals and animal products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grains and preparations . |  | 1,530 | 997 160 | 16,77 8,294 | 26 | $467$ | 2, 203 | 35,607 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,755 \\ 352 \end{array}$ | $45,963$ |
| Fruits and nuts ........... |  | 854 2.747 | 160 3,224 | 8,294 64,145 | 2,14t. | 7,172 | $\begin{aligned} & 5,146 \\ & 6,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 219,362 \\ 2,596 \end{array}$ | 7,363 | 311,303 |
| Vegetables ..... |  | 2,747 538 | 3,224 21 | $\begin{array}{r} 64,145 \\ 3.334 \end{array}$ | 2,14. | 260 |  |  | 942 | 15,002 |
| Sugar and honey ........ |  | 538 17,136 | 21 422 | 30,892 | 1,211 | 5,902 | $10,466$ | 36,309 | $\begin{aligned} & 9,137 \\ & 1,858 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 111,475 \\ 57,985 \end{array}$ |
| Coffee, tea, and cocoa |  | 17,136 138 | 321 |  | 2,555 | 2,373 | 2,234 | 44,183 |  |  |
| Animal feeds $2 /$. |  | 138 3,233 | 2,497 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,335 \\ & 1,378 \end{aligned}$ | $3,955$ | 22,671 | $\begin{array}{r} 36,815 \\ 5,852 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,858 \\ 11,152 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57,985 \\ & 92,189 \end{aligned}$ |
| Fats and oils ............ |  | 3,233 57 | 2,497 1 | 10,488 2,311 |  | $39$ | 22 |  | 2 | $8,264$ |
| Tobacco, unmanufactured .. |  | 379 | 56 | 1,278 | 1,286 | 240 | 157 | 4,098 | 377 | $\begin{array}{r} 7,871 \\ 14,465 \\ 386,037 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Oilseeds, etc. |  | 375 | 56 | 1,278 | $\begin{array}{r}1,270 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | --- | 173 | 11,929 | \% 68 |  |
| Cotton |  | 27,818 | 5,028 | 84,169 | 2,441 | 10,694 | 17,374 | 216,305 | 22,208 |  |
| Total |  | 111,375 | 28,970 | 343,492 | 18,362 | 51,993 | 121,524 | 1,192,974 | 125,344 | 1,994,034 |

1 . See explanation of tabies on page 68.
2f Excludes feed grains, which are included under grains and preparations.
greatest, averaging 21 percent for the 7 -year period. The U.S share of EEC agricultural exports has grown at a rate of about 9 percent; this is somewhat higher than the rate for EFTA, but lower than the 10 percent for "other" countries. Exports to LAFTA have risen sharply, averaging a 37 -percent rise per year since 1960 . However, Lafta's receipts account for lesg than 1 percent of total EEC agricultural exports. Exports to the AOC countries have declined during the 7 -year period ending 1967, dropping at a rate of 4 percent per year.

## EXPLANATORY NOTES FOR TABLES

The trade groups shown in the tables contain the countries listed below.
The EEC-Associated Overseas Countries (AOC) includes: Algeria, Burundi and Rwanda, Caldonia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Fxench Guyana, French Somaliland, Gabon, Guadeloupe, Ivory Coast, Malagasy Republic, Mali, Martinique, Mauritania, Netherland Antilles, Niger, Reunion, Senegal, Somali Republic, Surinam, Togo, and Upper Volta.

The European Free Trade Association (EFTA) includes: Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

The Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) incIudes; Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and USSR.
The Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) includes: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Other African Countries includes: Angola, Comoro Islands $1 /$, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Mauritius, Malawi, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Other Portuguese West Africa, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Spanish Central Africa, Sudan, Tanganyika, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic (Egypt), Zambia, and Zanzibar-Pemba.

Other Asian Countries includes: Aden, Afghanistan, Bahrein, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, China (Mainland), China (Taiwan), Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Korea Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, North Korea, No:-th Vietnam, Pakistan, Philippines, Portuguese Asia, Oatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sterling Arabic Countries, Syria, Thailand, South Vietnam, and Yemen.

Other European Countries includes: Albania, Cyprus, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Spain, Yugoslavia, and nonspecified European countries.
$1 /$ Although Comoro Islands data are included with the Other African Countries, it is a member of the EEC-AOC countries. In 1967, EEC agricultural imports from the Comoro Islands were $\$ 1,902,000$ and exports were $\$ 452,000$.


## SPECIAL in this issue



PRILE LEVEL OF PRINCIPAL U.S. AGRI, URAL TRADE ITEMS
DECLINED 4.4 PERCENT IN FISCAL $\because: 1968$

by<br>Hans G. Hirsch 1;

Most of the 21 principal U.S. agricultural trade commodities were exchanged at lower prices in fiscal year 1968 than in fiscal year 1967. The average price level of export comodities declined 5.9 percent and that of import commoditic; 1.9 percent; the combined decline was 4.4 percent. Averages for the quarter endiug June 30 reflect a similar decline of the price level below the comparable quarter in 1967 (table 38 ).

The $1967 / 68$ price decline tended to offset the $1966 / 67$ price increase over $1965 / 66$ (table 39). Thus, $1967 / 68$ prices averaged virtually the same as in $1965 / 66$. This alsu means that $1967 / 68$ prices showed the same relationsinip to $1964 / 65$ prices as did $1965 / 66$ prices (cf. last and first line of table 3G).

The terms of trade index (expart price index divided by import price index) stood at 95.9 and was thus unfavorable to U.S, agricultural exports when $1967 / 68$ is compared with 1966/67; but compared with $1965 / 66$, it was virtually at par and compared with 1964/65, it amounted to 103.1 and was favorable to $\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}$. agricultural exports.

The import price indexes for the four quarters which make up fiscal year 1968 , hardly varied from the fiscal year index of 98.1 (table 40). The export price indexes ranged from 96.3 during the summer quarter to 92.2 during the fall quarter. The winter and spri: $:$ quarter indexes showed some successive recovery from that low level.

The only commodity with a strong upward price trend which runs counter to the general price weakness was cocoa beans. Both annual and quarterly unit values were 13 percent above a year earlier, furthering a trend which has continued uninterruptedly since the winter quarter of 1966 -- when the cocca bean unit value started its recovery from the long-time low level of 12.6 cents a pound recorded in the fall of 1965 . The spring 1968 price was 2.1 times as much, 26.7 cents. The anmal prices for sugar and rice also showed strength; both were up 5.5 percent. The sugar price, however, seems to have stabilized. Both spring quarter and fiscal year prices amounted to 6.4 cents a pound. During the preceding 2 years, the sugar price was higher in the spring than in any other quarter. During the preceding 3 years, it rose between 0.4 and 0.6 cent a pound from winter to spring; in 1968 that rise was only 0.1 cent. The quarterly rice price was above the amual price and at its highest level in many years. U.S. price quotations For rice -- in contrast to the trade unit values here discussed -- were still at peak levels. In Asia, however, rice price quotations receded during the April-June quarter from the record levels registered some months ago.

