UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Bureau of Agricultural Economics

WHAT AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS HAD WE BEST EXPORT?

By C. C. Stine, Principal Agricultural Economist, Division of Statistical and Historical Research

Address, Twenty-first Annual Meeting, American Farm Economic Association, Cleveland, Ohio, December 31, 1930

What agricultural products had we best export? A short answer to the question is: We should export those agricultural products which, sold in foreign markets, will return more net profit than would substitute products sold on a domestic market basis. This is an economic axiom but it is often overlooked in discussing national agricultural problems. It is sometimes easier to formulate a general principle than to apply the principle to the problems that are presented to us. Definite measures of the profitableness of producing commodities for either the domestic or foreign market are lacking. Continually changing conditions make it difficult to forecast the profitableness of alternative products for foreign and domestic markets. Policies or plans must be formulated, however, upon the basis of available information and apparent tendencies. It is our purpose to consider present conditions and long-time tendencies with reference to the outlook for the production of and demand for the agricultural products of the United States in relation to exports.

Perhaps it would be in order first to consider whether or not the United States should export any agricultural products. In the discussions of agricultural surpluses during the last few years, the significance of exports has often been misrepresented. The agricultural depression was said to be due to surplus production. The surplus most easily identified was what we exported and, therefore, exports caused the depression. Many have overlooked the fact that we have had real economic surpluses of agricultural products - such as wool and sugar - of which we export nothing. Shifting from an export to a domestic market basis may make a material change in the price relations to the producing area but this is no guarantee of profitable production. It is axiomatic that we may be producing and selling at a great loss on the domestic market just as well as upon the foreign market.

One proposed solution of the surplus problem goes to the extreme of advocating duties or other restrictions sufficient to prevent imports of agricultural products, so that export producers may shift to production for the domestic market. During the last five years the value of the imports of agricultural products into the United States has averaged somewhat above the value of the agricultural exports. This may seem to indicate that such a shift could be made. But an analysis of the items entering into the imports shows this to be impracticable. Among these imports are

large items that we produce only in very small volume, or not at all. The largest items are silk, coffee, and rubber. Add to these tea, chocolate, and a few other such small items and we find that in value more than one-half of our average imports are not and can not be economically produced in this country because natural conditions are not suitable for their production. If we are to continue to use these products in volume, we must buy them.

Some of our agricultural imports are by-products, and to produce our domestic requirements of these by-products would result in an exportable surplus of the primary products to which they are related. Cattle hides, for example, are merely by-products of meat production. Doubtless the United States could produce enough cattle to provide the hides used in this country, but what would we do with the beef? We would have to sell it at very low prices, probably both in the domestic and in the foreign markets. If we were to produce our wool requirements, including carpet wools, the result would probably be an exportable surplus of mutton and lamb. Consequently not much could be accomplished toward eliminating exports by undertaking to produce the imported articles which have become largely the by-products of major agricultural enterprises.

There are cases in which physical and market conditions would permit imports to be reduced or eliminated by increasing domestic production on areas taken from the production of exports. A good example of the possibility of doing this is to be found in the case of flaxseed. Wheat acreage can be shifted to flaxseed, but a shift sufficient to meet domestic requirements for flaxseed would make little impression upon wheat production. A rough analysis of all such shifts that might be made indicates that probably not more than 15,000,000 acres used in producing for export could be shifted to replace imports, and this would still leave at least 45,000,000 acres producing for export. Furthermore in most cases it is not obvious that in the long run such shifts as could be made would increase net profits to producers.

Our rejoinder to any proposal to live at home and eliminate the exportable surplus must be that it is neither practicable nor a solution of the much discussed agricultural surplus problem. Buy what you can buy cheaper than you can produce it, is an economic axiom which applies at this point.

