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#### Abstract

The rapid increase of fish prices has recently caused public concern. To find the cause of the difference between the price the fisherman receives for his product and the ultimate price paid by the consumer, the report analyzes the distribution of the consumer's. dollar paid to the retailer as well as to the wholesaler, processor, and fisherman.

Selected for this study are seven finfish, two canned fish, and four shellfish products. The difference or margin between selling and purchasing prices of each level and the share of the consumer's dollar by each level and each cost component are calculated for each fish product. The report also analyzes the costs and profits incurred by each marketing function and describes the major influence on margin differences.


The objective of the study is to give individual firms in the fishery a systematic guide to examine their margins, costs, and profits for each fish product; compare them with the data presented in this study, as national averages for the same product; and determine whether there is room for improvement for their performance and services.

Note: In this study the word fisherman is defined as a person who is engaged or employed in fishing as an occupation. Fisherman's share refers to the return to those who own, manage, or operate the vessels and gear used to catch fish.

## INTRODUCTION

Although fish is not a dominant item in the food budgeting of the average American, yet the fact that it is diverse in nutritive contents makes it important in the menu planning for a balanced diet.

Consumers watch the prices of fish with the same concern as prices of other food items. During the period.1969-71, fish .prices have increased more rapidly than most other food products (Fig. 1). Government action to restrain prices and wages in every sector of the economy started with moral suasion in 1969 and culminated in a mandatory freeze in August 1971. General price increases were arrested or minimized to some extent for the rest of 1971. Nonetheless, both consumers and consumer protection advocates remain concerned over the continued high prices for fish products. A close examination of fish pricing by each marketing level seems nec̣essary.

Selected for this study are four groundfish fillets (haddock, flounder, cod, and ocean perch), salmon and halibut in steak and dressed forms, canned tuna and salmon, and four shellfish products (shrimp, blue crabs, American lobsters, and sea scallops). Their production accounts for 36 percent of total fish harvested in the United States in 1971 on a round-weight basis.


Fresh \& frozen fish fillets

## Meaning of Price Spread

The differences between the prices charged by the producer and those paid by the consumer can be explained by price spreads. For a fish product, the price spread is the margin between the price paid for the . final product by the consumer and the dockside value of an equivalent weight of the product. This difference is also called the marketing charge, most of which includes the payments received by all agents performing services in moving fish products from fishermen to consumers. These services include handling (landing), processing, storage, transportation, wholesaling, and retailing.

Computation of the ex-vessel/retail spread provides the measurement for the fisherman's share of the dollar the consumers spend for the product. The share is commonly expressed as a percentage of the product retail price. The wider the price spread, the lower the fisherman's share.

From dockside to retail the spread is composed of margins at various levels. The difference between the retail price and the cost of the product to the retailer (or price paid to the wholesaler) is called the retail margin. The difference between the price charged by the wholesaler and the cost of purchase from the processor is called the wholesale margin. In the same manner the processor's margin can be estimated from what was paid at dockside and the price received from the wholesaler. Prices at the four levels were collected from each of the selected fish products over the period 1950-71 1/

## Purpose of the Study

Each marketing level contributes some value either by changing the form, place, or time utility of the product. Through the various mechanisms of exchange, each level gets its return for the value added to the final product. Studying the contribution of value and analyzing the operating costs at each marketing level are the first steps in monitoring the effectiveness of every sector of the fishery relative to other industries. The ultimate objective of such a study is to determine the causes of rapid price rises so that actions may be taken to slow down this rising trend. To serve as an intermediate objective, this study is designed at this stage to:

1. present estimates of the costs and profits comprising the margins for a number of selected fishery products;
2. encourage individual firms at each level to review their own operations by comparing the magnitude of their margins with that of national averages; and
3. indicate areas where problems exist which require further studies. Detailed studies on marketing efficiency may lead to ramifications of derived problems such that supplemental inqueries would be deemed necessary. Studies like labor-output and capital-output analyses of fishing vessels and processing plants, efficient size of plant, streamlining of distribution mechanisms, efficiency of transportation and storage facilities, and others could be pursued to reduce costs in marketing fish products.

Source of Data
To calculate each of the margins of a price spread, prices of
fish products at different marketing levels are collected. Over 60\% of fish products consumed in this country are imported. Almost all imported fish products are frozen and priced lower than domestic fresh products. To avoid the distortion of measurement of the fisherman's share of the consumer's dollar only fresh fish prices and canned fish prices are used in this study except where a large portion of the domestic catch is frozen.?

Ex-vessel prices ${ }^{3 /}$ are published by the Regional Market News Offices of the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Processors' prices are calculated from the quantity and value statistics published in the annual reports of Canned Fishery Products, Packaged Fishery Products, and Processed Fishery Products issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Wholesale prices for salmon and halibut steaks are based on New York market prices; for canned tuna, they are averages of different brands reported by San Diego brokers and cannery representatives; for canned salmon, they are confined to pink salmon prices at Seattle; for shellfish, they are collected from the cities near where they are landed (e.g., Brownsville, Tex.; Hampton and Norfolk, Va.; Portland, Me.; and Boston, Mass.; for groundfish, they are adjusted from Boston quotations of prices to primary wholesalers.

New York City is the only place where retail prices for a number of fresh fish products have been published. Price series are available from 1949 to the present, except that one or two series were discontinued and a new series started in later years. The series are still relatively complete so far as the availability of fresh fish prices is concerned. Shellfish retail prices, with the exception of shrimp; are collected from marketing service offices of different State Governments in or near the cities
where wholesale prices are gathered.
Although the author recognizes that some of these price series are imperfect and that biases may distort the findings, these are the best data available. Because of this, adjustments were made as described below. Other people using these price series will need to evaluate the sources to find out what is included and how they were reported.

## Adjustment of Price Data

To measure the fisherman's share in the retail price, the exvessel price must be expressed on a comparable weight basis with the retail price. In our study, the ex-vessel price is converted to the value of a quantity equivalent to the final form sold to the consumer. For example, if fish are landed in round form and sold to consumers in fillet form, ex-vessel prices of that species are converted from a roundweight to a fillet-weight basis, by a conversion factor calculated for that species.

Prices at all levels are further adjusted to account for general price inflation. This is done by expressing all prices on the basis of the 1967 price level. Thus, prices of different fishery products at the four levels are divided by the implicit price deflator (for nondurable goods) with 1967 as the base year. The deflated prices are used in tracing the trend movements at the four levels in the price spread charts presented in figures 2 to 14. For the tables, in the calculation of fisherman's share and markups at different levels, actual prices are used (tables 15 to 27 in the Appendix).

Shrinkage and spoilage of fish products vary at different levels. Prices could be adjusted according to the ratio of shrinkage and spoilage losses estimated by studies made by the former Marketing Division of our Service in 1966. They will not be adjusted for such losses in the present study until more accurate figures for shrinkage and spoilage are established.

Processor's costs could be adjusted downward if the value of their byproducts were known. Further studies should be made in this respect.

## Behavior of the Retail Food Market

To assess the markups of prices at different levels, a distinction in characteristics should be draw between a retail food market on the one hand and harvesting, processing, and wholesaling of food products as a group on the other. A retail food store is a multiproduct firm handling thousands of food and nonfood items at the same time, whereas the latter handle a small number of products in different seasons of the year. The demand for any product taken by itself in the multiproduct retail firms is very inelastic and prices tend to vary widely among different stores, whereas the opposite is true among the sectors that handle fewer products at one time (Holdren, 1960).

Thus, while price is an important factor for the sale of an individual commodity up to the wholesale level, sales at the retail level are more likely to be determined by nonprice factors such as location,
service offered, the personality of the manager, and the layout, decorations, and atmosphere of each store.

The nonprice factors create product differentiation which is further enhanced by (1) the growth of supermarkets in size and in product lines each carries (tables $13 \& 14$ ); (2) joint demand for food products in shifting the attention of shoppers from individual commodities to the aggregate of goods and services offered by a store; (3) imperfect knowledge of the shoppers most of whom seek to minimize time and energy inputs spent on grocery shopping by making a one-stop purchase instead of pricing around; and (4) suburbanization of population leads to immobility of consumers (Naden, 1953).

For the retailers, less emphasis is placed on prices or margins of individual commodities. The imputation of retailing costs is imperfect, and the bases of their allocation are different from store to store. It is more economical to allocate costs to a product-mix rather than to each individual product. For these reasons some products are priced lower in one store than in another. The losses on one item could be recouped by profits made on other items. The retail pricing policy is such that the size of the margin of individual items is less significant; its strategy is focused on the maximization of the overall profit of the entire store.

The diversity in prices among stores and the rigidity of price movement within a store are characteristic of the behavior of the retail food market. This is substantiated by the following studies.

A nationwide survey of fish retail distributors was made in 1968. The wide dispersion of prices of various fish products are shown in table 51. In another study, weekly retail prices of fish in New York City indicate wide deviations from their means as shown in tables 52 and 53. On the other hand, the weekly average retail prices of similar fish products from one store in a Chicago study remained stable regardless of changes in costs and sales volume. This is presented in charts shown in figures 15 to 26 . These tables and figures are appended to the end of the report.

While the price of individual products of each store differs widely from that of another, the average annual price of the same product in a market area remains more or less in line from year to year as exemplified by the retail price series of fish products in New York and Chicago. Individual prices are marked by irregularity in their occurrence; but regularity of arrangement appears when many individual prices are brought togethers. Randomness brings about orderliness in mass behavior. Given the large number of products to be priced and the large number of factors to be considered by different stores, there is bound to be a considerable amount of unexplained variations. But equal forces independent of each other working in different directions tend to generate values toward the mean. (Mills, 1965)

## Variation Among Finfish Product Groups

The fisherman's share ${ }^{4 /}$ in the retail market varies considerably depending on the products. It averaged about $41.2 \%$ for fresh groundfish fillets, $23.4 \%$ for frozen ocean perch fillets, $34.0 \%$ for fresh salmon steaks, $42.3 \%$ for halibut steaks, $25.7 \%$ for canned salmon, and 40.1\% for canned tuna in 1971 (table 1). The weighted average share in these major groups is estimated at about $36.6 \%$ in $1971 .$. This means that, on the average, for each dollar spent for fresh and canned finfish products by consumers in retail food stores, fishermen received about 37 cents and marketing firms 63 cents.

Fresh fillets are usually priced higher than frozen fillets, not only because fresh supply is seasonal and limited but also because their costs in packing and transporting (usually shipped with layered ice) are higher and losses in spoilage and shrinkage are greater. In addition, prices of domestic frozen fillets are depressed by lower-cost imports.

The fisherman's share in canned tuna retail prices was greater than in canned salmon in all the years since 1950. One reason for this was that the annual supply of canned tuna at the wholesale level was much higher than canned salmon (2.7 times greater in 1971). The higher turnover rate tends to reduce the overhead costs and thus the price spread of canned tuna. Second, the salmon production season historically has been shorter than tuna, and the domestic market for salmon is not supplemented by imports as it is in the

Table 1. --Fisherman's share of consumer's dollar for finfish products compared with farmer's share of the same for beef, pork, and market basket foods, 1950-1971

|  | Fisherman's share |  |  |  |  |  | Farmer's share 3 / |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Groundfish fillets |  | Salmon | Halibut steaks | Canned | fish | Beef |  | Market basket |
| Year | Fresh 1/ | Frozen? | (fresh) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (fresh \& } \\ & \text { frozen) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pink salmon | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tuna } \\ & \text { (chunk) } \end{aligned}$ | grade) | Pork | foods 4 |
|  | --- | ---- | --- | - Percent- | --- | ---- | --- | - | - |
| 1950 | 39.45 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 27.66 | N.A. | 74 | 64 | 47 |
| 1951 | 40.65 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 33.17 | N.A. | 77 | 63 | 49 |
| 1952 | 40.06 | 31.66 | N.A. | N.A. | 28.03 | N.A. | 74. | 60 | 47 |
| 1953 | 37.69 | 29.52 | N.A. | N.A. | 29.43 | 33.00 | 66 | 67 | 44 |
| 1954 | 35.14 | 30.83 | N.A. | N.A. | 28.10 | 33.99 | 68 | 65 | 43 |
| 1955 | 35.43 | 29.17 | N.A. | N.A. | 30.18 | 32.47 | 66 | 54 | 41 |
| 1956 | 35.52 | 30.07 | N.A. | N.A. | 25.74 | 33.04 | 65 | 52 | 40 |
| 1957 | 37.33 | 29.67 | N.A. | N.A. | 31.20 | 32.40 | 65 | 55 | 40 |
| 1958 | 39.84 | 30.85 | N.A. | N.A. | 24.41 | 33.50 | 67 | 58 | 40 |
| 1959 | 39.69 | 29.35 | N.A. | N.A. | 30.65 | 32.14 | 66 | 46 | 38 |
| 1960 | 34.17 | 29.68 | N.A. | 23.42 | 32.68 | 33.96 | 65 | 51 | 39 |
| 1961 | 32.35 | 27.72 | N.A. | 29.04 | 22.65 | 32.44 | 62 | 52 | 38 |
| 1962 | 33.22 | 28.57 | N.A. | 35.53 | 30.94 | 34.00 | 68 | 51 | 38 |
| 1963 | 33.53 | 30.37 | N.A. | 24.46 | 25.94 | 29.59 | 62 | 48 | 37 |
| . 1964 | 31.23 | 27.39 | N.A. | 30.09 | 24.88 | 31.82 | 60 | 48 | 37 |
| 1965 | 32.23 | 26.71 | N.A. | 34.92 | 25.72 | 32.55 | 65 | 58 | 39 |
| 1966 | 35.30 | 30.66 | N.A. | 38.36 | 51 | 32.76 | 63 | 57 | 40 |
| 1967 | 35.28 | 24.14 | 39.75 | 31.84 | $5 /$ | 30.04 | 64 | 52 | 38 |
| 1968 | 34.60 | 23.48 | 36.37 | 34.31 | 5/ | 38.89 | 65 | 51 | 39 |
| 1969 | 39.52 | 25.93 | 34.55 | 52.94 | $5 /$ | 39.76 | 65 | 55 | 41 |
| 1970 | 42.26 | 26.35 | N.A. | 47.50 | 5 | 39.27 | 63 | 50 | 39 |
| 1971 | 41.20 | 23.44 | 33.99 | 42.32 | 5/ | 40.06 | 65 | 45 | 38 |

1/ Includes cod, flounder, and haddock fillets.
2/ Frozen ocean perch fillets only.
3/ Compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
Include meat products, dairy products, poultry, eggs, bakery and cereal products, fresh fruits, fresh vegetables, processed fruits and vegetables, fats and cils, and miscellaneous products--farm-originated food products purchased annually per household by wage-earners and clerical worker families and single workers living alone. Meals in eating places, imported foods, seafoods, and foods not of farmorigin are excluded.
5/ Series discontinued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
case of canned tuna. ${ }^{5 /}$ salmon and a greater risk of price declines over the marketing period. All of these factors limit the supply of salmon and, therefore, help to raise the price spread of canned salmon.

## Variation Among Shellfish Products

The fisherman's share in the retail market in 1971 was higher, in most instances, for shellfish than for finfish. It was $77.9 \%$ for sea scallop meats, $54.6 \%$ (1967) for live American lobsters, 49.9\% for frozen peeled shrimp, and $24.9 \%$ for blue crab meat (table 2). The weighted average share in these products was almost $47.4 \%$ in 1971. For each dollar spent for shellfish products by consumers, fishermen received about 47 cents and distribution channels, 53 cents.

Sea scallops are shucked prior to landing, while American lobsters are sold live: In each case, there is little or no processing beyond the harvesting level; consequently, the fisherman's share is higher for these products. In addition, reduced consumption of the two products in recent years was associated with a slower rate of increase in retail prices than in ex-vessel prices. This further boosted the fishermen's share in the consumer's dollar for these two shellfish products.

Blue crab meats are picked by hand. The high cost of wages in the processing stage makes the prices at the wholesale and retail levels higher than the other four shellfish products and, therefore, diminishes the crab fisherman's share to the lowest rank.

Table 2.--Fisherman's share of consumer's dollar for shellfish products compared with farmer's share of the same for beef, pork, and market basket of foods, 1959-71!

| Year | Fisherman's share |  |  |  | Farmer's share |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sea scallop meats | Frozen raw peeled shrimp | Live American lobsters | Blue crab meats | Beef (Choice grade) | Pork | Market basket of foods |
|  | - | - - - | -- Per | -- | --- | Pork | Of |
| 1959 | 53.78 | 36.33 | 49.12 | 39.21 | 66:0 | 46.0 | 38.0 |
| 1960 | 44.75 | 40.81 | 46.16 | 26.72 | 65.0 | 51.0 | 39.9 |
| 1961 | 49.35 | 44.77 | 45.47 | 28.56 | 62.0 | 52.0 | 38.0 |
| 1962 | 52.19 | 46.94 | 44.87 | 27.87 | 68.0 | 51.0 | 38.0 |
| 1963 | 55.05 | 36.52 | 50.82 | 25.64 | 62.0 | 48.0 | 37.0 |
| 1964 | 56.29 | 44.38 | 54.71 | 28.34 | 60.0 | 48.0 | 37.0 |
| 1965 | 59.21 | 43.58 | 51.16 | 29.94 | 65.0 | 58.0 | 39.0 |
| 1966 | 50.77 | 48.49 | 51.63 | 27.00 | 63.0 | 57.0 | 40.0 |
| 1967 | 63.80 | 39.83 | 54.64 | 22.98 | 64.0 | 52.0 | 38.0 |
| 1968 | 63.97 | 45.23 | $2 /$ | 29.34 | 65.0 | 51.0 | 39.0 |
| 1969 | 66.02 | 45.39 | 2/ | 25.96 | 65.0 | 55.0 | 41.0 |
| 1970 | 72.34 | 43.20 | $\underline{2}$ | 21.52 | 63.0 | 50.0 | 39.0 |
| 1971 | 77.93 | 49.87 | 2/ | 24.88 | 65.0 | 45.0 | 38.0 |

1/ Retail prices of most shellfish products are not available for the years before 1959.
2/ Series discontinued since 1968.