[^10]



Coteon poundages were obtained frm U.S. Burdul of the Census Reports, Stembement to EM 522
2f The indux numers are wi "Fishur's Idual" cype.

Table 39.--Price index numbers of U.S. foreign agricultural trade, fiscal years 1966-68 1/

| Year ending June 30 : | Exports | Imports | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( |  |  |  |
| Based on year earlier: |  |  |  |
| 1966 | 99.6 | 96.5 | 98.4 |
| : |  |  |  |
| 1967 ................................................. | 105.9 | 101.7 | 104.4 |
| 1968 | 94.1 | 98.1 | 95.6 |
| 1968 based on 1966 |  | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| ( |  |  |  |
| 1968 based on 1965 ................................... | 99.3 | 96.3 | 98.2 |
| -T- |  |  |  |
| 1/The index numbers are of Fisher's "Ideai" type. The indexes un the last two lines are chained; that is, 1968 based oil 1966 are upper section $1968 \times 1967$ numbers and 1968 based on 1965 are upper section $1968 \times 19$ ć $7 \times 1966$ numbers. |  |  |  |

Table 40.--Price index numbers of l.S. foreign agricultural trade, quarters of fiscal year 1968 1/

| Quarter | Exports | Imports | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| July-September 1967 | 96.3 | 98.2 | 97.0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| September-December 1967 | 92.2 | 98.0 | 94.1 |
|  |  |  |  |
| January-March 1968 | 93.9 | 98.3 | 95.5 |
| April-June 1968 | 94.9 | 98.0 | 96.1 |
| Fiscal year 1968 | 94.1 | $9 \times 1$ | 95.6 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1/ The index numbers are of Fisher's "Ideal" type. Each period is compared with the same period 1 year earlier. Data on the last 2 lines are from table 38 ; those on the upper 3 lines from corresponding tables in preceding issues of this periodical. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Sorghum grain, cotton, flue-cured tobacco for export, coffee, bananas, beef and veal as well as hams are seven commodities which have displayed substantial price stability, with annual and quarterly unit values ranging from 97 to 102 percent of a year earlier. The other 11 principal comodities, however, sufferea substantial price declines. The price of imported tobacco moved differently from that for export tobacco and is down 3 percent in spring and 5 percent for the year.

The wheat price was down 4.0 percent for the year and 6.1 percent for the quarter; and wheat flour prices were down 14 and 13 percent. Coin prices dropped 12 percent in both series, with the quarterly corn price 5.3 cents a bushel ( 4.0 percent) below the sorghum grain price. This is a still more abnormal price relationship than that observed during the winter quarter and quite different from the average 17 cents a bushel premium of corn over sosghum grain which prevailed during 1965-67.

The annual soybean price was down 9 percent and that of protein meal 8 percent. The quarterly soybean price, however, was down only 2 percent, while the quarterly protein meal price was 16 percent less than in spring 1967. Hardest hit were soybean oil, inedible tallow, hides and skins, rubber, and wool, with price declines ranging from 16 to 19 percent -- except for the quarterly hides and skins price, which dropped only 10 percent.

The quancity indexes were down for exports but steeply up for imports as shown by the following tabulation:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Fiscal year } 1968 & \text { Spring quarter } 1968 \\ \text { Based on FY } 1967 & \text { Based on spring quarter } 1967\end{array}$

|  | 99.3 | 98.9 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Exports | 107.1 | 121.2 |
| Imports | 102.0 | 107.1 |

The combined fiscal year value of the 12 principal export items was down 7 percent from a year earlier and the combined fiscal year value of the nine principal import items was up 5 percent from a year earlier, the same percentages as those reported for all agricultural exports and for all agricultural imports.


## SPECIAL in this issue

## SELECTED PRICE SERIES OF INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

In July, the first month of the $1968 / 69$ wheat matreting yur, the price of Canadian No. I Northern wheat, in store Fort William-Port Arthur, was quoted at Can. $\$ 1.99$ a bushel, up? cents from June and only 8 cents ( 4 percent) less than a year earlier (table 41). By contrast, the seller's export price of U.S. No. 1 Hard Winter Wheat, ordinary protein, f.o.b. Gulif ports, continued to drop for the fourth successive month. The average July quotation was $\$ 1.52$ a bushel, 27 cents ( 15 percent) below a year earlier, and 22 cents below the applicable International Grains Arrangement (IGA) minimum price. That price has been maintained to the buyer by requiring exporters to purchase certificates which raise the price to the IGA minimum level. American No. 2 Hard Winter Wheat was quoted at $\$ 1.98$ a bushel ( $\$ 72.75$ a metric ton) c.i.f., U.K. ports as of July 31, 1968, and was in line with the $\$ 1.73$ f.o.b. Gulf ports minimum price uncer the IGA.

The c.i.f., U.K. quotation of Australian wheat averaged $29 \frac{1}{2}$ pounds sterling per long ton in July, the highest monthly average since devaluation last November. That quotation was 6 percent less than that for American No. 2 Hard Winter wheat c.i.f., U.K., which averaged 31.4 pounds sterling in July. Argentine wheat was not quoted in London.

The average July Liverpool quotation for Memphis Territory, strict middling cotton of 1-1/16 inch staple length was quoted nominally at 34.55 cents a pound, up 0.94 cents from June and 4.65 cents from a year ago.

Feed grain prices dropped from June to July. The c.i.f., U.K. price for Argentine corn was down 0.5 pound sterling ( 1.9 percent), while the price of U.S. No. 3 corn at that location dropped 0.1 pound ( 0.4 percent). The sorghum grain price was particularly weak at 22.1 pounds sterling ( 5.2 percent less than in June). In terms of pounds sterling, that price was only 1 percent below a year earlier; but in terms of dollars, it was 16.1 percent below a year earlier. The difference stems from the pound devaluation. These quotations imply an 8 cents a bushel discount for sorghum grain below U.S. corn and reflect a more normal price relationship between these two feed grains than that which prevailed during the previous year.

The export price of Thai rice rose slightly, by 1.0 pound sterting per metric ton (l. 2 percent); but expresed in dollars, it was 21 percent below the September 1967 peak.

With a plentiful new crop in sight, the c.i.f., U.K. price of U.S. soybeans dropped to 46.5 pounds per long ton, the lowest post-devaluation level and, in terms of dollars, 5 percent below a year ago. The same proportionate drop from July 1967 to Juiy 1968 was observed in the price received by U.S. farmers for soybeans; the marketing margin from the point of original sale by U.S. farmers to U.K, ports -- comprised mostly of freight costs -- was 19 percent of the price received by farners in both periods.

Table 4l.--Selected price serfes of international significatue


1/ Nowinal.
2/ U.S./Argentine sorghums transshipped fran Continental European ports
3/Preliminary
Source: Monthly Bulletin of Agricultursi 玉conomics and Statistics, FAO, and for recent months, original sources.