Still another proposition is to eliminate exportable surpluses simply by contracting production to domestic requirements even where there are no more profitable alternative products. This proposition is supported by the argument that withdrawal to the domestic market basis would increase prices more than sufficiently to compensate for the reduction in the volume of the product to be marketed. In some cases probably a smaller production could be sold in the domestic markets for more money than is now being obtained for the entire production in domestic and foreign markets. But upon examination, this proposition is also found to be impracticable. The problem is how to obtain the reduction. The action of any one individual has very little effect upon the total. Under the competitive conditions now prevailing, no one is compensated for sacrifices made for the benefit of others and concerted action by all is impossible.

In the discussions of solutions for the surplus problem we meet another general proposition - that agriculture should retire from the export field because farmers can not and should not try to compete with the peasant labor of Europe and Asia. This argument is of course superficial. The keenest competitors of the farmers of the United States are not the peasants of Europe but the farmers of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand who also have high standards of living and pay high wages for labor. Experience has demonstrated that the intelligent and educated farmers of the United States with their machines can easily compete with the peasant labor of Europe and Asia, just as many of the captains of industry in the United States compete with the exploiters of cheap labor in foreign countries, by larger scale and higher quality production.

In the last analysis whether or not the farmers of the United States produce for export and what they export depend upon the available agricultural resources and their most profitable use. I mean to include in agricultural resources not only the land but also the farmers themselves with all their knowledge and equipment for agricultural production. The United States has a large share of the agricultural resources of the world and a smaller share of the world's population to be fed and clothed. The experience of the last few years indicates that many of our farmers can compete successfully in foreign markets on the basis of both quality and quantity of production, even in the face of a tendency for world-wide surplus production.

The economy of specialization and large-scale production is applicable to agriculture as well as to industry. Cotton is by far the most important export commodity of the United States. This country produces about 62 per cent of the world crop outside of China. In the past five years 54 per cent of the production has been exported. (See Tables 1, 2, and 3). The farmers of the South specialize in cotton. They can produce corn, hogs, and many other products; but just to the north is the Corn Belt which is better suited to producing corn and hogs, and not cotton. Consequently many of the Southern farmers find that they can buy most of their food and feed cheaper than they can produce what they need. Stated in another way, the cotton planter relieved of the necessity of producing his own food and feed can put all of his energies into cotton production and thus produce large quantities at a relatively low cost per pound. Doubtless many cotton farmers can advantageously supplement their income from cotton by producing some feed and food or other products for sale; but it is the economy of specialization that causes the South to continue the one-crop system of producing cotton, in the heart of the Cotton Belt, in spite of campaigns for diversification. It is this specialization in production as well as the size of the Cotton Belt that produces a large exportable surplus of cotton.

Although the future of the position of the United States as an exporter of cotton is not free of the prospect of severe competition from other countries, that position seems to be secure for the immediate future. Foreign production is increasing and the consumption of foreign growths by foreign countries is increasing faster than the consumption of American cotton. Suitable lands can be found in foreign countries sufficient to produce the world's requirements for cotton. But there is no immediate prospect of a very rapid extensive development of new lands in foreign countries.

Perhaps a word should be said about Russia's cotton production plans. That country plans a marked increase in production but her resources are limited and probably no more than sufficient to produce what that country will consume. That is, we may lose the Russian market for our cotton. In the meantime the westward expansion of the Cotton Belt, together with new developments in the technique of production, is strengthening the South for competition with the cheapest labor and the most fertile cotton producing areas in other foreign countries.

Another point favorable to the export of cotton is the fact that many of the most populous countries and largest consumers do not produce it. (See Table 4). They want the raw materials for manufacture and have no interest to protect. An exception to this might develop through colonial preferences on the part of France and the British Empire, but this is not threatening for the immediate future.

Tobacco appears to be in a position similar to that of cotton. (See Table 5). There are large areas suitable for highly specialized production. The United States produces about 40 per cent of the world's tobacco crop outside of Russia and China, and exports about 39 per cent of it unmanufactured. For many years this country has held a dominant position in the international trade in tobacco and that position does not seem to be threatened seriously for the future. The United Kingdom has resorted to preferential duties to encourage colonial production. This has developed more competition for some types but it has had no material effect upon the demand for flue-cured tobacco from the United States for the manufacture of cigarettes. The late war stimulated the demand for tobacco to be used in the form of cigarettes, and the United States seems to have profited most by this development, in foreign as well as in domestic markets. Not much headway has been made in Continental Europe against the homegrown, Turkish, and colonial tobaccos, but recently the Orient has become an important market for our cigarette tobacco without much competition from any source.