The fisherman's share for shrimp (peeled) is next highest after live American lobsters. Ex-vessel prices of both products have icreased faster than their retail prices, which tends to increase the fisherman's share over time.

## Variation Over Time

The fisherman's share in the finfish market varied considerably during the last 22 years since 1950. When we examine the historical series of the fisherman's share in groundfish products $\frac{6 /}{9}$ greater shares of around 40 percent (table 1) are found during the early 1950's. This could be attributed to the lower marketing costs due to less services involved, cheaper materials used in packaging, and lower freight rates. At the harvesting level, on the other hand, less efficient methods in fishing were practiced in earlier years before the rapid transition to trawling and the extensive use of electronic equipment, such as fish-finders, depth indicators, and automatic steering. The unit cost at the ex-vessel level was, therefore, raised while prices at the retail level stayed stable in competing with imports.

During the period 1954-65, the fisherman's share in groundfish products was depressed somewhat in certain years. The downturns during this period almost coincide with the recession years 1954-55, 1960-61, and 1964, when ex-vessel prices dropped more noticeably than retail prices.

The rise of the fisherman's share in groundfish products to above $39 \%$ after 1966 could be explained by the following: (1) the rapid growth in the size and sales of supermarkets since 1963 (tables 13 and 14) has lowered marketing costs; (2) centralization of purchases by chain stores has tended to reduce invoice costs; and (3) increasing imports of fish products has exerted more pressure on retail prices than ex-vessel prices in the domestic market.

Ex-vessel prices are more influenced by the supply from the stock in the sea than by the demand in the retail market. For the 5 years, 1967-71, the landing quota for haddock in Georges Bank has been reduced from year to year because of the increasing deterioration of haddock stocks. Ex-vessel prices increased from 12.9 cents a pound (drawn weight) in 1967 to 32.4 cents a pound in 1971, an increase of $26 \%$ a year. Retail prices on the other hand, increased from 80.2 cents to 136.7 cents a pound (fillet weight) during the same period, an increase of only $14 \%$ a year. As retail prices of haddcck increased to a certain height, consumers began to switch to flounder and cod. This switch, therefore, put a ceiling to haddock retail prices as ex-vessel prices continued to rise. The result was that the fisherman's share in the haddock market during the 5-year period increased drastically; his share in the flounder market declined distinctly; and his share in the cod market, only slightly.

The fisherman's share in the retail market for canned tuna has been increasing at the rate of $0.31 \%$ a year while that in canned pink
salmon declined 0.22 percent a year since 1950. Reasons discussed in the next-to-last section apply here as well.

During the 13 years 1959-71, the fisherman's share for shellfish increased in three products--sea scallops ( $2.2 \%$ a year), live American lobsters ( $14 \%$ a year), and frozen raw peeled shrimp ( $0.5 \%$ a year)--and declined in blue crab meats ( $-0.7 \%$ a year).

The fisherman's share in the shrimp market showed a distinct upward trend following the pattern of consumption. Shrimp consumption increased at the rate of 5.6 percent a year during the 4 years (196771), while retail prices after adjustment to constant value stayed. stable. As ex-vessel prices, after value adjustment, continued to increase during this period, the fisherman is bound to get a bigger share in the retail market.

Ex-vessel prices of sea scallops and live American lobsters increased faster than retail prices over the years since 1959. The increase has raised the fisherman's share in these two products in recent years.

The decline in the fisherman's share in blue crabs is attributed to a different reason. Blue crab meat processing is labor intensive and its costs increase more rapidly than the expenses in harvesting.
Table 3 See table 3 for the change of fisherman's share in all fish products.

## Comparison With 'the Farmer's Share

The weighted average of the fisherman's share was $47.4 \%$ of shellfish retail prices in 1971, compared favorably with $38 \%$ of the farmer's share in the market basket. of 63 food items compiled by the

Table 3.--Linear trends of fisherman's share in the retail markets of different finfish products during 1950-71 and shellfish products during 1959-71¹/

| Product | Constant | Beta | $\frac{\text { Statistical information }}{\mathrm{R}^{2}}$ |  | T |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{l}Period <br>

covered\end{array}\right]\)

1/ Fisherman's share in the retail market $=\frac{P e x}{P_{r}} \times 100$. The time series of calculated annual values of fisherman's shar is used as the independent variable for the regression analysis of each fish product. $\operatorname{Pr}=$ retail price; Pex $=$ exvessel price adjusted to a value equivalent to the quantity sold to the consumer.
U.S. Department of Agriculture in the same period (tables 1 and 2). But the fisherman's share of $36.6 \%$ in the finfish market was much lower than the farmer's share in beef and pork markets, which were $65 \%$ and $45 \%$ respectively.

Beef and pork are sold in large quantities in the market. Compared with fish products, beef consumption during 1969-71 averaged about 10 times greater and pork consumption six times greater. To handle the large quantities of meat products, each meat packing plant is operated on a much larger scale and with more automation than a fish processing plant. It is likely that due to economics of scale meat packing has an edge over fish processing in being able to lower packing and marketing costs (National Commission on Food Marketing, 1966). Fish are not sold in as large quantities as meat in the retail market. Demand for fish products is less elastic than that for beef and pork (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1967.) I/ Owing to the large sales of meat, meat prices, particularly beef prices, are more often offered by retail stores as the "price leaders" to attract customers. Beef and pork prices are, therefore, cut to the lowest possible levels (National Commission on Food Marketing, 1966a). These cuts reduce the margins on beef and pork sales and raise the farmer's share accordingly.

## TREND OF PRICE SPREADS OF FISH PRODUCTS

While the fisherman's share is expressed in percentage terms of the retail price, price spread is an absolute value between price and cost. The price spread of a food product can be divided into as many margins as there are ownership transfers and available price information. In this study, the prices of each fish product are gathered at four levels--ex-vessel, processing, wholesale, and setail (figs. 2. to 14 in the text and tables 15 to 27 in the Appendix).

## Ex-vessel Prices

When all prices are adjusted to constant dollar value- ${ }^{-1}$, prices at the ex-vessel level trended upward for some species since 1950, particularly haddock, sea scallops, American lobsters, and shrimp; and downward for tuna and ocean perch. Because of changes in stocks or runs ${ }^{9 /}$, ex-vessel prices of halibut, pink salmon, and blue crab fluctuated annually without exhibiting any discernible trend. Better harvesting years command lower ex-vessel prices.

Price margins for most fish products were relatively large at the ex-vessel level because of high wage costs. Over two-fifths of gross earnings were spent on labor and about one-fifth on capital expenses.

## Processor's Margin and Markup

Price margins at the processor's level for most fish products were as large as those at the ex-vessel level because processing is rather
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See notations for figure 14.


Figure 2. - Price spreads for fresh haddock fillets, 1950-71


Figure 3. - Price spreads for f'resh flounder fillets, 1950-71


Figure 4. - Price spreads for fresh cod fillets, 1950-71


Figure 5. - Price spreads for frozen ocean perch fillets, 1950-71


Figure 6. - Price spreads for halibut steaks, fresh and frozen, 1950-71
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Figure 7.--Price spreads for fresh king salmon steak, 1967-71
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See notations for figure 14.


Figure 8.--Price spreads for canned pink salmon, 1950-65


Figure 9, - Price spreads for fresh dressed king salmon, 1950-71


Figure 10. - Price spreads for canned tuna (chunk), 1950-71


Figure 11. - Price spreads for frozen raw peeled shrimp, 1959-71


Figure 12. - Price spreads for live American lobster, 1959-71


Note: The above Charts are produced from prices (at all levels) wtich are adjusted by a common deflator ( $1967=100$ ) to bring the historical priceseries to a constant dollar value. See explanations given in the section of Price Data Adjustment in the Introduction, and footnote No. 8 in the section of Trend of Price Spread.


Figure 13. - Price spreads for fresh sea scallops, 1959-71


Figure 14.--Price spreads for fresh blue
crab meat; $1959-71$

Table 4.--Annual average markups (gross earning rates) of finfish by product group at three functional levels, 1969-7

| Products | Processing | Wholesale | Retail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - - - - Percent. - - - - - |  |  |
| Groundfish fillets |  |  |  |
| Fresh: |  |  |  |
| Haddock | 25.67 | 8.35 | 17.00 |
| Flounder | 37.33 | 17.67 | 34.66 |
| Cod | 45.64 | 13.67 | 30.00 |
| Average | 36.21 | 13.23 | 27.22 |
| Frozen: |  |  |  |
| Ocean perch | 52.33 | 16.00 | 36.67 |
| Steak |  |  |  |
| Halibut steak (fresh \& | 33.30 | 11.32 | 19.00 |
| frozen) <br> Fresh king salmon steak | 39.41 | 29.24 | 20.06 |
| Fresh king salmon, dressed | 39.40 | 29.25 | 20.05 |
| Average | 37.37 | 23.27 | 19.70 |
| Canned products |  |  |  |
| Pink salmon, 1965-2/ | 56.92 49.04 | 18.02 16.05 | 27.89 25.03 |
| Tuna (chunk), 19691971 | 42.66 | 14.32 | 19.65 |
| Average | 49.54 | 16.32 | 24.19 |

1/Canned salmon price series was dropped by BLS in 1966.
2/Use 1965 figure to compare with canned salmon in the same period.
Note: According to the Barometer of Small Business published in 1964 by the American Accounting Association, markup at any level can be calculated in two ways: One is the quotient of the margin (or the difference between the sales value and cost of sales) divided by cost of sales; the other is the quotient of the margin divided by the value of sales. Either method is correct depending on the purpose it serves. The second method is used here because the result so obtained is equivalent to the gross profit rates that will be applied in the report from time to time.
labor intensive. Processor's prices after adjustment to constant dollar value increased slightly for most of finfish products during the last two decades and for shellfish during the last decade. Exceptions to this observation were canned tuna, fresh flounder fillets, and frozen ocean perch fillets.

The decline of processor's prices usually followed the drop of ex-vessel prices. If the ex-vessel price of one product dropped more than the processor's price, the processor's margin increased despite the fact that the price he asked declined. To compare the margins at different levels of one product and those among different products over a period of time it is more convenient and better understood to express the differences in relative instead of absolute values. When the processor's margin is divided by the processor's price the result is the value of markup: interpreted as the gross earning in percent of the processor's sales, or simply the gross earning rate.

During 1969-7I- gross earning rates at the processor's level were highest for ocean perch fillets ( $52.3 \%$ ) among groundifish products, highest for fresh king salmon steaks (39.5\%) among dressed and steak forms of fish products, and higher for canned pink salmon (56.9\%) than canned tuna (tables $4 \& 5$ ). For all packaged seafood processing, the gross earning rate was $52.7 \%$ according to the Census of Manufactures.
Table 4 (See tables $31 \& 32$ in the Appendix.)

Over the past 20 years, gross earning rates for fresh flounder fillets, fresh cod fillets, halibut steaks, and fresh blue crab meat

Table 5 .--Annual average markups (gross earning rates) of shellfish by product at three functional levels, 1969-71.

| Products | Processing | Wholesale | Retail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Fresh products

| Blue crab meat |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 58.96 | 17.02 | 25.04 |
| 1970 | 63.04 | 15.97 | 29.96 |
| 1971 | 62.00 | 8.98 | 29.01 |
| Average | 61.33 | $\overleftarrow{73.99}$ | 28.00 |
| American lobsters (live) ]/ |  |  |  |
| 1965 | Sold | 37.03 | 18.02 |
| 1966 | live | 35.94 | 19.97 |
| 1967 |  | 35.02 | 16.03 |
| Average |  | 36.00 | 18.01 |
| Sea scallop |  |  |  |
| 1969 | Shucking | 11.01 | 25.89 |
| 1970 | is done on | 7.07 | 22.00 |
| 1971 | the boat | 9.96 | 14.03 |
| Average |  | 9.35 | 20.64 |

Frozen products

| Peeled shrimp |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 33.92 | 17.03 | 18.03 |
| 1970 | 33.04 | 17.02 | 22.77 |
| 1971 | $\underline{27.97}$ | $\underline{16.94}$ | 16.89 |
| Average | 37.31 | 17.00 | 19.23 |

1/Retail prices of American lobsters were not available for 1969-71; 1965-67 prices were used. The product is sold live; no processing is required. More costs are incurred by the wholesalers in packing and transportation.
increased slightly at the processor's level, while fresh haddock fillets and canned tuna declined as frozen ocean perch fillets; raw peeled shrimp, and canned pink salmon remained almost unchanged.

The processor's markup, as will be seen later, is in most cases higher than the wholesale level. About 55 to 60 percent of the processor's margin is composed of labor and material costs which increased faster than the overhead costs (fig. 14). In addition, the amount spent for food product advertising increased even faster than wage costs. These expenses are incurred by the processor when the products bear the manufacturer's name. Processor's margin may go down from the present level in the event that there will be advancement in production efficiency due to modernization of technology, growth in plant size to reduce unit cost, and/or utilization of byproducts.

Wholesale Margin and Markup
In most instances, retail prices are subject to lesser fluctuation than are ex-vessel prices. Since retail pricez are relatively stable, it follows that somewhere in the channels of disiribution, market margins must be reduced (raised) when ex-vessel prices rise (decline).

Prices at the wholesale level fluctuated more distinctly and moved upward for most fish products except that wholesale prices of canned tuna and ocean perch fillets declined slightly and those of fresh flounder fillets and eanned pink salmon remained more or less constant. An increase in wholesale price does not necessarily imply that the wholesale margin over the processor's price has increased.

During 1969-71, wholesale markups (gross eaming rates) for packaged and canned fish products are estimated around 15-16 percent, with the exception of American lobsters (36\%) and fresh king salmon steaks (29.4\%) (tables 4 and 5).

Although wholesale prices increased, wholesale margins remained relatively stable. A similar increase in wholesaler's cost of sales, i.e., processor's prices, equalized the margins at the wholesale level over the period.

## Retail Margin and Markup

Price margins at the retail level for some fish products are as large as at the ex-vessel level. For the last two decades retail prices of most fish products under our study, after adjustment to constant value, fluctuated slightly with a mild upward trend. Prices of halibut steaks and canned tuna, however, were heading downward. Those that showed an abrupt change in price movements, particularly during the years 1969-71, were fresh flounder fillets and fresh haddock fillets showing a sudden retail price upturn and fresh sea scallops and blue crab meat experiencing a sudden drop in retail prices (figures 2,3,12, and 13).

While most retail prices, after they are deflated, were moving upward, the gross earning rates of fish retailers increased slightly only in four products--fresh flounder fillets, frozen ocean perch fillets, canned pink salmon, and fresh blue crab meat. Markups for halibut steaks and fresh sea scallops declined drastically while those for

Table 6.--Linear trends of markups at the processing, wholesale and retail levels for finfish products during 1950-71 and shellfish products during 1959-71

| Products | Independent variable ${ }^{\text {l/ }}$ | Constant | Beta | Statistical information |  | Period covered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | T |  |
| Fresh haddock fillets | Mp | 49.58 | -0.93 | 0.4582 | 3.9013 | 1950-71 |
|  | MW | 16.51 | -0.33 | . 4657 | 3.9607 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mr | 31.65 | -0.60 | . 2382 | 2.3725 | 1950-71 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1950-71 |
| Fresh flounder fillets | M ${ }^{\text {p }}$ | 29.68 | 0.62 | . 3521 | 3.3784 | 1950-71 |
|  | M W | 13.64 | 0.19 | . 1799 | 2.1463 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mr | 19.64 | 0.77 | . 4811 | 4.4121 | 1950-71 |
| Fresh cod fillets | Mp | 52.74 | 0.16 | . 0480 | 0.8986 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mw | 16.83 | 0.07 | . 0396 | 0.8117 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mr | 18.48 | -0.12 | . 0204 | 0.5778 | 1950-71 |
| Frozen ocean perch fillets | Mp | 52.74 | 0.09 | . 0275 | 0.7335 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mw | 16.83 | 0.07 | . 0565 | 1.0682 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mr | 18.48 | 0.72 | . 0331 | 3.0646 | 1950-71 |
| Halibut steak (fresh \& frozen) | Mp | 32.18 | 0.24 | . 0162 | 0.4254 | 1960-71 |
|  | Mw | 12.91 | -0.18 | . 0482 | 0.7467 | 1960-71 |
|  | Mr | 62.44 | -3.54 | . 0372 | 7\%5205 | 1960-71 |
| Canned pink salmon | Mp | 53.99 | 0.09 | . 0085 | 3.4589 | 1950-65 |
|  | Mw | 17.37 | -0.10 | . 0626 | 0.9668 | 1950-65 |
|  | Mr | 20.65 | 0.51 | . 2736 | 2.2963 | 1950-65 |
| Canned tuna (chunk) | Mp | 47.50 | -0.11 | . 0439 | 0.9090 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mw | 14.72 | 0.01 | . 0006 | 0.1035 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mr | 30.39 | -0.49 | . 5203 | 4.4182 | 1950-71 |
| Frozen raw peeled shrimp | Mp | 33.00 | 0.00 | -. 0000 | 0.0000 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mw | 15.62 | 0.08 | . 0046 | 0.2357 | 1950-71 |
|  | Mr | 29.35 | -0.97 | . 4468 | 3.1135 | 1950-71 |
| Live American lobsters | M 1 w | 41.67 | -0.87 | . 5930 | 3.4140 | 1959-67 |
|  | Mr | 22.61 | -0.43 | . 0839 | 0.8562 | 1959-67 |

Table 6.--Linear trends of markups at the processing, wholesale and retail levels for finfish products during 1950-71 and shellfish products during 1959-71. (continued)


1/Markups at different levels are the independent variables.
Markup $=\frac{\text { margin }}{\text { selling price }} \times 100$
$\checkmark$
$M p=\frac{P p-P e x}{P p} \quad \times 100=$ Processor's markup
$M_{w}=\frac{P W-P p}{P w} \quad \times 100=$ Wholesaler's markup
$M r=\frac{\mathrm{Pr}-\mathrm{P}_{W}}{\mathrm{Pr}} \quad \times 100=$ Retailer's markup
where Mex = Ex-vessel price, adjusted to the value of a quantity equivalent to the final form sold to the consumer; $\mathrm{Pp}=$ processor's price; $\mathrm{PW}_{\mathrm{W}}=$ wholesale price; $\mathrm{Pr}=$ retail price.
the remainder dropped slightly during the period covered in our study (table 6).