## Ocean Freight Rate Highlights



## ; OCEAN FREIGHT RATES FOR EXPORT GRAIN, JANUARY-JUNE 1968 //

Although still well above the levels that prevalled fmmediately before the closing of the Suez Canal, ocean frefght rates for transporting U.S. grain to foreign ports generally trended downward through the first half of 1968 (table 42). For a short while it appeared that the Suez Canal would be reopened to traffic. During this time, some charter parties made provision for shipment in U.S. flag vessels from the U.S. Gulf to the East Coast of India via Suez at rates averaging $\$ 35.92$ In the first quarter and $\$ 32.18$ in the second. The Suez Canal did not reopen, but had these rates become effective, they would have represented savings of $\$ 0.98$ and $\$ 2.36$ a ton, respectively.

Throughout the first half of 1968 , U.S. flag vessels continued to reflect their greater operating costs in rates well above those of foreign flag vessels for the same routes. As an example, the rates of U.S. flag vessels carrying grain from the U.S. Gulf to the West Coast of India averaged $\$ 26.87$, more than twice the $\$ 10.61$ average for foreign flag vessels for the same movement during the second quartfr of 1968.

At least a part of the general decline in ocean frefght rates for grain can be attributed to the steady increase in the average carrying capacity of bulk carriers and tankers (table 43). The average capacity of bulk carriers, vessels whose chfef cargoes are grain, ores, and dry chemicals such as fertilizer, increased by about 83 percent between 1966 and 1967 and by more than 356 percent between 1946 and 1967. Tankers -which are usually thought of as carrying petroleum and other liquids, but also carry grain -- have shown less dramatic, but still highly significant, increases in average capacity during the same periods.

The increases in vessel size have been accompanied by increases in numbers. Between 1966 and 1967, the number of frefghters increased by 32 , and bu1k carriers and tankers increased by $2 G 5$ and 86 , respectively. $2 /$

First quarter - 1968
During the first quarter of 1968 , ocean freight rates for transporting U.S. grain to foreign destinations averaged 11 percent below the previous quarter, but 26 percent above the first quarter 1967 average.

Countering the trend, Large increases were shown for shipments in U.S. Elag vessels from the U.S. Gulf to East Coast of India, and from Pacific Coast ports to West Coast of Indfa. These rates increased, on the average, by $\$ 3.15$ and $\$ 5.15$, respectively,

[^11]Table 42,--Average voyage charter rates per ton for corn, wheat, and soybeana, calendar years 1967 and 1968 1/


1/ Average of rates for individual cargoes weighted by volume: Rates for 2,000 pound tons and calendar quarters of years. 2/ None reported. 3/Via Suez Canal for January-May 1967, via Cape of Good Hope thereafter. R/Revised.

Table 43.--Average dead-wetght tonnage of world merchant fleets, by vessel type, selected years

| Years | : | Freighters | : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bulk } \\ & \text { carriers } \end{aligned}$ |  | Tankers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  | 1,000 tons |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1946 I/ |  | 7.6 |  | 4.6 |  | 13.9 |
| 1951 1/ |  | 7.5 |  | 4.9 |  | 15.3 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1961 1/ |  | 7.7 |  | 11.8 |  | 19.6 |
| 1966 2/ |  | 7.9 |  | 16.0 |  | 26.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1967 2/ |  | 7.8 |  | 21.0 |  | 28.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | - Percent |  |  |
| Percentage increase 1946-67 |  | 2.6 |  | 356.5 |  | 102.9 |
| $1 /$ Merchant Fleets of the World, September 1, 1939-December 3I, 1951, U.S. Departmen of Conmerce. <br> 2/ Merchant Fleets of the World, Seagoing Steam and Motor Ships of 1,000 Gross Tons and over, as of December 31, 1966 and 1967, U.S. Department of Commerce. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

from the fourth quarter of 1967. The rates charged by foreign flag vessels for these two trades averaged $\$ 1.71$ and $\$ 2.03$ below the previous quarter.

Rates to the Antwerp-Rotterdam-Amsterdam area from all Eastern and Southern U.S. and Canadian origins averaged 17 percent below those to the United Kingdom.

Second quarter - 1968
Ocean freight rates for grain dec1ined an average of 17 percent between the first and second quarters of 1968. With the decline, ocean rates moved below the 1967 average but remafned somewhat above the second quarter 1967 level.

Rates to Northern Europe averaged 29 percent below those to the United Kingdom, thus widening the sprıad over that of the first quarter.

Reduced programings of P.L. 480 wheat to Inda are evidenced in the absence of voyage charters reported from the Pacific Coast to Indian destinations. These reduced programings, by lowering the demand for shipping space, seem likely to be the immediate cause of the significant reductions in U.S. flag vessels' rates to India.


## Export Highlights

U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS BY COIJNTRY, FISCAL YEAR 1968
U.S. agricultural exports in fiscal 1968 (year ending June 30 ) totaled $\$ 6,315 \mathrm{milin}$, 7 percent below the record level in fiscal 1967. Substantial declines occurred in animals and animal products, cotton, tobacco, and fruits, with smaller declines for exports of grains and preparations, oilseeds and products, and vegetables. However, several individual commodities reached new records. Exports of rice, soybeans, and oil cake and meal were record high in 1967/68. The increased value of rice exports resulted frsm a larger quantity of exports as well as from higher prices. Oil cake and meal exports totaled 3.1 million short tons in $1967 / 68$, up from the 2.7 million in 1966/67. Exports of soybeans rose to a new record of 265 million busheis. However, the expurt value of soybeans was down slightiy due to the substantially lower prices.

Although U.S. agricultural exports were shipped to more than 150 countries in 1967/68, 15 countries accounted for 74 percent of the total farm product exports. Japan, which has ranked as the largest customer for II.S. agricultural exports since 1963/64, accounted for $\$ 898$ million in 1967/68 (table 44). Canada ranked as the second largest market, and received exports valued at $\$ 543$ million in $1967 / 68$. However, some of the $U . S$. exports of agricultural products reported by the Bureau of the Census as U.S. exports to Canada are maintained in bonded storage at lower St. Lawrence River ports for subsequent shipment to Western Europe and other world markets. Because of this, the reported exports to Canada were readjusted by quantity and converted to an estimated value to show the value of U.S. agricultural exports transshipped through Canadian ports. In 1967/68, these transshipments -- mainiy grains and soybeans -- amounted to $\$ 79$ million (table 45). Among the top 15 export markets for U.S. agricultural exports, the six EEC countries combined accounted for $\$ 1,403$ million in $1967 / 68$. The EEC is the largest single customer for U.S. farm products (table 46). Exports to the European Free Trade Association totaled $\$ 653$ million, with the United Kingdom accounting for the largest share.

Of the 15 major export markets for U.S. agricultural exports, nine were developed countries, while the renaining six were developing countries. Among the developing countries that fell within the top 15 , India, ranking third, received U.S. agricultural exports valued at $\$ 511$ miliion. The other developing countries included Pakistan, South Vietnam, Taiwan, and Brazil.