Specialization in wheat production on the frontier provides a surplus of wheat for export. (See Table 6). Wheat production continues to expand on the Great Plains, and in the inter-mountain territory. New technique in production and new machines make it more profitable to produce wheat than to continue livestock grazing over large areas which had been considered not suitable for growing wheat. Continued expansion in some areas in the face of falling prices seems to indicate a cost of production so low that wheat may be profitable at very low prices, and more profitable than any other agricultural enterprise to which these resources could be devoted. In some older producing areas wheat fits into a crop rotation better than any other crop and contributes something to income even at relatively low prices. However, doubtless many farmers are still producing wheat while some substitute would be more profitable, as many are slow to adjust to changing conditions. Would the elimination of all wheat production for which a more profitable alternative could be found, eliminate the exportable surplus? Since we have exported 21 per cent of our production in addition to building up large stocks in the past five years in the face of falling prices, it seems likely that we are producing a real exportable surplus of wheat.

How much longer can we or ought we to stay in the wheat exporting game? We still have considerable areas on the Great Plains and farther west upon which wheat can be grown. With decreasing per capita consumption tending to offset the effect of increasing population, the domestic demand for wheat as food would be a long time catching up with present production. The prospect of continuing to export large quantities of wheat, therefore, depends primarily upon foreign competition and demand conditions. Such relatively low wheat prices as exist in foreign markets at the present time probably would tend to reduce production in the older agricultural areas more rapidly than the production of newer areas could expand with profit. The continuation of these prices might soon bring an end to exports excepting small quantities to countries which normally depend upon the United States for a considerable part, if not all, of their flour and bread supplies, but recovery from the present world-wide financial and business depression is likely to bring somewhat higher prices. Even though the world's supply of wheat is now large enough to hold wheat prices below the normal level of the past few years, the new normal level may not be low enough to cause a rapid reduction in the wheat crop of the United States.

The demand for wheat is increasing in some foreign countries, particularly in tropical countries and the Orient, while it is remaining about stationary or decreasing in some other countries. On the whole it appears that the foreign demand for wheat is increasing. The question is, will the foreign production of wheat increase more rapidly than the demand for it, and thus continue to reduce the normal wheat price level?

There are large areas suitable for wheat production in many foreign countries. Production is expanding in new areas in Canada, Australia, and Argentina, as well as in the United States. Russia is reorganizing for expanding wheat production. Tractors and combines, which have contributed much to the maintenance of production and expansion into new areas in the United States, are being shipped to these countries to be added to the machines produced at home for wheat production. New scientific knowledge and technique are being used in these countries as well as in the United States. The greatest prospects for the development of new areas are in Canada and in Russia. During the next ten years expansion in these countries, with additions from some others, may continue to increase foreign production more rapidly than demand increases, and thus reduce the normal level of prices rapidly enough to cause some curtailment in exports from the United States. For the present, however, we seem to be in position to stay in the export game for many years, although the part we play in that game may be reduced to a minor role within the period of another generation.

Specialization in corn and hog production in the Corn Belt provides an exportable surplus of pork and lard. The number of hogs in the United States is about equal to the number in all of Europe outside of Russia, and one-third of the number in the world outside of Russia and China. (See Table 7). This would seem to indicate that we are in a good position to compete with the rest of the world in hog production. About 30 per cent of our lard production is exported (Table 8) but the exports of the meat of the hog have been reduced to about 4 per cent of production. (Tables 9, 10, and 11).