The rigidity of the pricing practice of each retail store causes the retail price of each item to be less responsive to the cost of sales. As a result, the retail margin narrows as wholesale prices
Table 6 advance.
The average rate of markups at the retail level is somewhere between those at the processing and wholesale levels. During 1969-71 retail markups were relatively high for most groundfish ( $34-37 \%$ ) except fresh haddock fillets ( $17 \%$ ) (table 4). Markups for blue crab meat and canned fish products ranked next between $28 \%$ and $24 \%$; while those for fish steaks, sea scallops, lobsters and peeled shrimp were around $20 \%$ (table 5).

The overall average of retail mark-ups of different fish products were about 63 percent higher than wholesale mark-ups during 1969-71: In some instances they rose to double the rate of the latter. The following reasons account for the higher mark-up rate at the retail level:

1. Fish products are sold at retailers by quantities of less than 10 pounds in each transaction while they are disposed of at tens of thousand pounds in each dealing at other levels.
2. Higher operating and overhead costs per unit sold are resulted at the retail level. About 67 percent of retail costs is operating expenses which include mostly salaries of salesmen attending the fish counter.
3. Spoilage and shrinkage increase progressively as fish products are distributed through marketing channels from the dockside to the consumer. The greatest loss is assumed by the retailer. Most of our retail prices are collected from New York City where the weight loss due to spoilage and shrinkage was 5.3 percent in winter and 6.0 percent in summer--about 1.9 and 2.2 times higher respectively than at the wholesale level (Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Marketing Division, 1966.)
4. Retailers pay about 1.5 cents per pound in winter and two cents per pound in summer for quality control of fish products on items such as ice, refrigeration, chemical additives, glazing, brine, and other treatments--about 15 percent higher than the amount paid by producers and distributors for the same purpose (Bureau: of Commerical Fisheries, Marketing Division, 1966.)

Despite the high costs involved in retailing fish products, retail markups for most fish products trended downward during the last decade for shellfish (except blue crab meat.), and during the last two decades for groundfish (except flounder and ocean perch fillets) and canned fish products (except salmon) (table 6).

Fish products with a relatively high unit price usually have low retail markups. Overhead costs are often allocated to products not according to their value but to the volume of floor space occupied. High-priced peeled shrimp, live lobsters, sea scollops., . . and halibut and king salmon steaks illustrate this observation. Those products that have easily discernible quality and are purchased relatively frequently by consumers are also given low retail markups because of the
large turnover of their sales. That is one of the reasons why canned tuna retail markups dropped rapidly for the last 4. years.

Comparison of Price Changes at Retail Level with those at. Other Levels

As was indicated in the discussion of retail food market behavior, retail prices moved upward without much fluctuation as did price at other levels. The trend of retail price movements reacts with price trends at other marketing levels differently from one product to another (table 7). A comparison of the price movements of the four levels over

Table 7 the last two decades can be summarized as follows:

1. Products whose retail prices increased at a slower rate than prices at the other three marketing levels are:
a. halibut steaks and fresh sea scallops (distinctively slower);
b. fresh haddock fillets, raw peeled shrimp, and live American
lobsters (moderately slower); and
c. canned chunk tuna (slightly slower).
2. Products whose retail prices increased at a faster rate than prices at the other three marketing levels are:
a. fresh flounder fillets (moderately faster), and
b. frozen ocean perch fillets, canned pink salmon, and fresh blue crab meat (slightly faster).
3. Only one product, fresh cod fillets, had its retail prices incresed at approximately the same rate as prices at other levels.

Table 7.--Linear trends of price changes at the exvessel, processing, and wholesale levels in relation to retail prices of corresponding years for different finfish products during 1950-71 and shellfish products during 1959-71

| Product | Independent variablel/ | Constant | Beta | Statistical information |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $R^{2}$ | T | Period covered |
| Fresh haddock fillets | Pex/Pr | 27.83 | 1.10 | . 4973 | 4.2200 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 56.74 | 0.78 | . 3510 | 3.1204 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 68.33 | 0.60 | . 2425 | 2.4006 | 1950-71 |
| Fresh flounder fillets | Pex/Pr | 48.13 | 0.86 | . 6688 | 6.5120 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 69.01 | -0.76 | . 5532 | 5.0994 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 80.17 | -0.75 | . 4727 | 4.3392 | 1950-71 |
| Fresh cod fillets | Pex/Pr | 33.15 | -0.05 | . 0235 | 0.6200 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 56.55 | 0.06 | . 0076 | 0.3504 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 65.52 | 0.14 | . 0392 | 0.6505 | 1950-71 |
| Frozen ocean perch fillets | Pex/Pr | 31.84 | -0.34 | . 6261 | 5.6400 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 67.70 | -0.63 | . 4304 | 3.7893 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 81.62 | -0.72 | . 3366 | 3.1046 | 1950-71 |
| Halibut steaks (fresh \& frozen) | Pex/Pr | 22.81 | 1.94 | . 8657 | 4.2920 | 1960-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 32.54 | 3.22 | . 8382 | 8.4199 | 1960-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 37.68 | 3.51 | . 6139 | 7.5491 | 1960-71 |
| Canned pink salmon | Pex/Pr | 30.20 | -0.23 | . 1053 | 1.2838 | 1950-65 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 65.58 | -0.36 | . 1313 | 1.4547 | 1950-65 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 79.43 | -0.53 | . 2653 | 2.2487 | 1950-65 |
| Canned tuna (chunk) | Pex/Pr | 30.98 | 0.30 | - 2881 | 2.6993 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 59.51 | 0.40 | . 5202 | 4.4180 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 69.64 | 0.48 | . 5250 | 4.4602 | 1950-71 |
| Frozen raw peeled shrimp | Pex/Pr | 39.59 | 0.56 | :2720 | 2.1172 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 59.86 | 0.74 | . 2778 | 2.1482 | 1950-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 70.64 | 0.98 | . 4620 | 3.2103 | 1950-71 |
| Live American lobsters | $\mathrm{Pex} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 44.87 | 0.99 | . 5375 | 3.0489 | 1959-67 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 77.36 | 0.43 | . 0813 | 0.8414 | 1959-67 |
| Fresh sea scallops, shucked | Pex/Pr | 43.61 | 2.18 | . 7913 | 6.7445 | 1959-71 |
|  | d $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 51.97 | 2.26 | . 8487 | 8.2060 | 1959-71 |
| Fresh blue crab meat | Pex/Pr | 32.33 | -0.68 | . 3910 | 2.7758 | 1959-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pp} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 67.86 | -0.42 | . 1406 | 1.4010 | 1959-71 |
|  | $\mathrm{Pw} / \mathrm{Pr}$ | 74.92 | -0.36 | . 3196 | 2.3745 | 1959-71 |

1/Relative prices are used as independent variables. $P_{\text {ex }}=$ exvessel prices adjusted to the value of a quantity equivalent to the final form sold to the consumer; $P_{p}=$ processor's price; $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{w}}=$ wholesale price; $\mathrm{Pr}=$ retail price.

To develop a better understanding of price spreads and their variation between products and that between marketing levels of each product, it is necessary to examine the services performed in getting the fish products from dockside to the retail market and the costs and profits involved in performing these services.

Source of Data
Estimates of costs and profits are compiled from the industry and trade series reports published by the Bureau of the Census (see tables 31 and 32), and the Business income tax returns and Corporate tax returns published by the Internal Revenue Service (tables 28, 29, 30, 33, and 34) (both 1968). They represent U.S. national averages for all firms engaged in the manufacture and trade of fishery products at the 4-digit level $11 /$. of the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system. These estimates are not broken down by regions of the country or .. by time other than the census year.

Usually more than one fish product is processed in or distributed through the same establishment at different seasons, with the result that costs of the total operationfor the year could be allocated to particular products on a more or less discretionary basis. The 4-digit census report put "canned and cured seafoods" as an industry group. Its costs and profits, reduced to ratios, are applied to canned salmon and canned tuna at the processor's level in this study. Cost and profit ratios derived from the "fresh and frozen packaged fish products" are applied to
the processing of fillets and steaks of grourdfish, salmon, and halibut and the processing of shellfish products (adjustments are made based on special studies for individual fisheries). (see table 35.).

At the wholesale level, cost and prorit ratios are derived from the "food and kindred products" statistics based on the Census of Business 1967: wholesale trade, commodity line sales (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 19.67). At the retail level for fresh and frozen processed fish products, costs and profits of the "meat and fich retail market"from business income tax returns and corporate tax returns which were both published by the Internal Revenue Service (both 1968) are used (table 36). Canned fish products are sold in the grocery departments of supermarkets, costs and profits statistics of the supermarket published by the Supermarket Institute, Inc., are applied to canned tuna and salmon retailing margins in this study (Supermarket Institute, 1963 and 1964).

Data for costs and profits of fishing vessels are gathered by the Economic Research Division according to types of boats from different fishing areas. Each type of vessel is understood to be specialized in the fishing of a particular species of fish although some of them are capable of alternating from one species to another.

## Classification of Costs

None of the cost statistics assembled from different sources provides information in the detail needed for cost allocation. Furthermore, each source has its own breakdowns of cost items. Under the circumstances, the estimated costs are grouped in a way to satisfy the different conditions that the primary data present. They are classified into four groups-materials and fuels, labor, capital costs, and operating expenses. Together

With net profit, they form the five components of each margin (or gross profit) at each functional level. The estimates are not made with perfect precision; they must be dealt with as approximations.

Under materials and fuels are included paper products (for packing and wrapping), metal containers, ice, gas, electric energy purchased, and office supplies. Bait and food on fishing vessels are included in the ...category. : :-.... Capital costs are comprised of depreciation, rent, and interest. Operating expenses include salaries, employee benefits, insurance, advertising, commission, bad debts, taxes, contract work, office maintenance and repairs, telephone charges, mailing, and miscellaneous expenses.

Labor costs at the production level are wages paid to the directly productive workers in the processing plants and wages paid to the crews while working on fishing vessels. Vessel owner's share and crewman's share except for wages are considered as salary and bonus, respectively. As salary it is an operating expense; as bonus it is considered as profit. Labor cost at the retail and wholesale levels are wages paid to workers in wrapping and labeling products and in unloading and moving cargoes.

Labor costs at the production and distributing levels increased faster than costs of material and fuel, capital expenditure, and operating expenses during the last two decades as shown in figure 15 for a few Fig. 15 major items.

Allocation of Costs
Margin components are reduced to ratios expressed as percentages of the margin or gross profit at each of the four functional levels-harvesting (fishing), processing, wholesaling, and retailing. They are summarized in tables 8 and 9 with the latest data available, gathered from the sources mentioned in earlier sections and shown separately in


Table 8.--Cost rates, as percentage of price margin, at different market levels

|  | Margin | $\begin{gathered} \text { Materials } \\ \text { \& fuels } \end{gathered}$ | Labor | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Capital } \\ \text { costs } \end{gathered}$ | Operating expenses | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Net } \\ & \text { profit } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I. Retail: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Supermarket 1/ | 100.0 | 4.1 | 6.3 | 16.9 | 63.6 | 9.1 |
| II. Wholesale: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Food \& kindred products ?/ | 100.0 | 14.8 | 6.1 | 9.2 | 45.4 | 24.5 |
| b) Northern lobster (live) 3/ | 100.0 | 23.0 | 13.0 | 7.0 | 47.0 | 10.0 |

III. Processing:
a) Fresh \& frozen packaged fish 4/
100.0
$36.5 \quad 22.2$
$7.8 \quad 25.3$
8.2
b) Canned \& cured seafoods 4/
c) Food \& kindred products 1/
d) Peeled shrimp 5/
e) Blue crab meat 6/
$\begin{array}{llllll}100.0 & 25.3 & 44.2 & 2.2 & 21.3 & 7.0\end{array}$
IV. Wholesale and processing combined

| Scallop \& oyster 7/ | 100.0 | 20.2 | 13.2 | 9.6 | 45.0 | 12.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1/ Published by Supermarket Institute, Inc., 1965.
2/ Business Income Tax Return Statistics, Internal Revenue Service, 1967.
3/ Derived from the Joint Haster Plan for the Northern Lobster Fishery, BCF, Department of the Interior, April, 1970.
4/ Census of Manufactures, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1967.
5/ Survey of the U.S. Shrimp Industry, Vol. 1, Special Scientific Report-Fisheries No. 277, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1954. Figures were readjusted after discussing with the industry.
6/ Derived from the discussion with the staff in the Branch of Shellfish Products, Division of Current Economic Analysis, NMFS, Department of Commerce.
I/ Derived from figures \& information given in Culture, Handling, and Processing of Pacific Coast Oysters, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Department of the Interior, 1960.

Table 9.--Cost rates, as percentage of gross receipts, for different fishing vessels at the harvesting level. (Average of 3 years--1966-68, unless otherwise marked)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gross } \\ & \text { receipts } \end{aligned}$ | Materials, fuels, etc. | Labor | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Capital } \\ & \text { costs } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Operating } \\ \text { expenses } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline \mathrm{Net} \\ \mathrm{es} & \mathrm{profi} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - | -----10 | -Perce | ------- | ---- |  |
| 1. Boston large trawler (1964-66) | 100.0 | 19.6 | 47.2 | 16.6 | 12.3 | $4 \cdot 3$ |
| 2. New Bedford dragger (1967-68) | 100.0 | 18.6 | 47.0 | 18.0 | 11.3 | 5.1 |
| 3. Rhode Island small trawler (1964) | 100.0 | 16:1 | 47.1 | 21.1 | 7.1 | 8.6 |
| 4. Halibut vessel | 100.0 | 18.5 | 36.6 | 21.4 | 12.0 | 11.5 |
| 5. Salmon troller 1/ | 100.0 | 12.5 | 32.5 | 31.8 | 11.1 | 12.1 |
| 6. Salmon purse seiner | 100.0 | 9.8 | 39.0 | 21.8 | 13.2 | 16.1 |
| 7. Tuna purse seiner | 100.0 | 13.2 | 41.5 | 25.2 | 13.1 | 7.0 |
| 8. American lobster inshore boats with traps (1955)-same for blue crab traps 2/ | 100.0 | 16.3 | 43.1 | 9.8 | 28.4 | 6.0 |
| 9. Gulf shrimp otter trawler | 100.0 | 13.9 | 37.6 | 16.6 | 25.5 | 6.4 |
| $\qquad$ | 100.0 | 14.5 | 48.03/ | 15.8 | 17.2 | 4.5 |

I/ Printout of salmon troller earnings and costs for 68 vessels surveyed by the Laboratory in 1968.
2/ Estimation of the Economic Benerits to Fishermen, Vessels, and Society from Limited Entry to the Inshore U.S. Northern Lobster Fishery, draft manuscript by Frederick Bell, March 1970.
3/ Shucking done on boat.
Source: Basic Economic Indicators, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 1970.