Each of the top 15 countries has shom an overall increase in receipts of U.S. agricultural products since 1962/63. South Vietnam has shown the largest growth rate, with an average annual increase of 76 percent since 1962/63. However, much of this increase resulted from the U.S. efforts toward Iiberation of the South Vietnamese from Communist control. For the 3 years 1962/63 through 1964/65, exports to South Vietnam increased relatively slowly, rising from $\$ 32$ miliion to $\$ 53$ million. However, beginning in $1965 / 66$, U.S. agricultural exports jumped to $\$ 103 \mathrm{million}$, and reached a high in $1966 / 67$ of $\$ 196$ million before dropping to $\$ 154$ million in $1967 / 68$. More than 68 percent of the $\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}$. exports to South Vietnam during these years was rice. Japan, France, South Korea, and Taiwan have also shown substantial growth rates since $1962 / 63$-- each one has had average annual increases greater than 10 percent.

Table 44 .- U. S. agricultural exports to 15 major countries, fiscal years 1963-68


Table 45.--U.S. agricultaral exports from Camadian parts: Quantity and value by comalitity and destination,
flecal year 1968

|  | Wheat |  | Barley |  | Corn |  | O3ts |  | Rye |  | Flaxseed |  | Soybeans |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination | : Quancity : | Value | Quantity : | Value | Quanticy | Value | Quantity | Value | Quancity | Value | Quantity | Value | Quantity | Value | value |
|  | 1,000 bu. | $\begin{array}{r} 1,000 \\ \underline{\$ o l} . \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1,000 } \\ \text { buc. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,000 \\ \text { dol. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { bu. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { dol. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { bu. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,000 \\ \text { dol. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { bu. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,000 \\ \text { dol. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { bu. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { dol. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1,000 } \\ \text { bus. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,000 \\ \text { dol. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { dol. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| European Economic | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cancanity (EEC) - | : 1,390 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beigium-Luxembourg | : 1,380 | 2,189 | --- | --> | 1,979 | 2,434 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | - | 73 | 199 | 4,822 |
| France | : 804 | 1,275 | 724 | 80 | -- | -- | 1 | 3 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 2 | $\cdots$ | 1,275 |
| Italy . | : 997 | 1,581 | 724 | 804 | 42 | 52 | 442 | 324 | --- | --- | --- | --. | 224 | 612 | 3,373 |
| Netherlands | : 3,040 | 4,822 | $\cdots$ | --- | 5,153 | 6,338 | $\cdots$ | --- | 142 | 177 | 337 | 1,012 | 2,534 | 6,918 | 19,267 |
| Nest Germany | : 1.375 | 2.181 | 71 | 79 | 4,294 | 5,281 | 237 | 174 | --- | $\cdots$ | 346 | 1,039 | 500 | 1,365 | 10,119 |
| Subtotal | 7,596 | 12,04日 | 795 | 383 | 11,468 | 14,105 | 679 | 498 | 142 | 177 | 683 | 2,051 | 3,331 | 9.094 | 38,856 |
| European Frge Trade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dssociariso fertal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Noway . ............ | : 644 | 1,021 | --- | --* | --- | --. | --- | --- | --. | -.. | -.. | -.. | ${ }^{1}$ | 221 | 1,242 |
| Switrezland | : 4 | 6 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 6 |
| linited Kingdom | : 1,342 | 2,129 | --- | --- | 3,847 | 4,732 | $\cdots$ | --- | --- | -- | $\cdots$ | --- | 381 | 1, 060 | 7,901 |
| Subtotal | : 1,990 | 3,156. | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 3.847 | 4,732 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | --- | $\cdots$ | 462 | 1,261 | 9, 249 |
| Other - | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Algeria ....... | ; 944 | 1,497 | --- | --" | $\cdots$ | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --. | 1,497 |
| Baybados ........ | : $\quad \cdots$ | -- | -.. | --- | 4 | 5 | --- | --- | -. | ..- | --- | -.. | --- | ... | 5 |
| India .... | : 4,440 | 7,042 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -.. | --- | --7 | --- | 7,042 |
| Israel | : | --- | --" | --. | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 1,143 | 3.120 | 3,120 |
| Japan ........... | : --- | --- | --- | --- | - | $\cdots$ | --- | --- | --- | $\cdots$ | --- | --- | 1,610 | 4,395 | 4,395 |
| Salta ............ | : | 6. 593 | --- | -- | --- | --. | ---- | ---- | ---- | --- | ---- | ---- | $\cdots$ | --- | 6 474 |
| Paland | : -- | , ... | 202 | 225 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -.. | -.- | --- |  | --- | 225 |
| Spain .... | : | --- | --- | --- | -*. | $\cdots$ | --* | --- | -*- | $\cdots$ | --- | --- | 1,9y? | 5.452 | 5,452 |
| Taiwan.... | : | -.. | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- | --. | 225 | 614 | 614 |
| Tunisia | 726 | 1,152 | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | --- | --- | --- | --- | - | --- | --- | -- | --- | 1.152 |
| Subtotal | 10,541 | 16, 718 | 202 | 225 | 4. | 5 | $\cdots$ | --- | --- | - | --- | --- | 4,975 | 13, 381 | 30,529 |
| Total | : 20,127 | 31,922 | 997 | 1,100 | 15,315 | 18,842 | 679 | 498 | 142 | 177 | 683 | 2,051 | 8,768 | 23,936 | 78,534 |

Sources: Statistics Division, Board of Gratn Comissioners for Canada; External Trade Division, Dominion Buteau of Statistics; ard Foreign Irade Divisior, D.S. Bureev of the Census.

Table 46.--U.S. agricultural exports to major trade blocs, fiscal years 1963-68

| Trade Bloc | Year ending June 30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 |
|  | -- Million dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EEC | 1,070 | 1,333 | 1,371 | 1,593 | 1,516 | 1,403 |
| EFTA | 609 | 720 | 668 | 729 | 744 | 653 |
| LAFTA | 274 | 282 | 299 | 292 | 407 | 296 |
| COAECON | 103 | 312 | 101 | 129 | 141 | 91 |
| CACM | 31 | 37 | 37 | 40 | 42 | 42 |
| Total | 2,087 | 2,684 | 2,476 | 2,783 | 2,850 | 2,485 |

Exports of farm products to developed countries ranged in value from about $\$ 3$ billion to $\$ 4.4$ billion from $1962 / 63$ to $1965 / 66$ (table 47). Developed countries received an average of 61 percent of U.S. agricultural exports during the 6 -year period. Exports to less developed countries ranged from a low of $\$ 1.8$ billion to a high of $\$ 2.7$ billion. Exports to the less developed countries averaged about 36 percent of the of the total U.S. agricultural exports during the 6-year period. Shipments to Eastern European countries declined to a low of $\$ 91$ million in 1967/68, after reaching a high of $\$ 312$ million in $1963 /$ h (table 47 ). The higher value of U.S. agricultural exports to Eastern Europe in 1963/64 resulted from the poor grain crops in Eastern European countries and the substantial exports of wheat and other grains to Poland, the Soviet Union, and other Eastern European countries.

While U.S. agricultural exports to the 15 major markets have shown an average annual increase since 1962/63, exports in 1967/68 were down from 1966/67 to Japan, Canada, the United Kingdom, West Germany, Suth Vietnam, France, and Relgium-Luxembourg.

Table 47.--U.S. agricultural exports by destination to developed and less developed countries and to Eastern Europe, fiscal years 1963.68

| Destination | Year ending June 30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 |
| : | -- Million dollars -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developed countries .......: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developed countries ........: | 3,148 1,828 | 3,027 2,735 | 3,832 2,164 | 4,414 | 4,429 | 2,389 |
| Less developed countries .. | 1,828 103 | 2, 312 | 2, 101 | -130 | 141 | 91 |
| : | -- Percentage distribution -- |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Developed countries ....... | 62.0 | 49.8 | 62.9 | 66.0 | 62.0 | 60.7 |
| Less developed countries ... | 36.0 | 45.0 | 35.5 | 32.1 | 35.9 | 37.8 |
| Eastern Europe . ........... | 2.0 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.5 |

Partly offsetting these decines were increases to India, the Netherlands, Italy, the Republic of Korea, Pakistan, Taiwan, and Brazil. As indicated by the countries listed, the bulk of the decline in U.S. agricultural exports in 1967/68 resulted from smailer exports to developed countries. These exports declined $\$ 362$ million in $1967 / 68$, while the decline in exports to less developed countries was only $\$ 40 \mathrm{million}$.

## Import Highlights

PRINCIPAL SOURCES OF U.S. AGRICULTURAL IM'iRTS
U.S. imports of agricultural products amonted to $\$ 4,657$ milien during the fiacal year ending June 30 , 1968 , almost 5 percent above the preceding $z$ years. Imports from most leading suppliers were higher. The ranking of 16 major suppliurs changer?, out not markedly. Brazil maintained its predominant position by a wide margin, as shipments of coffee and ather products increase' sharply over the 4 previous years' levels. For the last 3 years, Nexico has held secon. plave as a source of U.S. farm imports. Coffee, sugar, and certain fruits and vegetas!es contributed most w exnanded yexican expor's to the tinited States. L.S. agricultural imports from the philiypines slipped to third plac? in $1065 /: 6$ because of the more rapid growth in L.S. purchases from Mexico. Still, . S. agr. sltural imports from tha Philippines continued their upward trend. Philippine exports to the tnited States imtude ran stigar, copra, cocomat oil, and scrap tobaces. Larger imports were also evident from Australia, New Zealand, the Dominican Republic, Argentina, Peru, the Netherlands, and Italy (table -8).

Growth in impe. cs from France may be slowed somewhat this year as a result of r.s. action on August 13 to impose countervailing duties on most "rench grods. i'.S. ditits wers raised by an average of 2.5 percent to offset expart subsidy measures adopted by the Franch Government in June. Trance plans to rednce thest subuidies by ont-half m November 1, and to terminate them at the end of Janary 1969. The coumtervailing duties wili be halved when French export subsidies are lowered, and susnended upon their termination. Duty free imports from France, such as carpet wool, some hides, and certain essential sils, will not ba affected by the additional levy.

## Trad Blocs

U.S. agricallural imports from med members if the Latin American Free Trade Area (LAFTA) inereased in value in 1967/68 from the previons vear. The extept ons were Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela. Imports iron Cencrai American Comm Marbet (CACM) countries fell because of reduced purchases from El Salwador, fuatemala, and Hondiras. Values increased for imports from Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

Among European Economic Commanty (EEC) nembers, $\dot{C}, S$. farm imports from Italy, the Netherlands, and West Germany rose ir alue, while those from Bt lium and France declined. Overall farm imports fram the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) vere higher, inainly because of larger purchases from Portugal. Those from Denmark, Aus'ria, and Sweden were slightly less, and imports from the remaining members were about steady After increasing for several years, imports from COMECON leveled off in 196:/68 due to reduced purchases Erom Poland and the USSR. Small increases took place in imports Erom Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia.

While overall U.S. agricultural imports from Africa increased in value during 1967/68 from the preceding year, shipments from individual countries showed wide differences.

Tabie 48.--U.S. agricultural imports from 16 major suppliers: Value by country, fiscal years 1964-68


Values increased for imports from Morocco, Ghana, Angola, Libya, Burundi-Rwanła, Congo (Kinsiasa), [ganda, and the 继lagasy lepubliz, while imports Erom Egypt, Sudan, Camproon, Nigeria, Eiberia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, and South Africa showed dec?ines.

Itports of agricultural products from Asia increased, especially those from the Philippines, Taiwan, Nalaysia, Thailand, India, Iran, and Israel.

Table49 shows the value of imports from Regional Trade Groups and other regions over the last 5 years.

Apart from the 16 principal sources and the Regicnal Trade Groups shown in tables 48 and 49 , increases were recorded for $1 . S$. agricultural imports from Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, Spain, and Panama (table 50),

Table 49.--U.S. agricultural imports from Regional Trade Groups: Value by region, fiscal years 1964-68

| Region and group | : | Year ending June 30 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : | 1964 : | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 |
|  | : | -- 1,000 dollars -- |  |  |  |  |
|  | ; |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Western Hemisphere: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LAFTA | : | 1,334,434 | 1,202,371 | 1,347,085 | 1,276,526 | 1,369,890 |
| CACM |  | 199,623 | 236,463 | 259,808 | 284,302 | 248,391 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Europe: : |  | 240,916 | 265, 227 | 293,724 | 323,412 | 333,140 |
| EEC. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFTA |  | 111,250 | 113,151 | 162,764 | 178,078 | 183,560 |
| SOMECON |  | 32,302 | 39,315 | 49,645 | 59,729 | 57,324 |
| Africa | : | 451,400 | 471,674 | 520,554 | 481,091 | 500,862 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asia |  | 752,886 | 761,441 | 769,997 | 737,281 | 787,507 |
| Oceania | : | 423,534 | 331,665 | 407,167 | 431,863 | 453,260 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 50.--U.S. agricultural imports from 5 secondary sources: Value by country, fiscal years 1964-68


Tatle 52.-nt. A. arriculturai exports: wiantity and value by commadity, July 1967 ami :9f8