Table10.-Average annual margins of fish products at four market levels, 1969-71

| Products | Harvesting | Processing | Wholesale | Retail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Groundfish fillets: | Cents per pound- |  |  |  |
| Fresh: |  |  |  |  |
| Haddock | 67.75 | 22.28 | 8.69 | 21.38 |
| Flounder | 43.79 | 26.07 | 14.80 | 44.73 |
| Cod | 36.93 | 26.69 | 9.95 | 31.60 |
| Frozen: <br> Ocean-perch | 15.87 | 14.37 | 9.89 | 23.64 |
| Steaks: |  |  |  |  |
| Halibut | 49.92 | 25.53 | 9.35 | 20.50 |
| King salmon | 57.91 | 37.66 | 39.50 | 33.91 |
| King salmon (dressed) | 52.17 | 33.93 | 35.60 | 30.53 |

Canned Products:

|  | 18.17 | 21.47 | 8.58 | 23.41 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Salmon (1963-65) I/ | 24.77 | 23.85 | 9.58 | 15.77 |
| Tuna, chunk (1963-65) ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 24.77 |  |  |  |
| Tuna, chunk (1969-71) | 38.81 | 28.64 | 11.24 | 19.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| resh shellfish products: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 43.52 |
| Live American lobster | 77.52 | $3 /$ | 26.63 |  |
| Blue crab meat | 56.88 | 88.34 | 23.36 | 65.75 |
| Sea scallop meats | 131.60 | $4 /$ | 13.57 | 36.74 |

Frozen shellfish products:

| Peeled shrimp | 110.62 | 49.90 | 32.87 | 46.07 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1/ Figures not available in later years.
2/ Use the same period to compare with salmon.
3/ Sold live.
4/ Landed shucked.
historical series in tables 28 to 36 in the Appendix. The ratios presented in tables 8 and 9 are used as bases to allocate the costs of each fish product according to the actual margins calculated from price studies at each level as exemplified in the margin component tables 37 to 50 in the Appendix. A summary of margin estimates for all products is shown in table 10 for comparison. The margin at the lowest level, harvesting, is the ex-vessel price itself.
Tables 8, $9 \& .10$

## DIVISION OF CONSUMER'S DOLLAR SPENT ON FISH PRODUCTS

Prices of fish products are expressed in cents per pound. They can be converted to pounds per dollar at the retail level, i.e., the value of a consumer food dollar. A consumer's dollar spent for each fish product can be sliced many ways. It can be divided according to marketing functions to show how much is earned by the retailer, the wholesaler, the processor, and the fisherman out of each dollar spent by the consumer. The share of a consumer's dollar can also be distributed according to costs spent by the four functions to show how much goes to labor, materials, capital expenses, operating expenses, and net profit in the production and marketing of each fish product. A different comparison is offered here to evaluate the services rendered and profits earned by all the functions involved in bringing each fish product to the consumer market expressed in fractions of a consumer's dollar (table ll).

Out of each dollar spent by the consumer during 1969-71 on fresh haddock fillets, a relatively high-valued fish, the retailer grossed

Table llonistribution of consumer's dollar spent in various fish products in the United States: according to the raverage prices of 1969-71, by Marketing functions and cost items


Table. 11:-Distribution of consumer's dollar spent in various fish products in the United Statesaccording to the average prices of 1969-71, by Marketing functions and cost items (continued)


By marketing functions

| Retailing | 17.19 | 16.23 | 32.68 | 21.31 | 19.48 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wholesaling | 26.44 | 27.58 | 11.97 | 12.95 | 11.50 |
| Processing | 20.98 | 20.76 | 29.87 | 32.24 | 29.30 |
| Harvesting | 35.39 | 35.43 | $\underline{25.36}$ | 33.48 | 39.71 |
| Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

44
By cost items.

| Profits at 4 levels:Total | 11.09 | 11.13 | 14.64 | 9.55 | 9.06 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retailing | 1.56 | 1.48 | 5.67 | 1.94 | 1.77 |
| Wholesaling | 3.52 | 3.66 | 2.93 | 3.17 | 2.81 |
| Processing | 1.72 | 1.70 | 1.95 | 2.09 | 1.9- |
| Harvesting | 4.28 | 4.29 | 4.09 | 2.33 | 2.78 |
| Materials and fuels | 16.70 | 16.75 | 15.64 | 18.27 | 17.78 |
| Labor | 18.85 | 18.83 | 18.26 | 22.44 | 24.24 |
| Capital costs | 18.23 | 18.18 | 14.36 | 16.35 | 17.20 |
| Operating expenses | 35.13 | 35.11: | 37.06 | 33.36 | 31.48 |
| Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100:00 |

1/ 1963-65 average prices are used here since the retail price series of canned pink salmon was discontinued by BLS in 1966. Prices of the same period are used for canned tuna for comparison purpose.

Table:ll--Distribution of consumer's dollar spent on various fish products in the Unfited States -according to the average prices of 1969-71, by Marketing functions and cost items (continued)

|  | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Live <br> American <br> Ilobster | Fresh blue crab meat | Frozen peeled shrimp | Fresh and <br> frozen <br> sea <br> scallop <br> meats |
|  | --- | ------ | ----- |  |
| By marketing functions |  |  |  |  |
| Retailing | 18.03 | 28.05 | 19.23 | 20.19 |
| Wholesaling | 29.47 | 9.96 | 13.72 | 7.45 |
| Processing | $2 /$ | 37.69 | 20.83 | $72 / 3$ |
| Harvesting | 52.49 | 24.27 | 46.19 | 72.34 |
| . Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| By cost items |  |  |  |  |
| Profits at 4 levels: Total | 7.73 | 8.23 | 10.78 | 6.91 |
| Retailing | 1.64 | 2.55 | 1.75 | 1.84 |
| Wholesaling | 2.94 | 2.44 | 3.15 | 1.83 |
| Processing | 21 | 1.78 | 2.92 | $3 /$ |
| Harvesting | 3.15 | 1.46 | 2.96 | 3.25 |
| Materials and fuels | 16.07 | 16.12 | 14.44 | 12.42 |
| Labor | 27.59 | 29.50 | 26.00 | 36.45 |
| Capital costs | 10.25 | 9.29 | 14.24 | 15.52 |
| Operating expenses | 38.22 | 36.87 | 34.94 | 28.67 |
| Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

[^0]Note: This table is compiled in percentage terms from the actual values presented in tables 37 and 52 in the Appendix.
17.8 cents; the wholesaler, 7.23 cents; the processor, 18.55 cents; and the fisherman, 56.4 cents. By contrast, in the sale of frozen ocean perch fillets, which are low-valued, the retailer retains 37.1 cents for each consumer food dollar; the wholesaler, 15.5 cents; the processor, 22.5 cents; and the fisherman, 14.9 cents. In general, market margins (except at the harvesting level) tend to be proportionally higher for lower priced fish products as labor and overhead expenses are fixed for all products regardless of their differences in value. By the same token, the consumer pays more out of a dollar for halibut steaks at all levels except the wholesale level than fresh king salmon steaks. Part of fresh
Table ll salmon steaks is shipped out by air-freight from Seattle by the wholesaler. This tends to inflate the wholesale:margin of the products.

When the dollar spent on fresh haddock fillets is split according to costs paid at all levels, shown in the lower part of table ll, labor earned 32.3 cents, operating expenses disposed of 27.1 cents, materials and fuels cost 19.8 cents, capital costs used up 14.8 cents, and profits netted 6.0 cents. Net profit differs by the four marketing functions. It is estimated that the fisherman netted the most, 2.4 cents, while the retailer, the least, 0.3 cents.

The distribution of consumer's dollar spent on other fish and shellfish products included in the study is also found in table 11. The reader is also referred to Appendix tables 37 through 50 where the same information is shown in terms of cents per pound of sales rather than percent of a consumer food dollar.

Prices of shellfish are generally higher than those of finfish products on a meat weight basis. Higher priced products enjoy higher profit in monetary terms but lower profit rate against sales in relative terms. This applies to shellfish products. Conversely, profit rates for finfish products generally ranked higher, but actual price on a per pound basis is lower than those for shellfish products.

## CONCLUSIONS

The fisherman's share and the markups at. different marketing levels of different fish products over the period analyzed showed either up or down trends at various degrees. The striking feature is the relative frequency of increasing trends at the fisherman's level compared to other. levels as shown in table 12. Of eleven products, four indicated significantly increasing trends over time and two, moderately. A greater percent of processors showed an upward trend in markups than wholesalers, and there were only three cases that showed slightly increasing markups at the retail level. It is rasonable to conclude that the price rise is more restrained at the retail and wholesale levels than at the processing and harvesting levels in later years. This does not imply that the operation at one level is necessarily more efficient than the other by comparing the sizes or trends of their markups.

Table 12.--Trends of fisherman's share and marketing markups over period analyzed

| Product | Fisherman's share | Markups |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Processors | Wholesalers | Retailers |
| Fresh haddock fillets | ++ | -- | - | -- |
| Fresh flounder fillets | - | + | + | + |
| Fresh cod fillets | 0 | + | 0 | - |
| Frozen ocean perch fillets | s | + | 0 | + |
| Halibut steaks (fresh \& frozen) | ++ | + | - | -- |
| Canned pink salmon | - | + | - | + |
| Canned tuna (chunk) | + | - | 0 | - |
| Frozen raw peeled shrimp | + | 0 | + | -- |
| Live American lobster | ++ |  | - | - |
| Fresh sea scallop meats | ++ |  | - | -- |
| Fresh blue crab meat | - | - | - | - |

Notations: + = moderate increase; - = moderate decline; $0=$ no trend; ++ = significant increase; -- = significant decline.

Dividing each price spread into margins at different functional levels and breaking each margin down into component costs and profits to examine them in depth is the first step toward evaluating the effectiveness of a marketing system.

Over half of the margin at the harvesting level is labor cost. Wage rates have been increasing faster than most costs, and this trend is likely to continue. The slow recruitment of resources of certain species and the lag in harvesting efficiency in some other fisheries (Bell, 1971) will further accelerate the increase in their ex-vessel prices or fishermen's margin compared to other levels.

Component costs at the wholesale level are mostly administrative. Margins at this level will increase much slower than at the ex-vessel level, although wholesale price will increase according to the purchase cost paid to the processor.

Processor's costs are comparatively less involved in labor than fishing vessels, but more than at the wholesale and retail levels. Its margin tends to rise at a pace between the rates of increase in wholesale and ex-vessel prices.

At the retail level, observations made at the variation of margins for different products have borne out the expectation that:

1. margins vary diractly with the perishability of products and the distance of shipment;
2. margins vary inversely with the rate of turnover, the level of unit price, and the amount of imports of identical products; and
3. retail margins are higher on manufacturer's brands than on private brands.

When price spreads of different periods are compared, the year-toyear changes for all fish products are ascribed to one or more of the following seven factors: (1) demand and supply, (2) cost of production factors, (3) different profits made by producers and dealers, (4) degree of processing and extent of services, (5) quantities of imports, (6) revaluation of foreign exchange, and (7) efficiency'of' the marketing system.

Precise measurement of the last factor is not possible on an aggregate basis as there exists a paucity of sources for detailed data and information. In addition, tremendous imponderables and uncertainties are entailed in the assessment. The quality and cost of similar products may differ between firms because of the following reasons: (1) the intensity of labor employed, (2) the degree of freshness in different shipments, (3) the degree of streamlining of the distribution system in different regions, (4) the changing of demand for a product at different levels at a particular period, (5) the manner in which the product is packed, (6) demands by labor differ according to the strength of labor unions in different places where the processors are, (7) trucking freights differ by the State, (8) freight rates differ according to distance and quantity shipped, ( 0 ) the amount of products masqueraded as fresh products but defrozen from imported products, and many others. These micro factors are details necessary for the study of marketing efficiency of individual firms, case by case. Their information is not collected since it will not be fit for the macro analysis of the industry on an aggregate basis as the case is in this study.

Individual fish dealers at either the producing or distributing level, however, will have a chance to identify whether there is room for improvement in their performances by examining and comparing the magnitudes of their margins, component costs, and profits with those of similar products presented in this report as national averages.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continuous Price Spread Studies--Since the creation of the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry by Congress in the early 1930's to investigate the cause of the difference between the prices of agricultural products paid to the producer and the ultimate costs to the consumer, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been publishing the quarterly price spreads of different farm products. Price spreads between the fisherman and the consumer have only recently begun to attract the attention of the public. To serve the interast of the public a continuous inquiry into the subject matter as attempted by this report appears to be necessary.
2. Primary Data on Marketing--To make a more accurate study of price margins by functional levels, a field survey of the processing procedures and distributing practices for some of the major fish products in important areas will be necessary for marketing research.

Over a period of time, marketing services and distribution channels change. As a result, some of the marketing services have improved; some channels are combined and others separated. Difficulties arise when one attempts to delineate clearly where fish
harvesting leaves off and marketing begins. Some fishery firms are vertically integrated from fishing, processing to distribution; some wholesalers are engaged in processing or repacking, or part of each. Commissions and transportation costs are assumed either by processors or wholesalers depending on the kind of agreement entered into or the practices in a certain area. Furthermore, no data regarding byproducts from fish processing are available. If they are utilized their value should be included.
3. Detailed Marketing Cost Studies--Transportation costs. in the distribution system of fish products are not'available and therefore not shown separately in this study: The evaluation of the services done by this sector of the economy to the fishery is not presented in the study. Transportation costs have to be compiled, transaction by transaction, from the truck and railroad companies' shipping consignment copies collected from various States by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Marketing Development Research Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has a special section which concentrates on food transportation studies.

Costs at the production and distribution levels of the fishing industry are not presented in detail nor are they weighted according to the importance of each. "To embark on a more accurate analysis, special arrangements should be made with the Bureau of Census and the Internal Revenue Service to use their primary printouts and work sheets to look into detailed breakdowns of costs items.
4. Correction and Extension of Statistical Series--Bureau of Labor Statistics' purpose in collecting prices is to measure change in prices (to compile price indexes) rather than their absolute values. The same is true with the New York State Marketing Service in collecting retail fish prices. The latter collects prices on Mondays and Tuesdays, but special sales are mostly offered on Fridays and Saturdays. The quantity sold at reduced prices may be much greater than that sold at regular prices. Neither BLS nor the New York State Marketing Information Service weight prices of fish according to volume sold. The reported prices are, therefore, overestimated. To measure the discrepancy, spot surveys would be necessary to establish a ratio or factor for corrections.

If these studies are to be carried out, fresh fish price series at wholesale and retail levels should eventually be established by the Statistics and Market News Division in cooperation with marketing service offices of different State Governments. More attention should be given to obtaining fresh fish prices, since a large share of domestically caught groundfish and shellfish is marketed in that form. The vast majority of foreign-caught fish is sold either frozen or canned.

Based on complete price statistics of both fresh and frozen products, price spreads and profit margins could be derived and published to keep fishermen, packers, distributors, and retailers informed of the profitability of marketing fresh fish products. It serves to encourage fishermen to adjust production, and distributors to make timely alterations and improvements in shipping and packaging to minimize losses or take advantage of favorable prices.

## FOOTNOTES

1/ Retail prices of some fish products are not available for the 1950s.

2/ About $84 \%$ of ocean perch landings, $19 \%$ of haddock, $67 \%$ of shrimp, $21 \%$ of sea scallop, and only $2-4 \%$ of cod and flounder were frozen in 1971. Some of their frozen prices are also taken for comparison in this study. Canned tuna prices are mixed for domestic and imported products. Canned salmon prices are for domestic products.

3/ Ex-vessel prices are the prices agreed upon between the seller, the fisherman, and the buyer, the wholesaler or processor, at the dockside for the exchange of certain amount of fresh fish landed by the fisherman on a per pound basis.

4/ Fisherman's share $=\frac{P e x}{P r} \times 100$, where $\operatorname{Pex}=$ ex-vessel price adjusted to a quantity equivalent to the final form sold to the consumer; $\operatorname{Pr}$ = actual retail price.

5/ In 1971, about 341 million pounds in edible weight (or $66 \%$ ) of total tuna supply in the United States were imported, whereas there was a net export of 16.7 million pounds of canned salmon and a net export of 25.2 million lbs. of fresh and frozen salmon.

6/ The series under other products are not complete enough to cover the comparable period.

7/ The price elasticity of demand for beef was estimated to be -0.76 ; for pork, -0.82 ; for fish and seafood, -0.07 at the retail level (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1967).

8/ The constant dollar value of a commodity at any market level is one when the current price of the commodity is adjusted to a value as if the price has not risen because of inflation compared with a certain period as the base year. The adjustment is made by dividing the actual prices of the commodity in a time series by the corresponding indexes from the implicit price deflator series for nondurable goods. In this study we use 1967 as the base year.

9/ Stock refers to the resource available for each species. Run refers to the migration of a fish up a river to spawn.

10/ Wholesale margin of American lobsters is larger than other fish products because they are sold live and heavy transportation costs are assumed by the wholesalers. Part of fresh salmon is shipped by air freight, the costs of which are paid by the wholesalers.

11/ In the SIC system, the first 2 digits represent a major group; the first 3 digits, a group; and the first 4 digits, a subgroup. For example: in the manufacturing industries, 2-digit major group 20 is Food and Kindred Products; 3-digit group 203 is Canned and Preserved Food; and 4-digit sub-group 2031 is Canned and Cured Seafoods.

I am grateful to Dr. Frederick W. Bell of the Economic Research Division, National Marine Fisheries Service, for his many valuable suggestions which have substantially improved the techniques applied at yarious points. Thanks also go to Dr. Frederick V. Waugh, former Director of the Division of Statistics and Economic Research, U.S. Department of Agriculture, for his advice during the preparation of the report, and to Dr. Lawrence Van Meir, Director of Economics and Statistics Division, National Canners Association, for his valuable comments on the first draft.