Table $51--\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{S}$, agricultural exports: quantity and value by comncdity, iuly : 967 and 1968 - Continued

| Commodity exported : Unit | July 1/ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Quantity |  | - Value |  |
|  | 9967 | 2968 | $: 967$ | : |
| - $:$ |  |  | COL | $\bigcirc 1.0$ |
| Other animal broducts | :Thousands | Thuusands | dollars | doliars |
| Feathers, etc., crude and dressed ... Lb. | 39 | 36 | 42 | 74 |
| Gelatin, edzitle frade ............... Lk. | 57 | $\pm 51$ | 77 | $2 \%$ |
| Hair, animal (exiept woul) .......... Lb . | 367 |  | 10, | \% |
| Hides and skins (except tims) $2 / \ldots$... No. | : 1,438 | - 5973 | 8, 5, 8 | 8.7 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |
| Honey, naturam ....................... Lb. | 1,0ex | 76.5 | 158 | $\because 1$ |
| Wonl, unmfd. (incluiing fine Eair) .:G.Lh.: | . 80 | $88 ?$ | 5 | 5.56 |
| Other ............................... | a) | $\dot{5}$ | i, iki | 363 |
| Total other animal proiucts | $\cdots$ | - | 10, 818 | - 04 |
| Tetal animals ardi animal prods. : -- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\mathrm{c}_{6}, \cdots$ | 47,846 |
| Yemencli mauners |  |  |  |  |
| Dotton, inmanafactured | : |  |  |  |
|  | : 28 | 357 | -7,:97 | $43,3 \times 8$ |
| Linters . .............................EExie: | 2 C | 29 | $0 \times 3$ | 13. |
| Total cutton and linters .......... | 448 | 376 | C, CEI | 4 5 , 989 |
| Fruits ani creparatiens | : |  |  |  |
| Canned (pripartd or yrostrvid)- |  |  |  |  |
| Fruit socktail .................... | 5.57i | 6,339 | 893 | $\therefore 816$ |
| Feaches .......................... ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Lb. | 2,003 | $\therefore 28.4$ | 25: | -7: |
| Pears ............................: Lb. | :54 | 475 | $3 \%$ | 63 |
| Fineapples ........................ : Ib. | 6,855 | 9,609 | i, ciz | i, 322 |
| Other . ............................ : Lb. | 1,670 | 2,084 | $4 \times 7$ | 488 |
| Total canned fruits ............. Lb . | 16, 233 | 19,591 | E,622 | 5,669 |
| Dried -- |  |  |  |  |
| Prunes ............................ Lb. | 5,377 | 7,499 | 1,244 | ?,588 |
| Grapes (raisjns) ................. Lb. | 10,67i | 12,383 | 1,663 | <, $\mathrm{i}_{1} 6$ |
| Other ............................... : Lb. | 478 | 310 | 184 | 153 |
| Total dried frusts .............. Lb. | 16,526 | 20,192 | 3,091 | 3,902 |
| Fresh - |  |  |  |  |
| Apples ........................... : Lb. | 6,262 | 3,157 | 6't | 40. |
| Berries ........................... : Lb. | 2,023 | 1,694 | 486 | 414 |
| Crapefruit . ....................... : Lb. | 9,989 | - 1 , 396 | 745 | 892 |
| Grapes .......................... Lb. | 6,858 | 13,506 | i,278 | 2,092 |
| Lemons and limes .................. Lb. $^{\text {L }}$ | 33,692 | 35,356 | 2,889 | 3,245 |
| tranges and tangerjnes, etc. ....., Lio. | 69,788 | 23,759 | 5,865 | 2,814 |
| Pears . ............................. Lk L. | 70 | 2,634 | 13 | 336 |
| Other ............................. Lb : | : 58,091 | 82,373 | 4,644 | 5,604 |
| Totw fresh fruits .............. Lb . : | - 186,773 | 172,875 | 16,550 | 15.799 |
| Fruit juices - : |  |  |  |  |
| Grapefruit . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .Sai. | 353 | 500 | 323 | 536 |
| Orange ........................... :Gal. | 1,448 | 1,701 | 1,808 | 2,652 |
| other . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : :Gal. | 1,206 | 1,033 | 949 | 888 |
| Total fruit juices ..............:Gal. | 3,007 | 3,234 | 3,080 | 4,076 |
| Frozen fruits ...................... : Lb. | 524 | 292 | 112 | 58 |
| Other .............................. --- | 2) | 2/ | 273 | 275. |
| Total fruits and preparations ..... --- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 25,728 | 27,379 |

Table 51.--i.S. asricultural exports: quantity and value by commodity, Jhy ${ }^{2} 967$ and : 4,8 - Continwd


Table 51. - U.S. agricultural exports: wantity and value by commolity, Julv :967 and 1968 - Cuntinued

| Dommodity exported :Unit | antity $\frac{\text { July }}{:} \frac{1}{\text { value }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1967 | 968 | ! 96 | 968 |
| : |  |  | 1.000 | $\therefore, 000$ |
| - | :Thousands | Thousands | dollars | dollars |
| Vepetarles and preparaticns | : |  |  |  |
| Canned (prepared or freservea) - | $:$ |  |  |  |
| Asparagus .. ....................... : Llv. | $\therefore 764$ | 3,9: | 738 | $\therefore, 037$ |
| Corn . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : L6. | 796 | 707 | 44 | - 4.4 |
| 3ups ............................... Lb. $^{\text {L }}$ | 1,9:7 | $\therefore, 697$ | 408 | 346 |
| Tomatoes, sauce, puree, etc. .....: Lb. | $12 \times 36$ | 655 | -25 | 24: |
| Other .............................. : Lb. | C. 348 | 185 | 4.4 | 384 |
| Total canned vegetables .........: Lb. | 9,05: | 9, 153 | -. 919 | 2, 052 |
| Dried beans, including donations ...: Lb. | :9,798 | 10,032 | 2,16ć | 966 |
| Dried peas, incl. cow and chick .... : Lb. | 11,386 | i $2,67 \%$ | 771 | 894 |
| Fresh - : |  |  |  |  |
| Lettuce ............................ : Lt. | 6, | 5,339 | 4 Cf | .50 |
| Onions ............................. : Lb. | 10,6es | - $4,5,54$ | 764 | (4.) |
| Eotatoes (except sweet potatoes) : Ib. | S. 2.38 | 66.35 | -.354 | -, 054 |
|  | 5,486 | - 6,59 | $\therefore 25 \%$ | <,377 |
| Other ............................... Lb : | $=30 . .58$ | < 6,552 | 1, mey | $\bigcirc$ |
| Total fresh vegetakles .......... Lb. | : $146,1.7$ | 133,3880 | 6.71 | 6.726 |
| Frozen vegetables ................... Lb . | 294 | <,384 | E< | 450 |
| Soups and vegetables, dehydrated .... Lb . | :,973 | :,989 | 699 | 8 Ci |
| Torato suice, canned ................:Gal. | 99 | 79 | 13 | 1 Ca |
| Veretable seasonings ................. LL. | $3{ }^{4} 4$ | 94.5 | $\cdots 7$ | 483 |
| Uther ............ | $\underline{1}$ | s/ | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Total vegetabias ant preps. | -- | - | 14, 2.4 | 13.774 |
| Cther ver table products | : 60 |  |  |  |
| Voffee ............................... | :, 650 | $\therefore 43.2$ | -,377 | !,89\% |
| Drues, herbs, roots, tte. ............ : Le. | 589 | 433 | 493 | 293 |
| Essential oils and resiroids ........ Lb , | 1,062 | 711 | 1,874 |  |
| Feels, etc. (except oil saks) .......: --- | $\therefore$ | $\underline{2}$ | 7,35\% | 2,733 |
| Flavorine sirups, supars, etc. ......: --- | \% | $\pm$ | 3,218 | 3,65i |
| Hows ................................ Li. $^{\text {L }}$ | 308 | 375 | 183 | \% 6 |
| Nursery stock ...................... | - | $\leq$ | 555 | $5: 4$ |
| Nats and preparations ............... | 13, 69 |  | $\therefore, 301$ | 2,439 |
| Seeds (except oilseeds) ............. | 4,04~ | 3,843 | 1, 314 | i, 17e |
| Spicos ............................... Lb . | 518 | 789 | 359 | $43!$ |
| Other, including donations | -1 | i) | 5, 178 | 6, 6.85 |
| Ictal other vegetable products | :- -- | - | -3,995 | [8,155 |
| Total vegetable products | $\cdots$ | -- | 4;0,149 | 4.7 .951 |
|  | : |  |  |  |
| Total agricultural exports ........... | - | --- | 472,251 | 4 615,797 |
| Total nonagricuitural exports ......... | - | - | . 417.919 | 2, 298,636 |
| Total txports, all sommoditits ......: - | $\cdots-$ | --- | ,390,200 | 2,664,433 |

I/ Prisiminary.
2/ Reported in valut only.
3/ weludes the number of "other hitis and skins," reported in value only.

Table 52.--U.S. agricultural imperts For consumption: Quantity and value by sommedily, July 1967 and 1968


Table 52.-U.S. agricultural imports for consumption: Quantity and value by commadity, July 1967 and 1968 - Continued


Table 52.-U.S. agricultural imports for consumption: Quantity and value by conmodity, July 1967 and 1968 - Continued

| Comodity imported SUPPLEMENTARY | July $1 /$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Quantity |  | 2067 Value |  |
|  | 1967 | 1968 | 1967 | 1968 |
| - | Thousands | Thousands | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{gathered}$ |
| Nuts and preparations |  |  |  |  |
| Almonds . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 18 | ${ }^{51}$ | 6 | 29 |
| Brazil nuts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 1,062 | 6,008 | 323 | 1,264 |
| Cashew nuts . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 5,828 | 9,871 | 2,882 | 5,634 |
| Cocomut meat, fresh, or preserved ...: Jb. | 5,437 | 18,409 | 657 | 3,930 |
| Pistache nuts . ....................... : Ib. | 1,887 | 331 | 1,267 | 211 |
| Other ... | $3 /$ | 31 | 266 | -17. $\frac{284}{32}$ |
| Total nuts and preparations | $\cdots$ | --- | 5,401 | 11.322 |
| Oilseeds and products |  |  |  |  |
| Oils, crude or refined - |  |  |  |  |
| Cosua butter . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Lt. L | 1,704 | 2,355 | 923 | 1,450 |
| Carnauba rex . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. : | 692 | 1,067 | 229 | 340 |
| Castor oil ........................... : Lb. | 5,162 | 13,853 | 678 | 2,017 |
| Coconut oif . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 24,057 | 40,508 | 2,649 | 6,861 |
| Olive oil, edible ................... | 4,071 | 5,112 | 1,330 | 1,595 |
| Palm oil ............................. | 0 | 8,664 | 0 | 697 |
| Palm kernel oil ..................... | 9,034 | 14,100 | 1,037 | 2,407 |
| Tung oil . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 893 | 1,386 | 99 576 | 127 |
| Other . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 2,984 | 7,547 | 576 | 1,205 |
| Total oils (except essential) ...: Lb. | 48,597 | 94,592 | 7.521 | 16,699 |
| Oilseeds - |  |  |  |  |
| Copra . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 49,567 | 49,168 | 3,733 | 5,668 |
| Sesame seed . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 3,040 | 1,446 | 500 | 222 |
| Other | 31 | $3 /$ | 161 | 170 |
| Total oilseeds | ---- | --- | 4,394 | 6,060 |
| Oil cake and meal .................... | 7,161 | 5,990 | 224 | 183 |
| Total oilseeds and products ....... |  | 20 | 12,139 | 22,942 |
| Sugar and relat, ed products |  |  |  |  |
| Sugar, cane or beet ................... : STon: | 503 | 477 | 63,781 | 62,559 |
| Molasses unfit for consumption ...... : Gal.: | 32,340 | 32,409 | 4,090 | 4,448 |
| cther . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : --- | -3/ | $3 /$ | -908 | 536 |
| Total sugar and related products .. : - | - =-- | --- | 68,779 | 67,543 |
| Vegetables and preparations |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Fresh, chilled, or frozen -- : |  |  |  | 18 |
| Gucumbers . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | ${ }_{21}^{21}$ | ${ }_{2}^{144}$ | 213 | 18 |
| Garlic . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 1,765 | 2,301 | 243 | 443 |
| Onions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 1,477 | 470 | 207 | 43 |
| Potatoes, white or Irish .......... : Cwt.: | 24 | $\xrightarrow{1}$ | 63 557 | 577 |
| Tomatoes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. : | 4,969 | 4,126 | 557 | 577 |
| Turnips or rutabagas ............... : Cht. : | 5 | 4 | 12 | 9 |
| Prepared or preserved - : |  |  |  |  |
| Cassava, tapioca, flour, etc. : Ib. | $20,276$ | 15,251 | 930 | 1,149 |
| Mushroons . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . : Lb. | 1,810 | 2,122 | 994 | 1,149 297 |
| Pickied vegetables ................. : Lb. | 1,209 11,392 | 1,668 | 1,279 | 506 |
| Tomatoes, tomato paste and sauce ..: Lb. Other | $\begin{array}{r} 11,392 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}1,14 \% \\ -3 / \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 2,738 | 2,928 |
| Total vegetables and preparations: |  | --- | 7,074 | 6,566 |

Conlinued -

Table 52.--U.S. agricultural imports for consumption: Quantity and value by conmodity, July 1967 and 1968 - Continued