Table 13.--Number and sales of food stores and eating places in the United States, 1963 and 1967


Source: Compiled from Census of Business, Retail Trade, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Table 14.--Percentage distribution of numbers of grocery stores and sales, by annual sales size, Census years, 1929-1967

| Annual sales | Percentage of total stores |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage of total sales |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1929 | 1939 | 1949 | 1958 | 1963 | 1967 | 1929 | 1939 | 1948 | 1958 | 1963 | 1967 |
| -Dollar | -Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -Per |  |  |  |
| Under 50,000 | 87.1 | 91.5 | 66.1 | 53.5 | 46.7 | 38.53 | 53.0 | 53.6 | 18.5 | 7.5 | 4.9 | 3.10 |
| 50,000-299,999 | 12.7 | 8.2 | 29.8 | 35.9 | 37.7 | 42.06 | 43.1 | 37.3 | 43.4 | 23.5 | 19.3 | 16.02 |
| 300,000-999,999 | . 2 | . 3 | 3.5 | 7.2 | 9.1 | 10.30 | 2.7 | 8.0 | 26.2 | 23.5 | 23.1 | 19.62 |
| 1,000,000 \& over | (1) | (1) | . 6 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 9.11 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 11.9 | 45.5 | 52.7 | 61.26 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

(1) Less than 0.05 percent

Source: Compiled from Census of Business, Retail Trade, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Table 15.--Fresh haddock fillets: Prices at four market levels, fisherman's share in retail market, and markups at three market levels, 1950-71

| Year | Prices]/ |  |  |  | Fishermen's <br> share of retail price | Markups |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vesse12/ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Pro- } \\ \text { cessing } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Wholesale | Retail |  | Processors | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Whole- } \\ & \text { 3/salers } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{Re}- \\ & \text { tailers } 5 / \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 21.27 | 33.23 | 37.78 | 55.40 | 38.39 | 36.00 | 12.06 | 31.81 |
| 1951 | 22.12 | 36.64 | 42.17 | 59.20 | 37.30 | 39.61 | 13.12 | 28.89 |
| 1952 | 22.06 | 35.63 | 40.80 | 60.10 | 36.71 | 38.07 | 12.67 | 32.11 |
| 1953 | 21.53 | 36.11 | 41.67 | 62.30 | 34.56 | 40.36 | 13.35 | 33.12 |
| 1954 | 18.40 | 34.18 | 40.19 | 60.00 | 30.67 | 46.15, | 14.96 | 33.02 |
| 1955 | 17.09 | 33.48 | 39.72 | 58.80 | 29.07 | 48.94 | 15.72 | 32.44 |
| 1956 | 17.94 | 35.06 | 41.62 | 60.10 | 29.85 | 48.82 | 15.77 | 30.75 |
| 1957 | 21.75 | 39.79 | 46.70 | 60.81 | 35.77 | 45.33 | 14.80 | 23.20 |
| 1958 | 27.96 | 46.31 | 53.34 | 63.10 | 44.31 | 39.63 | 13.18 | 15.46 |
| 1959 | 27.68 | 46.32 | 53.46 | 65.80 | 42.06 | 40.25 | 13.36 | 18.76 |
| 1960 | 22.56 | 40.04 | 46.57 | 67.10 | 33.62 | 43.66 | 14.03 | 30.59 |
| 1961 | 21.12 | 36.23 | 42.23 | 65.80 | 32.10 | 41.69 | 14.20 | 35.83 |
| 1962 | 23.16 | 42.17 | 50.16 | 68.00 | 34.05 | 45.09 | 15.92 | 26.24 |
| 1963 | 26.90 | 45.50 | 53.83 | 69.80 | 38.54 | 40.99 | 15.32 | 22.88 |
| 1964 | 25.28 | 41.60 | 50.39 | 69.21 | 36.52 | 39.24 | 17.45 | 27.19 |
| 1965 | 25.50 | 45.94 | 52.85 | 76.11 | 33.51 | 44.49 | 13.07 | 30.56 |
| 1966 | 26.25 | 47.15 | 54.23 | 77.80 | 33.74 | 44.32 | 13.06 | 30.30 |
| 1967 | 32.10 | 50.79 | 58.31 | 80.20 | 40.02 | 36.81 | 12.90 | 27.29 |
| 1968 | 36.75 | 65.01 | 72.13 | 88.69 | 41.44 | 43.46 | 9.88 | 18.67 |
| 1969 | 52.75 | 80.24 | 88.40 | 101.00 | 52.23 | 34.26 | 9.23 | 12.47 |
| 1970 | 70.26 | 35.53 | 102.42 | 122.60 | 57.31 | 26.45 | 6.73 | 16.46 |
| 1971 | 80.24 | 96.33 | 105.33 | 136.70 | 58.70 | 16.70 | 8.54 | 22.95 |

1/Exvessel and processing prices are collected from New England, retail prices from New York City, and wholesale prices are adjusted from prices to primary wholesaiers in Boston.
2/Exvessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of fillet weight from drawn weight.
3/The margin between processing and exvessel prices is expressed as a percentage of the processing price, representing processors' gross earnings in percentage of their total sales value.
4/The margin between wholesale and processing prices is expressed as a percentage of the wholesale price, representing wholesaler's gross earning rate.
5/The margin between retail and wholesale prices is expressed as a percentage of the retail price, representing retailer's gross earning rate.

Table 16.--Fresh flounder fillets: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1950-71

| Year | Prices ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  |  | Fishermen's <br> share of retail price | Markups |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vessel릐 } \end{aligned}$ | Processing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Whole- } \\ & \text { sale } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Retail |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- Whole- Re- } \\ & \text { cessors 3/salers 4/tailers 5/ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 32.55 | 46.79 | 54.49 | 71.50 | 45.53 | 30.43 | 14.14 | 23.78 |
| 1951 | 40.47 | 60.89 | 71.07 | 80.30 | 50.40 | 33.54 | 14.33 | 11.49 |
| 1952 | 39.88 | 59.47 | 68.96 | 80.40 | 49.61 | 32.94 | 13.75 | 14.23 |
| 1953 | 36.36 | 49.91 | 63.67 | 83.20 | 43.70 | 27.15 | 21.67 | 23.48 |
| 1954 | 35.19 | 51.29 | 58.59 | 81.60 | 43.13 | 31.39 | 12.46 | 28.20 |
| 1955 | 36.95 | 52.29 | 59.52 | 82.85 | 44.60 | 29.32 | 12.15 | 28.16 |
| 1956 | 37.54 | 52.97 | 60.74 | 85.10 | 44.11 | 29.13 | 12.80 | 28.16 |
| 1957 | 38.12 | 56.46 | 65.89 | 87.20 | 43.72 | 32.47 | 14.32 | 24.43 |
| 1958 | 34.60 | 54.94 | 64.19 | 87.40 | 39.59 | 37.02 | 14.41 | 26.56 |
| 1959 | 37.54 | 57.44 | 66.83 | 88.90 | 42.23 | 34.64 | 14.04 | 26.56 24.83 |
| 1960 : | 35.78 | 57.35 | 67.14 | 96.80 | 36.96 | 37.61 | 14.58 | 30.64 |
| 1961 | 31.09 | 46.54 | 53.51 | 89.80 | 34.62 | 33.19 | 13.03 | 40.41 |
| 1962 | 28.45 | 52.58 | 63.83 | 88.20 | 32.26 | 45.90 | 17.62 | 27.63 |
| 1963 | 24.63 | 51.78 | 64.87 | 86.30 | 28.54 | 52.43 | 20.18 | 24.83 |
| 1964 | 23.46 | 44.47 | 56.12 | 90.10 | 26.03 | 47.25 | 20.76 | 37.72 |
| 1965 | 27.86 | 49.97 | 59.57 | 95.00 | 29.33 | 44.25 | 16.12 | 37.29 |
| 1966 | 37.25 | 55.66 | 65.16 | 99.51 | 37.43 | 33.09 | 14.58 | 34.52 |
| 1967 | 33.72 | 59.26 | 71.37 | 96.90 | 34.80 | 43.10 | 16.98 | 36.52 26.34 |
| 1968 | 33.43 | 60.14 | 71.90 | 102.47 | 32.63 | 44.41 | 16.34 | 29.84 |
| 1969 | 39:88 | 63.83 | 77.73 | 114.10 | 34.95 | 37.53 | 17.88 | 31.87 |
| 1970 | 43.99 | 66.24 | 81.52 | 129.39 | 33.99 | 33.60 | 18.75 | 36. |
| 1971 | 47.51 | 79.69 | 94.70 | 144.69 | 32.84 | 40.37 | 15.86 | 34.55 |

1/See footnotes of table 15.
2/Exvessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of fillet weight from round weight.
3/See footnotes of table 15.
4/See footnotes of table 15 .
5/See footnotes of table 15.

Table 17.--Fresh cod fillets: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1950-71

|  |  |  | 1/ |  | Fishermen's |  | Markups |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vesse1?/ } \end{aligned}$ | Processing | Wholesale | Retail | retail <br> price | Processor | Wholesalers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Re- } \\ & \text { tailers/ } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | C | - | - |  |  | Perce | ------ |
| 1950 | 24.27 | N.A. | N.A. | 55.92 | 43.40 | -- | -- | -- |
| 1951 | 22.93 | N.A. | N.A. | 59.16 | 38.76 | -- | -- | - |
| 1952 | 22.80 | N.A. | N.A. | 62.04 | 36.76 | -- | -- |  |
| 1953 | 21.02 | N.A. | N.A. | 60.36 | 34.82 | -- | -- | - |
| 1954 | 18.74 | N.A. | N.A. | 59.28 | 31.61 | -- | -- | - |
| 1955 | 19.18 | 33.78 | 38.28 | 58.80 | 32.62 | 43.21 | 11.76 | 34.90 |
| 1956 | 19.98 | 33.75 | 39.03 | 61.32 | 32.59 | 40.79 | 13.53 | 36.35 |
| 1957 | 20.17 | 36.59 | 42.88 | 62.04 | 32.50 | 44.89 | 14.66 | 30.89 |
| 1958 | 23.20 | 38.17 | 43.90 | 65.16 | 35.61 | 39.22 | 13.06 | 32.62 |
| 1959 | 22.53 | 40.33 | 47.15 | 64.80 | 34.78 | 44.13 | 14.47 | 27.23 |
| 1960 | 21.07 | 38.98 | 45.68 | 66.00 | 31.92 | 45.96 | 14.66 | 30.80 |
| 1961 | 20.28 | 33.12 | 38.21 | 66.84 | 30.34 | 38.76 | 13.33 | 42.83 |
| 1962 | 21.16 | 38.99 | 46.50 | 65.40 | 32.35 | 45.74 | 16.14 | 28.90 |
| 1963 | 23.23 | 39.02 | 45.98 | 69.30 | 33.52 | 40.46 | 15.14 | 33.66 |
| 1964 | 21.33 | 34.83 | 42.11 | 68.50 | 31.13 | 38.78 | 17.28 | 38.53 |
| 1965 | 25.17 | 40.50 | 46.76 | 74.40 | 33.83 | 37.84 | 13.39 | 37.15 |
| 1966 | 26.86 | 47.78 | 47.96 | 77.30 | 34.74 | 35.72 | 12.89 | 37.96 |
| 1967 | 23.23 | 42.29 | 49.96 | 75.30 | 30.84 | 45.08 | 15.35 | 33.65 |
| 1968 | 24.58 | 46.90 | 57.70 | 82.69 | 29.72 | 47.60 | 18.71 | 30.23 |
| 1969 | 27.72 | 53.34 | 62.81 | 88.30 | 31.39 | 48.03 | 15.08 | 28.88 |
| 1970 | 35.90 | 64.11 | 74.30 | 101.20 | 35.47 | 44.00 | 13.72 | 26.58 |
| 1971 | 40.39 | 73.42 | 83.60 | 126.00 | 32.06 | 44.99 | 12.18 | 33.65 |

1/See footnotes of table 15 .
2/Exvessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of fillet weight from drawn weight.
3/See footnotes of table 15.
4/See footnotes of table 15.
5/See footnotes of table 15 .

Table 18.--Frozen ocean perch fillets: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1950-71

| Year | Prices ${ }^{\text {l/ }}$ |  |  |  | Fishermen's share of retail price | Markups |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vesse1 2/ } \end{aligned}$ | Processing | Wholesale | Retail |  | Pro- Whole- Re-cessors 3/salers 4/tailers 5/ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 14.66 | 25.16 | 29.16 | N.A. | -- | 41.74 | 13.72 |  |
| 1951 | 16.26 | 28.43 | 33.07 | N.A. | -- | 42.82 | 14.04 |  |
| 1952 | 14.53 | 26.68 | 31.30 | 45.90 | 31.66 | 45.53 | 14.77 | 31.80 |
| 1953 | 12.99 | 25.07 | 29.66 | 44.00 | 29.52 | 48.19 | 15.50 | 32.58 |
| 1954 | 13.54 | 29.64 | 35.77 | 43.90 | 30.83 | 54.33 | 17.14 | 18.52 |
| 1955 | 12.81 | 28.63 | 34.67 | 43.90 | 29.17 | 55.27 | 17.42 | 21.02 |
| 1956 | 12.63 | 29.17 | 35.50 | 42.00 | 30.07 | 56.70 | 17.83 | 15.48 |
| 1957 | 12.73 | 29.44 | 35.84 | 42.90 | 29.67 | 56.76 | 17.85 | 16.47 |
| 1958 | 14.07 | 30.97 | 37.45 | 45.60 | 30.85 | 54.59 | 17.29 | 17.87 |
| 1959 | 13.94 | 30.12 | 36.32 | 47.50 | 29.35 | 53.71 | 17.06 | 23.55 |
| 1960 | 14.07 | 30.00 | 35.95 | 47.41 | 29.68 | 53.11 | 16.55 | 24.16 |
| 1961 | 13.17 | 30.60 | 37.51 | 47.50 | 27.72 | 56.96 | 18.42 | 21.03 |
| 1962 | 14.29 | 32.48 | 40.14 | 50.00 | 28.57 | 56.02 | 19.07 | 19.72 |
| 1963 | 15.98 | 33.78 | 41.62 | 52.60 | 30.37 | 52.70 | 18.84 | 20.87 |
| 1964 | 14.46 | 30.28 | 38.79 | $\begin{aligned} & 52.80 \\ & 52.70 \end{aligned}$ | 27.39 | 52.24 | 21.94 | 26.52 |
| 1965 | 14.07 | 31.81 | 39.05 | 52.70 | 26.71 | 55.75 | 18.56 | 25.89 |
| 1966 | 16.58 | 33.31 | 40.24 | 54.10 | 30.66 | 50.21 | 17.24 | 25.61 |
| 1967 | 13.06 | 30.08 | 36.92 | 54.10 | 24.14 | 56.58 | 18.53 | 31.75 |
| 1968 | 12.65 | 28.60 | 35.24 | 53.90 | 23.48 | 55.76 | 18.83 | 34.62 |
| 1969 | 14.44 | 30.72 | 37.22 | 55.70 | 25.93 | 53.00 | 17.46 | 33.18 |
| 1970 | 16.65 | 34.09 | 40.46 | 63.20 | 26.35 | 51.15 | 15.73 | 35.98 |
| 1971 | 16.97 | 36.42 | 42.69 | 72.40 | 23.44 | 53.39 | 14.70 | 41.04 |

1/See footnotes of table 15.
2/Exvessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of fillet weight from round weight.
3/See footnotes of table 15.
$4 /$ See footnotes of table 15.
$\underline{5} /$ See footnotes of table 15 .

Table 19.--Halibut steaks, fresh and frozen: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1950-71

| Year | Prices 1/ |  |  |  | Fishermen's <br> share of retail price | Markups |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vesse1?/ } \end{aligned}$ | Processing | Wholesale | Retail |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- Whole- } \mathrm{Ra-} \\ & \text { cessors 3/ salers } 4 / \text { tailers 5/ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Cents/13 |  |  |  |  | ---------Percent ${ }^{-----------1 .}$ |  |  |
| 1950 | 28.94 | 43.45 | 48.98 | N.A. | -- | 33.40 | 11.29 | -- |
| 1951 | 25.75 | 39.48 | 44.72 | N.A. | -- | 34.78 | 11.72 | -- |
| 1952 | 27.29 | 43.38 | 49.52 | N.A. | -- | 37.10 | 12.40 | -- |
| 1953 | 21.81 | 36.25 | 41.75 | N.A. | -- | 39.82 | 13.19 | -- |
| 1954 | 24.66 | 38.27 | 43.46 | N.A. | -- | 35.57 | 17.95 | -- |
| 1955 | 18.77 | 32.68 | 37.98 | N.A. | -- | 42.56 | 13.96 | -- |
| 1956 | 28.83 | 43.89 | 49.65 | N.A. | -- | 34.31 | 11.61 | -- |
| 1957 | 23.98 | 39.08 | 44.86 | N.A. | -- | 38.64 | 12.89 | -- |
| 1958 | 28.48 | 41.76 | 46.84 | N.A. | -- | 31.79 | 10.85 | -- |
| 1959 | 25.49 | 39.14 | 44.36 | N.A. | -- | 34.88 | 11.77 | -- |
| 1960 | 21.78 | 36.29 | 41.71 | 93.00 | 23.42 | 39.98 | 12.99 | 55.15 |
| 1961 | 28.13 | 41.39 | 46.65 | 96.90 | 29.04 | 32.03 | 11.27 | 51.86 |
| 1962 | 38.38 | 51.71 | 57.31 | 108.00 | 35.53 | 25.78 | 9.78 | 46.94 |
| 1963 | 26.90 | 44.34 | 52.04 | 110.00 | 24.46 | 39.33 | 14.78 | 52.69 |
| 1964 | 30.09 | 44.07 | 51.60 | 100.00 | 30.09 | 31.72 | 14.59 | 48.41 |
| 1965 | 40.51 | 54.48 | 60.18 | 116.00 | 34.92 | 25.64 | 9.47 | 48.12 |
| 1966 | 42.95 | 57.95 | 64.16 | 112.00 | 38.36 | 25.86 | 9.69 | 42.71 |
| 1967 | 28.66 | 47.78 | 55.47 | 90.00 | 31.84 | 40.02 | 13.87 | 38.37 |
| 1968 | 30.98 | 55.05 | 61.43 | 90.29 | 34.31 | 43.74 | 10.38 | 31.97 |
| 1969 | 52.19 | 69.42 | 83.36 | 98.60 | 52.94 | 24.81 | 16.73 | 15.45 |
| 1970 | 51.59 | 79.90 | 87.68 | 108.61 | 47.50 | 35.43 | 8.88 | 19.27 |
| 1971 | 46.00 | 77.04 | 83.36 | 108.70 | 42.32 | 40.29 | 7.59 | 23.31 |

1/Exvessel prices are Pacific halibut prices at Seattle; wholesale prices are collected from BLS in dressed form coriverted to steak value; retail prices from New York City; and processing prices are from the tables of Processed Fishery Products in the Fishery Statistics of the United States, Department of Comerce.
'2/Exvessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of steak from dressed weight.
$3 /$ See footnotes of table 15.
$4 /$ See fcotnotes of table 15 .
5/See footnotes of table 15 .