| Commodity imported SUPPLMENTARY | July $1 /$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Quantity : |  |  | Value |
|  | 1967 | 1968: | 1967 | 1968 |
| : $:$ |  |  | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Oti : | Thougands | Thousands | dollars | donlars |
| Other vegetable products |  |  |  |  |
| Feeds (except oil cake), etc. .......) --- | 3/ | $3 /$ | 1,224 | 1,112 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Jute and jute butts, unnanufactured. :L.Ton: | 1 | 4 | 205 | 563 |
| Malt liquors (ale, porter, and beer) : Gal.: | 1,950 | 2,440 | 2,078 | 2,716 |
| Nursery and greenhouse stock ........: .me: | 3/ | $3 /$ | 44 | 133 |
| Seeds, except oilseeds .............: --- : | $3 /$ | $3 /$ | 811 | 1,118 |
| Spices ............................... : Lb. : | 4,359 | 4,650 | 518 | 715 |
| Tobacco, unmanufactured .............: Lb . : | 14,942 | 18,427 | 9,724 | 11,042 |
| Wines ................................ : Gal.: | 1,267 | 1,688 | 5,851 | 7,219 |
| Other | 3/ | $3 /$ | 1.129 | 1,630 |
| Total other vegetable products .... | --- | $\underline{-}$ | 21,586 | 26,248 |
| Total vegetable products | $\cdots$ | -- | 129,056 | 151,336 |
| Total supplementary imports | $\cdots$ | =-- | 216,429 | 257,492 |
| COMPILMENTARY |  |  |  |  |
| Earunas, fresh .........................: Lb. | 237,937 | 308,645 | 10,829 | 14,595 |
| Coffee, green ......................... lb . | 231,252 | 328,186 | 80,546 | 111,703 |
| Coffee, roasted or ground ............: Lb . | 226 | 565 | 64 | 166 |
| Coffee extracts, essences, etc. ........: Lb. : | 2,057 | 767 | 2,277 | 672 |
| Cocoa beans ............................ Lb Lb. : | 36,877 | 41,699 | 8,837 | 10,522 |
| Cocoa and chocolate .................... Lb . | 9,667 | 17,906 | 1,485 | 2,836 |
| Drugs, herbs, roots, etc. .............. --- | 3/ | $3 /$ | 1,921 | 3,782 |
| Essential or distilled oils ...........: --n : | $3 /$ | $3 /$ | 2,303 | 3,013 |
| Fibers, unmanufactured ................ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ L.Ton: | 8 | 10 | 1,446 | 1,609 |
| Rubber, crude (natural) ................ Lb. : | 52,132 | 114,811 | 8,779 | 17,593 |
| Silk, raw .............................. | 160 | 136 | 1,205 | 1,152 |
| Spices ................................ : Lb. : | 8,713 | 8,442 | 2,740 | 2,933 |
| тea .................................. Lb. : | 10,476 | 11,440 | 3,970 | 4,375 |
| Wool, unnanufactured (free in bond) ...ig.Lb : | 8,254 | 17,160 | 3,235 | 5,257 |
| Other complementary agri. products ....: --- | $3 /$ | .31 | 746 | 950 |
| Total complementary imports .........: --- | $=$ | - | 130,383 | 181,158 |
| Total agricultural imports |  | $=$ | 346, 812 | 438,650 |
| Total nonagricultural imports | -- |  | 1,769,149 | 2.352,605 |
| Total imports, all conmodities ....... | - - - | --- | 2,115.961 | 2,791,255 |
| ```\(1 /\) Preliminary. 2) Less than 500 . 3/. Reported in value only. 4/ Excludes the weight of "uther hices and``` | kins," repo | rted in valu | only. |  |

## Explanatory Note

li.S. foreign agricultural trade statistics in this report include official U.S. data based on compilations of the Bureau of the Census. Agricultural commodities consist of (1) nonmarine food products and (2) other products of agriculture which have not passed through complex processes of manufacture such as raw hides and skins, fats and oils, and wine. Such manufactured products as textiles, leather, boots and shoes, cigarettes, naval stores, forestry products, and distilled alcoholic beverages are not considered agricultural.

The trade statistics exclude shipments between the 50 States and Puerto Rico, between the 50 States and the island possessions, between Puerto Rico and the island possessions, among the island possessions, and intransit through the United States from one loreign country to another when documented as such through U.S. Custons.

EXPORTS The export statistics also exclude shipments to the $\mathrm{H} . \mathrm{S}$. armed forces and diplomatic missions abroad for their own se and supplies for vessels and planes engaged in foreign trade. Data on shipments valued at less than $\$ 100$ are not compiled by commodity and are excluded from garicultural statistics but are reflected in nonagricultural and overall export totals in this report. The agricultural exports statistics fnclude shipments under P.L. 83-480 (Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act), and related laws; under P.L. 87-195 (Act for International Develupment) ; and involving Government payments to exporters. (USDA payments are excluded from the export value.) Separate statistics on Government progran exports are rompiled by USDA from data obtained from operating agencies.

The export value, the value at the port of exportation, is based on the selling price (or cost if not sold) and includes inland freight, insurance, and other charges to the port. The country of destination is the country of ultimate destination or where the comodities are to be consumed, further processed, or manufactured. Whe: the siipper does not know the ultimate destination, the shipments are credited to the last conntry, as known to him at the time of shipment from the United States, to which the comadicies are to be shipped in their present form. Except for Canada, export shipments valued $\$ 100-\$ 499$ are included on the basis of sampling estimates; shipments to Lanada valued $\$ 100-\$ 1,990$ are sampled.

1YPORTS Imports for consumption are a combination of entries for immediate consump!i:on and withdrawals from warehouses for consumption. The agricultural stai.:"e ckeludi low-value shipments from countries not identified because of ille;ble reporting, but they are reflected in nonagricultural and overall impore iwals in this report.
ine idgori salu, liffinu generally as the market value in the foreign country, excludes import dutios, acean freight, and marine insurance. The country oi origin is defined as the eduntry where the commodities were grown or processed. Where the country oi origin is not known, the imports are credited to the country of shipment.
 and $\quad$ anors that wo interchangeable in use to any significant extent with such t. S. commadiries are supplementary, or partly competitive. All other commodities are comalemmtary, or nonsompetitive.
further explanatory material on foreign trade statisics and compilatian procedures ai the pureat of the Census is cont ined in the publications of that agency.
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[^0]:    2/ Dell, Sidney, A Latin American Common Market, Oxford University Press: London, 1966, pp. 36-44, 70-88.

[^1]:    3/ General Agrement on Tariffs and Trade, 24th Sess., "Latin American Free Trade Association," (unpublished), November 20, 1967, pp. 15-24.
    4/ "Latin American Free Trade Association," International News, London, March 1, 1967.

[^2]:    6/ Under the new P.L. 480 legistation of November 1966, Tithes I and IV were combined

[^3]:    I/ Exctudes Bolivia and Venezuela. Data may not add to total Government exports due to rounding.
    $\frac{1}{2}$ Includes mostly Public Law 480 and small amourts under Hutual Security/A, I.D. programs from $1964-67$.
    $\frac{3}{3} /$ Nay be considered conmercial since 1963 when the emphasis under the barter program shifted to overseas procurement for other $v . S$. agencies.
    4 4) Less than $\$ 100,000$.

[^4]:    9/ Exciuding Bolivia and Venezuela.
    10/ Excluding Bolivia and Venezuela.
    11/ Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 11th Session of the in Grains," Maxch 1967, pp. 10 13 .

[^5]:    14/U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service, 'Peru: Agricultural Policy," February 26, 1967, p. 13.

[^6]:    1/ Data on LAFTA exclude Venezuela and Bolivia. 2/ Less than $\$ 1,000$.

[^7]:    18/:Dell, op.cit., "pp. 51-69, 197-217; Johannsen, Virginia, "OAS Looks Toward Creation of a Common Market, "Foreign Agriculture, April 10, 1967; and Florida Agricultural Experim nt Stations, "Problems, Progress, and Status of Economic Integration in Latin America," Phase I, pp. 21-27, 29-31. (The last document is a 2 -year study being done under contract for the Department of Agriculture and is to be completed in 1969.)
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