Table 20.--Fresh king salmon steak: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share in retail market, and markups at three market levels, 1967-71

| Year | Prices 1/ |  |  |  | Fishermen's share of retail price | Markups 3/ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ex- <br> vessel | Processing | Wholesale | Retail |  | Processors | Wholesalers | Re- <br> tailers |
|  | --- | ---Cen | 1b.-- | ---- |  |  | ercent- |  |
| 1967 | 50.89 | 79.50 | 104.21 | 128.00 | 39.75 | 35.99 | 23.71 | 18.58 |
| 1968 | 58.08 | 87.04 | 115.57 | 159.69 | 36.37 | 33.27 | 24.68 | 27.63 |
| 1969 | 57.34 | 95.39 | 133.71 | 165.93 | 34.55 | 39.90 | 28.66 | 19.42 |
| 1970 | 63.62 | 94.66 | 149.64 | N.A. | --- | 32.79 | 36.74 | --- |
| 1971 | 58.47 | 95.75 | 136.47 | 172.03 | 33.99 | 38.93 | 29.84 | 20.67 |

1/ Exvessel prices from Seattle, processing prices from the table on Processing Fishery Products in the Fishery Statistics of the United States, Department of Commerce, wholesale price from BLS, and retail prices from New York City.

2/ Exvessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of steak from dressed weight.

3/ See footnotes for the markup columns in table 15.

Fable 21.--Fresh, dressed king salmon: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1950-71

| Year | Prices ${ }^{\text {F/ }}$ |  |  |  | Fishermen's <br> share of retail price | Markups3/ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { Ex- }} \\ & \text { vessel } \end{aligned}$ | Processing | Whole- <br> sale | Retail |  | Processors | Whotesalers | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{Re}- \\ & \text { tailers } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | ------ | ts/1b:- | ---- |  |  | Percent | -- |
| 1950 | 27.86 | 43.96 | 50.10 | N.A. | -- | 36.62 | 12.25 | -- |
| 1951 | 29.86 | 46.62 | 53.00 | N.A. | -- | 35.95 | 12.04 | -- |
| 1952 | 31.74 | 46.33 | 51.90 | N.A. | -- | 31.49 | 10.72 | -- |
| 1953 | 27.39 | 43.48 | 49.60 | N.A. | -- | 36.99 | 12.35 | -- |
| 1954 | 30.68 | 49.30 | 56.40 | N.A. | -- | 37.78 | 12.58 | -- |
| 1955 | 33.90 | 50.26 | 56.50 | N.A. | -- | 32.56 | 11.04 | -- |
| 1956 | 36.96 | 56.14 | 63.49 | N.A. | -- | 34.17 | 11.58 | -- |
| 1957 | 37.81 | 56.90 | 64.20 | N.A. | -- | 33.55 | 11.38 | -- |
| 1958 | 40.93 | 64.34 | 73.30 | N.A. | -- | 36.38 | 12.23 | -- |
| 1959 | 40.74 | 67.17 | 77.30 | N.A. | .-- | 39.34 | 13.11 | -- |
| 1960 | 48.44 | 74.98 | 84.90 | N.A. | -- | 35.40 | 11.68 |  |
| 1961 | 50.83 | 76.66 | 86.90 | N.A. | -- | 33.69 | 11.78 | -- |
| 1962 | 52.74 | 82.49 | 95.00 | N. A. | -- | 36.09 | 13.16 | -- |
| 1963 | 50.18 | 78.86 | 97.50 | N.A. | -- | 36.36 | 13.82 | -- |
| 1964 | 49.84 | 74.77 | 88.20 | N.A. | -- | 33.35 | 15.22 | -- |
| 1965 | 46.34 | 74.86 | 86.50 | N.A. | -- | 38.09 | 13.46 | -- |
| 1966 | 50.50 | 78.99 | 90.79 | 113.10 | 44.65 | 36.06 | 12.99 | 19.73 |
| 1967 | 45.85 | 70.75 | 93.80 | 115.30 | 39.76 | 35.20 | 24.58 | 18.64 |
| 1968 | 52.26 | 77.64 | 103.99 | 143.72 | 36.36 | 32.69 | 25.34 | 27.64 |
| 1969 | 51.66 | 85.38 | 120.30 | 149.35 | 34.59 | 39.49 | 29.02 | 19.45 |
| 1970 | 57.32 | 85.00 | 134.68 | N.A. | -- | 32.56 | 36.89 | -- |
| 1971 | 52.68 | 86.03 | 127.24 | 154.83 | 34.02 | 38.77 | 32.39 | 44.44 |

1/See footnote of table 20.
2/Exvessel prices of Pacific halibut in dressed weight from Seattle.
3/See footnotes for the markup columns in table 15.

Table 22.--Canned pink salmon: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1950-65

| Year | Prices ${ }^{1 / 1}$ |  |  |  | Fishermen's share of retail price | Processors | Markups 4/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vesse12/ } \end{aligned}$ | Processin | Whole- sale | Retail |  |  | Wholesalers | $\mathrm{Re}-$ tailers |
|  |  | - | - |  |  |  | Percent |  |
| 1950 | 13.17 | 30.83 | 38.19 | 47.60 | 27.66 | 57.29 | 19.27 | 19.76 |
| 1951 | 20.50 | 39.55 | 47.48 | 67.80 | 33.17 | 48.17 | 16.70 | 23.18 |
| 1952 | 15.67 | 33.54 | 40.98 | 55.90 | 28.03 | 53.28 | 18.17 | 26.68 |
| 1953 | 15.54 | 32.38 | 39.40 | 52.80 | 29.43 | 52.02 | 17.81 | 25.38 |
| 1954 | 14.64 | 32.18 | 39.48 | 52.10 | 28.10 | 54.50 | 18.49 | 24.21 |
| 1955 | 16.87 | 37.20 | 43.62 | 55.90 | 30.18 | 54.65 | 14.72 | 21.97 |
| 1956 | 15.52 | 39.62 | 47.23 | 60.30 | 25.74 | 60.84 | 16.11 | 21.66 |
| 1957 | 19.50 | 40.57 | 47.22 | 62.50 | 31.20 | 51.93 | 14.09 | 24.45 |
| 1958 | 15.33 | 39.24 | 46.79 | 62.80 | 24.41 | 60.90 | 16.14 | 25.50 |
| 1959 | 19.00 | 41.49 | 48.59 | 62.00 | 30.65 | 54.19 | 14.62 | 21.62 |
| 1960 | 21.57 | 45.19 | 52.67 | 66.30 | 32.68 | 52.05 | 14.19 | 20.57 |
| 1961 | 16.83 | 47.75 | 58.17 | 74.31 | 22.65 | 64.76 | 17.91 | 21.71 |
| 1962 | 23.67 | 48.37 | 57.14 | 76.50 | 30.94 | 51.06 | 15.35 | 25.31 |
| 1963 | 19.50 | 41.82 | 50.15 | 76.50 | 25.49 | 53.37 | 16.62 | 34.45 |
| 1964 | 17.67 | 37.01 | 45.83 | 71.00 | 24.88 | 52.27 | 19.23 | 35.45 |
| 1965 | 17.33 | 40.10 | 48.69 | 67.40 | 25.72 | 56.77 | 17.64 | 27.77 |

1/Exvessel prices from Alaska, processing prices from the table on Processing Fishery Products in the Fishery Statistics of the United States, wholesale and retail prices from BLS.
2/Exvessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of canned product weight from round weight.
3/Canned fish processors offer promotional allowances in certain short periods of the year for selected dealers. The number of transactions involved and quantities transacted in each deal are not known. There is no quantitative information to be based on to adjust the processing price. These allowances were therefore not included in this analysis.
4/See footnotes for the markup columns in table 15.

Table 23.--Canned tuna (chunk): Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1950-71

| Year | Prices ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  |  | Fishermen's share of retail price | Markups $4 /$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vessel2/ } \end{aligned}$ | Processing | Whote- <br> sale | Retail |  | Processors | Whotesalers | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Re}- \\ & \text { tailers } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | cent | S/1b:- | ------ |  |  | Percent |  |
| 1950 | 37.45 | 55.54 | 69.01 | N.A. | -- | 43.37 | 19.52 | -- |
| 1951 | 30.11 | 55.41 | 65.95 | N.A. | -- | 45.66 | 15.98 | -- |
| 1952 | 30.98 | 56.70 | 67.49 | N.A. | -- | 45.71 | 15.99 | -- |
| 1953 | 31.02 | 59.32 | 71.10 | 94.00 | 33.00 | 47.71 | 16.57 | 24.36 |
| 1954 | 32.70 | 58.61 | 69.40 | 96.20 | 33.99 | 44.21 | 15.54 | 27.86 |
| 1955 | 29.32 | 54.48 | 64.96 | 90.31 | 32.47 | 46.19 | 16.13 | 28.07 |
| 1956 | 26.56 | 49.36 | 56.57 | 80.40 | 33.04 | 46.19 | 12.74 | 29.65 |
| 1957 | 25.59 | 50.08 | 57.82 | 79.00 | 32.40 | 48.90 | 13.37 | 26.81 |
| 1958 | 27.31 | 51.88 | 59.64 | 81.40 | 33.55 | 47.36 | 13.01 | 26.73 |
| 1959 | 26.17 | 48.64 | 55.73 | 81.40 | 32.14 | 46.20 | 12.73 | 31.54 |
| 1960 | 27.17 | 49.42 | 56.49 | 80.01 | 33.96 | 45.03 | 12.51 | 29.39 |
| 1961 | 25.86 | 49.81 | 57.87 | 79.70 | 32.44 | 48.09 | 13.93 | 27.39 |
| 1962 | 28.68 | 52.96 | 61.57 | 84.35 | 34.00 | 45.84 | 13.99 | 27.01 |
| 1963 | 24.47 | 48.72 | 57.77 | 82.70 | 29.59 | 49.76 | 15.68 | 30.14 |
| 1964 | 25.04 | 48.57 | 59.29 | 78.70 | 31.82 | 48.44 | 18.08 | 24.65 |
| 1965 | 25.61 | 50.18 | 59.45 | 78.70 | 32.55 | 48.96 | 15.59 | 24.46 |
| 1966 | 28.53 | 57.44 | 68.52 | 87.10 | 32.76 | 50.33 | 16.17 | 21.33 |
| 1967 | 25.80 | 53.94 | 64.40 | 85.90 | 30.04 | 52.16 | 16.24 | 25.03 |
| 1968 | 33.02 | 57.24 | 66.20 | 84.90 | 38.89 | 42.31 | 13.54 | 22.02 |
| 1969 | 34.95 | 60.14 | 69.72 | 87.90 | 39.76 | 41.88 | 13.74 | 20.68 |
| 1970 | 38.09 | 66.28 | 78.97 | 97.00 | 39.27 | 42.53 | 16.07 | 18.59 |
| 1971 | 43.39 | 75.93 | 87.39 | 108.30 | 40.06 | 42.85 | 13.12 | 19.31 |

I/ Ex-vessel prices are weighted average prices for all tuna landed in the United States, processing prices from the Fishery Statistics of the United States, wholesale and retail prices from BLS.

2/ Ex-vessel prices are converted to the equivalent value of canned product weight from round weight.

3/ See footnote 3 of table 22.
4/ See footnotes 3, 4, and 5 of table 15.

Table 24.--Frozen raw peeled shrimp: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1959-71

| Year | Princesl/ |  |  |  | Fishermen's <br> share of retail price | Processors | Markups 5/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | vessel | Processing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Whole- } \\ & \text { sale3/ } \end{aligned}$ | Retail4/ |  |  | Wholesalers | Retaīlers |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1959 | 56.50 | 81.00 | 98.56 | 155.50 | 36.33 | 30.25 | 17.81 | 36.62 |
| 1960 | 63.30 | 85.80 | 103.00 | 155.10 | 40.81 | 26.22 | 16.70 | 33.60 |
| 1961 | 70.60 | 108.70 | 126.58 | 157.70 | 44.77 | 35.05 | 14.13 | 19.73 |
| 1962 | 87.30 | 123.10 | 148.00 | 186.00 | 46.94 | 29.08 | 16.82 | 20.43 |
| 1963 | 64.20 | 116.56 | 132.60 | 175.80 | 36.52 | 44.92 | 12.10 | 24.57 |
| 1964 | 71.90 | 114.20 | 123.00 | 162.00 | 44.38 | 37.04 | 7.16 | 24.07 |
| 1965 | 77.00 | 119.00 | 132.90 | 176.70 | 43.58 | 35.30 | 10.46 | 24.79 |
| 1966 | 95.09 | 133.13 | 164.36 | 196.10 | 48.49 | 28.57 | 19.00 | 16.19 |
| 1967 | 83.41 | 131.45 | 161.70 | 209.40 | 39.83 | 36.55 | 18.71 | 22.78 |
| 1968 | 97.69 | 144.24 | 181.87 | 215.99 | 45.23 | 32.27 | 20.69 | 15.80 |
| 1969 | 105.30 | 156.98 | 190.19 | 231.99 | 45.39 | 32.92 | 17.46 | 18.02 |
| 1970 | 103.68 | 154.29 | 185.20 | 240.00 | 43.20 | 32.81 | 16.69 | 22.83 |
| 1971 | 122.87 | . 170.30 | 204.79 | 246.40 | 49.87 | 27.85 | 16.84 | 16.89 |

1/Weighted average for all shrimp landed in South Atlantic and Gulf States, converted from headless to peeled prices.
2/Weighted average of raw peeled shrimp processed in the Gulf region, Fishery Statistics of the U.S., Department of Commerce, i959-1971.
3/Frozen raw headless, New York City, converted to peeled prices.
4/Frozen raw headless at New York City, 1959-63; BLS 41- city average price from 1964 to present--converted to raw peeled price.
5/See footnotes for the markup columns in table 15.

Table 25.--Live American lobsters: Prices at three market levels, fishermen's share in retail market and markups at two market levels, 1959-71

| Year | Prices |  |  | Fishermen's <br> share of <br> retail <br> price | Markups 4/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vessel I/ } \end{aligned}$ | Wholesale $2 /$ | Retail $3 /$ |  | Wholesalers | Retailers |
|  | --- | Cents/] | - | - - - - | Percent | - |
| 1959 | 50.10 | 87.00 | 102.00 | 49.12 | 42.41 | 14.70 |
| 1960 | 45.70 | 77.00 | 99.00 | 46.16 | 40.65 | 22.22 |
| 1961 | 53.20 | 86.00 | 117.00 | 45.47 | 38.14 | 26.50 |
| 1962 | 50.70 | 82.99 | 113.00 | 44.87 | 38.91 | 26.55 |
| 1963 | 55.40 | 86.00 | 109.00 | 50.82 | 35.58 | 21.11 |
| 1964 | 66.20 | 98.00 | 121.00 | 54.71 | 32.45 | 19.01 |
| 1965 | 75.20 | 120.00 | 147.00 | 51.16 | 37.33 | 18.37 |
| 1966 | 74.87 | 116.11 | 145.01 | 51.63 | 35.52 | 19.93 |
| 1967 | 82.50 | 127.00 | 151.00 | 54.64 | 35.04 | 15.90 |
| 1968 | 73.95 | 132.13 | N.A. | -- | 44.03 | -- |
| 1969 | 88.09 | 133.00 | N.A. | -- | 33.77 | -- |
| 1970 | 99.20 | 153.99 | N.A. | -- | 35.16 | -- |
| 1971 | 108.40 | 178.99 | N.A. | -- | 39.44 | -- |

1/Weighted average value of landings in Maine. $\overline{2} /$ Live, chicken size, New York City. 3/Live, chicken size, New York City. (4/See footnotes for markup columns in table 12.

Table 26.--Fresh sea scallops, shacked: Prices at three market levels, fishermen's share at retail level and markups at two market levels, 1959-71

| Prices |  |  |  | Fishermen's <br> share of retail price | Markups 4/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { Ex- }} \\ & \text { vesse1 1/ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Whole- } \\ & \text { sale }{ }^{2} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | Retail $3 /$ |  | Wholesalers | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Re- } \\ & \text { tailers } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | - - - | Cents/ | .--- - | - - - | Percen | - |
| 1959 | 48.40 | 55.20 | 90.00 | 53.78 | 12.32 | 38.67 |
| 1960 | 34.90 | 41.70 | 78.00 | 44.75 | 16.30 | 46.54 |
| 1961 | 38.00 | 44.80 | 77.00 | 49.35 | 15.18 | 41.82 |
| 1962 | 40.70 | 47.10 | 78.00 | 52.19 | 13.58 | 39.61 |
| 1963 | 45.70 | 51.50 | 83.00 | 55.05 | 11.28 | 37.95 |
| 1964 | 54.60 | 61.60 | 97.00 | 56.29 | 11.36 | 36.50 |
| 1965 | 67.50 | 73.90 | 114.00 | 59.21 | 8.67 | 35.17 |
| 1966 | 49.24 | 65.27 | 96.99 | 50.77 | 24.55 | 32.71 |
| 1967 | 77.20 | 95.50 | 121.00 | 63.80 | 19.16 | 21.07 |
| 1968 | 112.00 | 126.22 | 175.07 | 63.97 | 11.27 | 27.91 |
| 1969 | 110.80 | 124.50 | 167.82 | 66.02 | 11.01 | 25.81 |
| 1970 | 136.00 | 147.00 | 188.00 | 72.34 | 7.49 | 21.81 |
| 1971 | 148.01 | 164.00 | 189.93 | 77.93 | 9.75 | 13.65 |

1/ New Bedford, Mass., prices, shucked form.
2/ Boston, Mass., 5-pound package, raw. Wholesaler and processor are combined since scallops are landed shucked. Washing, sorting, and packing are done by the wholesaler.

3/ Baltimore, Md.
4/ See footnotes for the markup columns in table 15.

Table 27.--Fresh blue crab meat: Prices at four market levels, fishermen's share at retail level, and markups at three market levels, 1959-71

| Year | Prices |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fisher- } \\ & \text { men's } \\ & \text { share of } \\ & \text { retail } \\ & \text { price } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Markups 5/ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Ex- } \\ & \text { vesselI/ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pro- } \\ & \text { cessing? } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Whole- } \\ & \text { sale } 3 / \end{aligned}$ | Retail $4 /$ |  | Processors | Wholesalers | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{Re}- \\ & \text { tailers } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | ---- | Cants/1b.- |  |  |  |  | Percent |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | s |  |
| 1959 | 54.30 | 97.51 | 105.50 | 138.50 | 39.21 | 44.31 | 7.57 | 23.83 |
| 1960 | 39.39 | 91.00 | 112.00 | 147.10 | 26.72 | 56.81 | 18.75 | 23.86 |
| 1961 | 34.30 | 81.28 | 86.00 | 120.10 | 28.56 | 57.80 | 5.48 | 28.40 |
| 1962 | 39.30 | 94.40 | 106.50 | 141.00 | 27.87 | 58.37 | 11.35 | 24.47 |
| 1963 | 42.10 | 100.70 | 115.80 | 164.20 | 25.64 | 58.20 | 13.04 | 29.48 |
| 1964 | 50.70 | 113.36 | 127.00 | 178.89 | 28.34 | 55.27 | 10.74 | 29.01 |
| 1965 | 54.30 | 125.92 | 128.60 | 181.40 | 29.94 | 56.87 | 2.08 | 29.11 |
| 1966 | 44.34 | 113.11 | 118.81 | 164.20 | 27.00 | 60.80 | 4.80 | 27.64 |
| 1967 | 41.40 | 126.79 | 130.20 | 180.20 | 22.98 | 67.35 | 2.62 | 27.75 |
| 1968 | 79.37 | 155.69 | 186.83 | 270.55 | 29.34 | 49.02 | 16.67 | 30.95 |
| 1969 | 65.69 | 158.31 | 189.86 | 253.00 | 25.96 | 58.51 | 16.62 | 24.96 |
| 1970 | 44.98 | 121.45 | 145.27 | 209.00 | 21.52 | 62.96 | 16.39 | 30.49 |
| 1971 | 59.97 | 155.91 | 170.61 | 241.00 | 24.88 | 61.54 | 8.62 | 29.20 |

1/Chesapeake Bay hard crab prices from live weight to meat weight basis. 2/Processed Fishery Products, Chesapeake Bay Fisheries, Fishery Statistics of the United States, Department of Commerce, 1959-71.
3/Weighted average of regular, lump and claw meats from Hampton, Virginia, Market News Annual Feport, 1959- 71.
4/Adjusted weighted average prices for fresh, regular, lump., and claw meats in Baltimore, Mid.
5/See footnotes for the markup columns in table 15.

Table 28.--Gross profit and costs, as percentage of sales, for retail grocery stores, by form of organization, 1963-67

|  | Business receipts | Cost of sales | Gross profit | Materials <br> \& supplies | Other costs | Capital costs | Labor | Operating expenses | Net profit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . 1963 | 100 | 78.9 | 21.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 15.2 | 1.5 |
| 1964 | 100 | 78.5 | 21.5 | . 3 | . 5 | 2.6 | . 9 | 15.5 | 1.7 |
| 1965 | 100 | 78.8 | 21.2 | . 2 | . 4 | 2.7 | . 9 | 15.4 | 1.6 |
| 1966 | 100 | 78.5 | 21.5 | . 3 | . 4 | 2.7 | . 9 | 15.8 | 1.4 |
| 1967 | 100 | 78.6 | 21.4 | . 3 | . 4 | 2.7 | . 9 | 15.6 | 1.5 |
| Partnerships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1963 | 100 | 80.7 | 19.3 | . 3 | . 6 | 2.0 | . 6 | 11.0 | 4.8 |
| 1964 | 100 | 79.3 | 20.7 | . 3 | . 5 | 2.1 | . 7 | 11.9 | 5.2 |
| 1965 | 100 | 79.2 | 20.8 | . 4 | . 5 | - 2.0 | . 6 | 12.1 | 5.2 |
| 1966 | 100 | 79.8 | 20.2 | . 4 | . 5 | 1.9 | . 6 | 11.7 | 5.1 |
| 1967 | 100 | 79.2 | 20.8 | . 4 | . 5 | 2.1 | . 8 | 11.5 | 5.5 |
| Proprietorships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1963$ | 100 | 81.8 | 18.2 | . 3 | 1.0 | 2.4 | . 6 | 9.2 | 4.7 |
| 1964 | 100 | 80.7 | 19.3 | . 3 | 1.2 | 2.6 | . 6 | 9.6 | 5.0 |
| 1965 | 100 | 80.9 | 19.1 | . 2 | . 2 | 2.6 | . 6 | 10.6 | 4.9 |
| 1966 | 100 | 81.8 | 18.2 | . 3 | . 4 | 2.5 | . 5 | 9.5 | 5.0 |
| 1967 | 100 | 81.3 | 18.7 | . 3 | . 4 | 2.4 | . 5 | 10.4 | 4.7 |

Source: Compiled from the income statements prepared by the Internal Revenue Service for sole proprietorships.

Table 29.--Gross profit and costs, as percentage of sales, for wholesale groceries and related products, 1957-58 to 1967


Source: Compiled from the income statements prepared by the Internal Revenue Service for sole proprietorships.

Table 30.--Gross profit and costs, as percentage of sales, for food and kindred product processing,

| Period | Business <br> receipts | Cost of <br> sales | Gross <br> profit | Materials <br> \& supplies | Other <br> costs | Capital <br> costs | Labor <br> Operating <br> expenses | Net <br> profit |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1957-58$ | 100 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 2.4 |
| $1958-59$ | 100 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 2.4 |
| $1959-60$ | 100 | 63.7 | 36.3 | 4.7 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 18.1 | 5.1 |
| $1960-61$ | 100 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 5.8 |
| $1961-62$ | 100 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | 6.3 |
| $1962-63$ | 100 | 64.4 | 35.6 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 19.5 | 4.8 |
| $1963-64$ | 100 | 57.0 | 43.0 | 7.6 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 19.2 | 5.0 |
| $1964-65$ | 100 | 61.3 | 38.7 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 19.4 | 5.3 |
| 1965 | 100 | 58.9 | 41.1 | 5.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 5.9 | 17.9 | 5.3 |
| 1966 | 100 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 17.7 | 5.5 |
| 1967 | 100 | 63.4 | 36.6 | 6.0 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 16.1 | 5.3 |

Source: Compiled from the income statements prepared by the Internal Revenue Service for sole proprietorships.

Table 31.--Comparative income statements of canned and cured seafood processing plants for 1954, 1958, 1963, and 1967

|  | 1954 |  | 1957 |  | 1963 |  | 1967 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million | Per | Million | Per | Million | Per | Mil1ion | Per |
|  | dollars | cent | dollars | cent | dollars | cent | dollars | cent |
| Total sales (inc. resales) | 237.9 | 100.0 | 325.1 | 100.0 | 452.5 | 100.0 | 523.1 | 100.0 |
| Value of resales | (30.3) | (11.1) | (19.7) | ( 6.1) | (44.8) | ( 9.9) | (83.3) | (15.9) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost of sales | 160.2 | 58.5 | 146.9 | 45.2 | 190.3 | 42.1 | 247.6 | 47.3 |
| Finfish round | 114.5 | 41.8 | 115.2 | 35.4 | 126.9 | 28.0 | 137.6 | 26.3 |
| Shellfish | 18.6 | 6.8 | 14.8 | 4.6 | 23.1 | 5.1 | 37.2 | 7.1 |
| Cost of resales | 27.1 | 9.9 | 16.9 | 5.2 | 40.2 | 8.9 | 72.8 | 13.9 |
| Gross profit | 113.7 | 41.5 | 178.2 | 54.8 | 262.2 | 57.9 | 275.5 | 52.7 |
| Material costs | 32.7 | 11.9 | 77.9 | 24.0 | 87.5 | 19.3 | 94.5. | 18.1 |
| Wages | 34.8 | 12.7 | 37.4 | 11.5 | 52.6 | 11.6 | 54.8 | 10.5 |
| Capital costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating expenses | 46.1 | 16.8 | 62.8 | 19.3 | 122.0 | 27.0 | 126.2 | 24.1 |
| Net profit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Compiled from Industry Statistics of the Census of Manufactures, United States Department of Commerce

Table 32.--Comparative income statements of packaged:seafood processing plants for 1954, 1958, 1963, and 1967

|  | 1954 |  | 1958 |  | 1963 |  | 1967 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million | Per | Million | Per | Million | Per | Million | Per |
|  | dollars | cent | dollars | cent | dollars | cent | dollars | cent |
| Total sales (inc. resales) | 164.6 | 100.0 | 307.4 | 100.0 | 391.2 | $\overline{100.0}$ | $\frac{557.4}{}$ | 100.0 |
| Value of Resales . | (12.1) | ( 7.4) | (24.7) | ( 8.0) | (29.1) | ( 7.5) | (37.9) | ( 6.8) |
| Cost of sales: | 90.0 | 54.7 | 168.3 | 54.8 | 199.3 | 50.9 | 285.8 | 51.3 |
| Finfish round | 39.3 | 23.9 | 68.0 | 22.1 | 86.2 | 22.0 | 102.8 | 18.4 |
| Shellfish | 40.1 | 24.4 | 79.6 | 25.9 | 88.0 | 22.5 | 155.5 | 27.9 |
| Cost of resales | 10.5 | 6.4 | 20.7 | 6.8 | 25.1 | 6.4 | 27.5 | 5.0 |
| Gross profit | 74.7 | 45.4 | 139.1 | 45.2 | 191.9 | 49.1 | 271.6 | 48.7 |
| Material costs | 29.0 | 17.6 | 56.7 | 18.5 | 73.5 | 18.8 | 106.7 | 19.1 |
| Wages | 21.5 | 13.0 | 31.9 | 10.4 | 44.6 | 11.4 | 60.0 | 10.8 |
| Capital costs | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating expenses | 24.2 | 14.8 | 50.5 | 16.4 | 73.9 | 18.9 | 104.9 | 18.8 |
| Net profit. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Compiled from Industry Statistics of the Census of Manufactures, United States Department of Commerce.

Table 33.--Costs and profit on percentages of net sales of restaurants collected by different agencies at different years


1/ Business Income Tax Return Statistics, 1967, Internal Revenue Service.
2/ Barometer of Small Business: for restaurants grossing $\$ 25,000$ ro
3/ National Restaurant Association for restaurants grossing $\$ 300,000$ to $\$ 500,000$ annually.

Table 34.--Net profit before taxes as percentage of sales at three market levels of food products in general in the United States, 1953-54 to 1966

| Period | Processor | Wholesaler | Retailer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent- | ------- |
| 1953-54 | 3.5 | N.A. | 2.1 |
| 1954-55 | 3.3 | N.A. | 2.0 |
| 1955-56 | 3.9 | N.A. | 2.0 |
| 1956-57 | 3.7 | N.A. | 2.1 |
| 1957-58 | 3.4 | N.A. | 2.0 |
| 1958-59 | 3.3 | . 8 | 1.9 |
| 1959-60 | 3.4 | . 9 | 1.8 |
| 1960-61 | 3.3 | . 8 | 1.7 |
| 1961-62 1/ | 4.1 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| 1962-63 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
| 1963-64 | 4.0 | . 7 | 2.7 |
| 1964-65 | 3.9 | . 9 | 1.7 |
| 1965 | 4.0 | . 9 | 1.5 |
| 1966 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.8 |
| 1967 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 1.6 |

1/ Corporations that incurred losses were not included in this year's report.

Source: Compiled from Business Income Tax Return Statistics for corporations (proprietorships and partnerships are excluded), Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

Table 35.-Costs and profit, as percentage of net sales, for each type of fish processing plant compared with food processing in general, 1967

|  | Fresh \& frozen packaged fish1/ | Canned \& cured seafoocs l/ | Groundfish filleting fishery2/ | Average | Food processing: food and kindred products ${ }^{3 /}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ----------Percent- |  |  |  |  |
| Net sales | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Cost of sales | 51.3 | 47.3 | 66.3 | 55.0 | 63.4 |
| Gross profit | 48.7 | 52.7 | 33.7 | 45.0 | 36.6 |
| Material costs | 19.1 | 18.1 | 6.7 | 14.6 | 7.8 |
| Labor | 10.8 | 10.5 | 12.5 | 11.3 | 4.1 |
| Capital costs | 4/3.3 | $4 / 5.1$ | 9.0 | 5.8 | 3.3 |
| Operating expenses | 4/11.5 | 4/15.6 | 6.4 | 11.2 | 16.1 |
| Net profit before tax | 5/4.0 | 5/3.4 | -0.9 | 2.2 | 5.3 |

1/Census of Hanufactures (including fin- and shellfish) 1967, U.S. Department of Commerce.
2/Groundfish: Fishing and Filletins, a special study of 23 firms in 1954, 55, 56, made by U.S. Tariff Comission.
3/Business Incone Tax Returns Statistics, 1967, Internal Revenue Service. 4/Derived from the ratios of the 2 items in general food processing as reported by Internal Revenue Service, 1967.
5/Derived from financial statenents collected by Moody's on fishery product processors and canners, 1969.

Table 36.--Costs and profit as percentages of net sales of retail foodstores collected by different agencies at different years

|  | Groceries 1964 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Food } \\ & \text { stores 2/ } \\ & \quad 1967 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Super- } \\ & \text { market 3/ } \end{aligned}$ | Average | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Meat } \\ & \text { market 4/ } \\ & 1964 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Meat and } \\ & \text { fish market 2/ } \\ & 1967 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Average | Food stores in Portland, Me 1964-655/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | --- |  |  | -Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Net sales | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| $\because \quad$ Cost of sales | 83.18 | 81.90 | 80.25 | 81.78 | 79.23 | 79.08 | 79.15 | 64.33 |
| ) Gross profit | 16.82 | 18.10 | 19.75 | 18.22 | 20.92 | 20.92 | 20.85 | 35.67 |
| ¢\% Material costs | 0.51 | 0.80 | 0.80 | . 70 | 1.19 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 5.97 |
| Labor | 4.37 | . 60 | 1.25 | 4.12 | 7.04 | 7.00 | 7.02 | 7.40 |
| $\therefore$ Capital costs | 2.34 | 2.60 | 3.34 | 2.76 | 2.35 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.00 |
| O. Operating expenses | 4.38 | 9.90 | 12.56 | 6.90 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 19.77 |
| \% $\begin{array}{r}\text { Net profit } \\ \text { before tax }\end{array}$ |  | 4. | 1.80 | 3.74 | 6.23 | 6.12 | 6.17 | 0.53 |

I/ For groceries with annual gross sales under $\$ 200,000$. 410 samples collected by the Barometer of Small Business, Accounting Corporation of America.

2/ Statistics of Income, 1967, Internal Revenue Service.
3/ For self-service food stores with annual gross sales above $\$ 1$ million. Nationwide samples collected by the Super Market Institute, Inc., 1963.

4/ Barometer of Small Business, Accounting Corporation of America.
5/ A special study of 15 stores in Portland, Maine, made by National Commission of Food Marketing and published in Food Retailing in 1966.

Table 37.--Fresh haddock fillets: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capital } \\ & \text { costs } \end{aligned}$ | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | Price | - | - - - | Cents | per poun | ----- | - |
| Retailing | 120.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 21.38 | 1.02 | 1.32 | 4.02 | 14.67 | 0.35 |
| Wholesaling | 98.72 | 8.69 | 1.29 | 0.53 | 0.80 | 3.95 | 2.12 |
| Processing | 90.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 22.28 | 8.13 | 4.95 | 1.74 | 5.64 | 1.82 |
| Harvesting | 67.75 | 67.75 | 13.28 | 31.98 | 11.25 | 8.33 | 2.91 |
| Total |  | 120.10 | 23.72 | 38.78 | 17.81 | 32.59 | 7.20 |

Table 38.--Fresh flounder fillets: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | - | - | - | Cents | per pound | ---- | ---- |
| Retailing | 129.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 44.73 | 1.48 | 2.19 | 6.08 | 30.91 | 4.07 |
| Wholesaling | 8.4 .66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 14.80 | 1.98 | 0.90 | 1.20 | 6.72 | 4.00 |
| Processing | 69.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 26.07 | 9.52 | 5.79 | 2.03 | 6.60 | 2.14 |
| Harvesting | 43.79 | 43.79 | 8.14 | 20.58 | 7.88 | 4.95 | 2.23 |
| Total |  | 129.39 | 21.12 | 29.46 | 17.19 | 49.18 | 12.44 |

Table 39.--Fresh cod fillets: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Operating expenses | Net profit |
|  | - | - | --- | Cents | per poun | - - - - | ----- |
| Retailing | 105.17 | 31.60 | 1.14 | 1.61 | 4.30 | 21.68 | 2.87 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whotesating | 73.57 | 9.95 | 1.47 | 0.61 | 0.92 | 4.52 | 2.43 |
| Processing | 63.62 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.4 |
|  |  | 26.69 | 9.74 | 5.93 | 2.08 | 6.75 | 2.19 |
| Harvesting | 36.93 | 36.93 | 7.24 | 17.43 | 6.13 | 3.54 | 2.59 |
| Total |  | 105.17 | 19.59 | 25.58 | 13.43 | 36.49 | 10.08 |

Table 40.--Frozen ocean perch fillets: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels Labor |  | Capita costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | Prer | - | -- | - Cents | per poun | ---- | ----- |
| Retailing | 63.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wholesaling | 40.13 | 23.64 | 0.97 | 1.29 | 3.98 | 13.86 | 3.54 |
| Processing | 30.24 | 9.89 | 1:46 | 0.60 | 0.91 | 4.49 | 2.42 |
|  |  | 14.37 | 4.25 | 4.19 | 1.12 | 3.64 | 1.18 |
|  |  | 15.87 | 2.56 | 7.47 | 3.35 | 1.13 | 1.36 |
| Total |  | 63.77 | 9.24 | 13.55 | 2.36 | 23.12 | 8.50 |

Table $41 .--F r e s h$ and frozen halibut steak: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | -- | - | --- | Cents | per pound | ---- | ----- |
| Retailing | 105.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wholesaling | 84.80 | 20.50 | 0.84 | 1.29 | 3.46 | 13.04 | 1.87 |
| Processing | 75.45 | 9.35 | 1.38 | 0.57 | 0.86 | 4.24 | 2.29 |
| Harvesting | 49.92 | 25.53 | 9.32 | 5.67 | 1.99 | 6.46 | 2.09 |
|  |  | 49.92 | 9.24 | 18.27 | 10.68 | 5.99 | 5.74 |
| Total |  | 105.30 | 20.78 | 25.80 | 16.99 | 29.73 | 11.99 |

Table 42.--Fresh king salmon steak: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Marsin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | - - - | - - - | - - - - | Cents | per pound | - - - - | - - - - |
| Retailing | 168.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 29.04 | 1.49 | 1.83 | 4.91 | 18.47 | 2.64 |
| Wholesaling | 139.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 95.27 | 44.67 | 6.61 | 2.72 | 4.11 | 25.28 | 5.94 |
| Processing |  | 35.46 | 12.94 | 7.87 | 2.77 | 8.97 | 2.91 |
| Harvesting | 59.81 | 59.81 | 7.48 | 19.44 | 19.02 | 6.64 | 7.23 |
| Total |  | 168.98 | 28.22 | 31.86 | 30.71 | 59.36 | 18.72 |

Table 43.--Fresh dressed king salmon: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials <br> \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | - - - | - - - | - - - - | Cents | per pound | - - - | - - - - - |
| Retailing | 152.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 24.68 | 1.01 | 1.55 | 4.17 | 15.70 | 2.25 |
| Wholesaling | 127.41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 41.94 | 6.21 | 2.57 | 3.86 | 23.73 | 5.57 |
| Processing | 85.47 | 31.58 | 11.53 | 7.01 | 2.46 | 7.99 | 2.59 |
| Harvesting | 53.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 53.89 | 6.74 | 17.51 | 17.14 | 5.98 | 6.52 |
| Total |  | 152.09 | 25.48 | 28.64 | 27.63 | 53.40 | 16.93 |

Table 44.--Canned tuna (chunks): margin components by marketing
functions, 1963-65 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels Labor |  | Capita | Operating | Net profit |
|  | --- | --- | - - - | - Cents | per po | ---- | ----- |
| Retailing | $\bigcirc 73.97$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 58.20 | 15.77 | 0.65 | 0.99 | 2.67 | 10.03 | 1.44 |
|  |  | 9.58 | 1.42 | 0.58 | 0.88 | 4.35 | 2.35 |
| Processing | 48.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 23.85 | 8.18 | 4.75 | 2.31 | 7.06 | 1.55 |
| Harvesting | 24.77 | 24.77 | 3.27 | 10.28 | 6.24 | 3.24 | 1.7 |
| Total |  | 73.97 | 13.52 | 16.60 | 12.10 | 24.68 | 7.07 |

Table 45.--Canned tuna (chunk): margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Uperating experises | Net profit before tax |
|  | --- | --- | --- | Cents | per poun | ---- | - - - - |
| Retailing | 97.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 19.04 | 0.78 | 1.20 | 3.22 | 12.11 | 1.73 |
| Wholesaling | 78.69 |  | \% |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 11.24 | 1.66 | 0.69 | 1.03 | 5.10 | 2.75 |
| Processing | 67.45 | 28.64 | 9.82 | 5.70 | 2.78 | 8.48 | 1.86 |
| Harvesting | 38.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 38.81 | 5.12 | 16.10 | 9.78 | 5.08 | 2.72 |
| Total |  | 97.73 | 17.38 | 23.69 | 16.81 | 30.77 | 9.05 |

Table 46 .--Canned pink salmon: margin components by marketing functions, 1963-65. average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Material <br> \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | - | - | -- | Cents | per poun | ---- | ---- |
| Retailing | 71.63 | 23.41 | 0.80 | 1.20 | 3.46 | 13.89 | 4.06 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wholesaling | 48.22 | 8.58 | 1.27 | 0.52 | 0.79 | 3.90 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.10 |
| Processing | 18.17 | 21.47 | 7.36 | 4.27 | 2.08 | 6.36 | 1.40 |
| Harvesting |  |  |  | 7.09 | 3.96 |  |  |
|  |  | 18.17 | 1.78 |  |  | 2.40 | 2.93 |
| Total |  | 71.63: | 11.21 | 13.08 | 10.29 | 26.55 | 10.49 |

Table 47.--Frozen raw peeled shrimp: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average.

| Function | Price Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Materials \& fuels |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capital } \\ & \text { costs } \end{aligned}$ costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | - - - - | --- | Cents | per pound | ---- |  |
| Retailing | 239.46 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 46.07 | 1.89 | 2.90 | 7.79 | 29.30 | 4.19 |
| Wholesaling | 193.39 |  |  |  |  |  |
| oces | $160.52{ }^{32.87}$ | 4.86 | 2.21 | 3.32 | 14.92 | 7.55 |
|  | 49.90 | 12.47 | 15.57 | 4.64 | 11.23 | 6.99 |
| Harvesting | $\begin{array}{r} 110.62 \\ 110.62 \end{array}$ | 15.38 | 41.59 | 18.36 | 28.21 | 7.08 |
| Total | 239.46 | 34.60 | 62.27 | 34.11 | 83.66 | 25.81 |

Table 48.--Blue crab meats: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price | Margin | Components of marain |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capital } \\ & \text { costs } \end{aligned}$ | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  |  | - | -- | - Cents | per poun |  |  |
| Retailing | 234.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wholesaling | 168.58 | 65.75 | 2.70 | 4.14 | 11.11 | 41.82 | 5.98 |
|  | 145.22 | 23.36 | 3.46 | 1.42 | 2.15 | 10.61 | 5.72 |
|  |  | 88.34 | 22.35 | 39.05 | 2.94 | 19.81 | 4.18 |
|  |  | 56.88 | 9.27 | 24.52 | 5.57 | 14.16 | 3.41 |
| Total |  | 234.33 | 37.78 | 69.13 | 21.77 | 86.40 | 19.29 |

Table 49.--Live American lobsters: margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average

| Function | Price Margin | Components of margin |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Materials \& fuels | Labor | Capital costs | Operating expenses | Net profit before tax |
|  | ----- | ---- | Cents | per pound | - - - - | ---- - |
| Retailing | 147.67 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 26.63 | 1.09 | 1.68 | 4.50 | 16.94 | 2.42 |
| Wholesaling | 121.0443 .52 | 10.01 | 5.66 | 3.05 | 20.45 | 4.35 |
| Processing | (live) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvesting | 77.5277 .52 | 12.64 | 33.41 | 7.60 | 19.22 | 4.65 |
| Total | 147.67 | 23.74 | 40.75 | 15.15 | 56.67 | 11.42 |

Table 50.--Fresh sea scallops (shucked): margin components by marketing functions, 1969-71 average


1/ Landed shucked, no processing.

Table 51.--Dispersion of retail prices by fish products from the survey of retail distributors, 1968


Table 51.--Dispersion of retail prices by fish products from the survey of retail distributors, 1968 (continued)


Table 51.--Dispersion of retail prices by fish products from the survey of retail distributors, 1968 (continued)


Table 51.--Dispersion of retail prices by fish products from the survey of retail distributors, 1968 (continued)
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Table 51.--Dispersion of retall prices by fish products from the survey of retail distributors, 1968 (continued)


Table 51.--Dispersion of retail prices by fish products from the survey of retall distributors, 1968 (continued)


Source: Compiled from the survey of retail distributors of fresh and frozen fish and shellfish products' conducted by the Division of Economic Research, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, United States Department of the Interior, 1968.

Table :52. --Weekly retail price range of fresh cod fillets, New York City, 1970

| Week | Low | High | : Most <br> : frequent <br> : prices | : | Mean | Deviation from the mean |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents/It |  |  |  |  | ---iercent---- |  |
| Jan. 12-IL | 74 | 130 | 77-99 |  | 88 | +32 | -16 |
| 19-21 | - | 130 | 79-110 |  | 95 | +27 | - |
| 26-28 | - | 130 | 79-109 |  | 94 | +28 | - |
| Feb. 2-4 | 64 | 130 | , 79-119 |  | 99 | +24 | -35 |
| 9-11 | 69 | 139 | 79-109 |  | 94 | +32 | -26 |
| 16-18 | 69 | 130 | 79-109 |  | 94 | +28 | -26 |
| 24-26 | 69 | 130 | 79-105 |  | 92 | +29 | -25 |
| Mar: 2-4 | 69 | 130 | 79-119 |  | 99 | $+24$ | -30 |
| 9-11 | 69 | 130 | 79-119 |  | 99 | $+24$ | -30 |
| 16-18 | 69 | 130 | 79-119 |  | 99 | $+24$ | -30 |
| 23-25 | 69 | 139 | 79-109 |  | 94 | +32 | -26 |
| Mar. 30-Apr. 1 | 69 | 139 | 89-109 |  | 99 | +29 | -30 |
| Apr:- 6-8 | 74 | 139 | 89-109 |  | 99 | +29 | -25 |
| 13-15 | 79 | 130 | 89-119 |  | 104 | +20 | -24 |
| 20-22 | 69. | 130 | 89-119 |  | 104 | +20 | -34 |
| 27-29 | 69 | 130 | 89-119 |  | 104 | +20 | -34 |
| May. 17-13 | 69 | 130 | 79-719 |  | 99 | $+24$ | -30 |
| 18-20 | 74 | 130 | 79-115 |  | 97 | $+25$ | -24 |
| 25-27 | 69 | 145 | 79-119 |  | 99 | +32 | -30 |
| June 1-3 | 69 | 145 | 79-119 |  | 99 | +32 | -30 |
| 8-10 | 69 | 130 | 79-119 |  | 99 | $+24$ | -30 |
| 15-17 | 67 | 14.5 | 79-139 |  | 109 | +25 | -38 |
| 22-24 | 69 | 145 | 89-139 |  | 174 | +21 | -39 |
| June 29-July 1 | 65 | 14.5 | 89-115 |  | 102 | +30 | -36 |
| July 6-8 | 69 | 14.5 | 89-109 |  | 99 | +32 | -30 |
| 13-15 | 69 | 14.5 | 89-119 |  | 104 | +28 | -34 |
| 20-22 | 79 | 145 | 79-119 |  | 99 | $+32$ | -20 |
| 2.7-29 | 59 | 145 | 69-119 |  | 94 | +35 | -37 |
| Alug. 3-5 | 69 | 11.5 | 89-719 |  | 204 | +28 | -34 |
| 10-1? | 69. | 14,5 | 79-109 |  | 94 | +35 | -26 |
| 17-19 | 69 | 14.5 | 79-179 |  | 99 | +32 | -30 |
| 24-26 | 59 | 14.5 | 79-99 |  | 88 | +39 | -33 |

Table $52^{\circ}$.-Weekly retail price range of Iresh cod fillets, New York City, 1970 (continued)


Source: VEsily reports of retail prices of food procucts published by New York State Yarketing Information Service, 1970.

Table 53.-Weekly retail price range of fresh flounder fillets, New York City, 1970

| Week | Low | High: | Fíost frequent orices | : ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ Mean $\cdots$ | Devia the m Hich | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ion from } \\ & \text { an } \quad- \\ & \hline \text { : Lcw } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jan. 12-714 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| 19-21 | - | 195 | 99-159 | 129 | +34 | - |
| 26-28 | 89 | 220 | 98-169 | 134 | +39 | -34 |
| Feb. 2-4 | 84 | 220 | - 99-169 | 134 | +39 | -37 |
| 9-11 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| 16-18 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| 24-25 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| Mart 2-4 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| 9-71 | 93* | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | -34 |
| 16-18 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| 23-25 | 99 | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | -29 |
| Mare 30-April 1 | . 99. | 195 | 109-165 | 137 | - +30 | -28 |
| Apr. 6-8 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| 13-15 | - | 195 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | - |
| 20-22 | 99 | 195 | 99-169 | 134 | $+31$ | -26 |
| 27-29 | 109 | 195 | 109-149 | 129 | +34 | -16 |
| May 17-13 | 89 | 195 | -99-139 | 119 | +39 | -25 |
| 18-20 | 99 | 195 | 99-149 | 124 | +36 | -20 |
| 25-27 | 89 | 195 | 99-139. | 119 | +39 | -25 |
| June 1-3 | 89 | 195 | 99-149 | 124 | +36 | -28 |
| 8-10 | 94 | 195 | 109-159 | 134 | +31 | -30 |
| 15-17 | 94 | 195 | 99-149 | 124 | +36 | -24 |
| 22-24 | 99 | 185 | 109-169 | 139 | +29 | -29 |
| June 29-July 1 | 99 | 195 | 109-149. | 129 | +34 | -23 |
| July 6-8 | - | 195 | 109-149 | 129 | +34 | - |
| 13-15 | 99 | 195 | 109-14:9 | 129 | +34 | -23 |
| 20-22 | 99 | 195 | 99-149 | 124 | +36 | -20 |
| 27-29 | 99 | 195 | 109-145 | 127 | +35 | -22 |
| Auge 3-5 | 99 | 195 | 109-149 | 129 | $+34$ | -23 |
| 10-12 | 99 | 195 | 109-129 | 129 | +34 | -23 |
| 17-19 | 94 | 195 | 109-139 | 124 | +36 | -24 |
| 24-26 | 108 | 195 | 109-139 | 124 | +36 | -13 |

Table 53:- Weekly retail price range of fresh flounder fillets, New York City, 1970 (continued)


Source: Weekly reports of retail prices of food products published by New York State Marketing Information Service, 1970.

Appendix Figures


Figure 16.--Fresh haddock fillets--weekly retail prices, purchaseccosts, and sales
volure from a Chicago food chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1968

$\qquad$ Figure $17 .-$ Frozen haddock fillets-weekly retail prices, purchase costs, and sales volume from a Chicago food chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1968


Ficure 18.-..Fresh ocean perch fillets--weekly retail prices, purchase costs, and sales volwh from a Chicogo fona chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1963



Figure 20 --Fresh cod fillets--weckly retail prices, purchase costs, and sales volume from s Chicago food chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1968
Sales volume 1 1n 1bs
50



Figure 2l--Frowen cod fillets--weekly retail prices, purchase cost's, and sales volune from a Chicago food chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1968


Figure 22.--Trozen sole fillets-veekly retail prices, purchase costs, and sales volune from a :hicago food chain store with 20 branches, $1957^{\prime \prime}$ and 1963


Ficure 23.--Fresh sole fillets-weekly retail prices, purchasc costo, and sales volume from a Chicago food chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1968


Figure $24 .-$ Presh flounder fillets--weekly retail prices, purchase costs, and sales volume from a Chioago food chain store with 20 brunche's, 1967 and 1968


Figure 25.--Witins-heeded and gutted.weekiy retaril prices, purchase corsts, and sales volume from a chicago food chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1968


Figure 26.--Presh and rozen salnon alcel--treckly retail prices, nurchase costs, and sules volume Irom a Chiceco food chain store with a mrunches, 1967 and 1968

.Figure 27.--Frozen halibut fillets--weekly retail prices, purchase costs, and sales
vollw:e froin a Chicago food chain store with 20 branches, 1967 and 1968
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[^0]:    1/ No processing
    2/ Shucked at sea