In the Corn Belt we have large agricultural resources for the production of pork and lard, but in appraising the future of our export of these products we must consider other demands upon these resources. (See Table 12). The growth of population within the country is increasing the demand for pork. The Corn Belt is called upon to supply grain feed for many other parts of the country. The South requires corn for its work animals, the East for dairy and poultry production, and the West for cattle, sheep, and dairy and poultry production. The amount of grain feeding per animal unit within the country is increasing at a fairly rapid rate. This is due to a definite tendency to increase production per animal unit. Another significant fact is the tendency to increase the production of whole milk for market, and thus reduce the hog production ordinarily associated with the production of butter and cheese or beef. On the other hand, an expansion of hog production in Northern Europe, particularly in Denmark and the Netherlands, associated with butter and cheese production, is lessening the foreign demand for pork. Consequently the exports, which are now less than in the period immediately preceding the war, may continue to dwindle until they practically disappear, and that within a comparatively short period.

The situation with respect to lard is somewhat different from that with respect to the meat of the hog. Lard exports are now larger than before the World War. The increase in hog production in Northern Europe apparently has had no effect upon the lard imports of the North European countries. Hogs produced upon barley and by-product feeds together with the by-products of the dairy industry do not produce lard in volume. The competition for lard is to be expected mostly from vegetable fats and oils, rather than from hog production outside of the Corn Belt. The future competition in the field of fats and oils is quite uncertain. If lard holds its export position, it must do so on the basis of volume production at low cost, to be sold in competition with large volumes of vegetable oils produced in the tropics.

In discussing cotton, tobacco, wheat, and hogs, the products that constitute the bulk of our exports have been dealt with. The growth of domestic demand, on the one hand, and increasing foreign competition, on the other, have practically eliminated the exportable surpluses of beef and dairy production. The exportation of feed grains has likewise disappeared excepting for the shipments of small quantities to neighboring countries and larger quantities to other countries in large crop seasons. Barley exports are still of some significance. (See Table 13). In part, the barley shipments consist of exports from areas in California which produce barleys having certain qualities desired for brewing in Northern Europe. Only small quantities are being shipped to Europe for feed and this barley is meeting with increasing competition from many other barley producing countries. Apparently barley is increasing in favor in the United States as a feed grain, and doubtless increasing demand for feed grains will absorb the exportable surplus of feed barley in the not very distant future.

Suitable areas for specialized production result in exportable surpluses of many of the minor crops. Rice is one example. (See Table 14). Rice has no strong competitor in the areas most suitable for its production within the United States. Since the domestic demand for rice is limited, a small production exceeds domestic requirements. Apparently

producers in California and in the South can successfully meet foreign competition in some foreign markets with the comparatively small surpluses produced.

Specialization in both quantity and quality production has developed an export surplus of several fruits. The most important is apples. (See Table 15). The investigations of Edwin Smith while he was a fruit specialist representing the Department of Agriculture in foreign countries indicate clearly that many European countries could produce all the apples that they could consume, and that the imports of those which could not meet their own requirements could be obtained from surplus producing European countries. The natural resources are available in several countries but the peasants living in areas suitable for producing large quantities of high-quality apples lack the initiative and foresight necessary to plan and develop the production of large volumes of high-quality apples for European industrial cities. In some cases failure to use the available natural resources for apple production may be due to the fact that the lands have greater value for other production; but, for the most part, it is probably due more to lack of organization or the failure to realize the possibilities for profit in apple production. As long as this situation continues, producers in the United States can plan to produce apples for export.

The production of oranges and grapefruit for export illustrates another situation. (See Table 16). Production highly concentrated in a few states exceeds domestic requirements. Comparatively cheap transportation makes Canada a natural market for these products. Efficiency in production and in marketing also enables producers of these products to place them in Northern Europe in competition with the products from other sources.

In many other cases comparatively small areas, which are not very well suited to the production of a large variety of products, may be suited to the intensive production of a single product or a small number of products. In any case in which specialization in the product or products adapted to the area results in supplies beyond domestic requirements, we have a product which we had best export if we can find foreign markets that will pay prices yielding net gains greater than could be obtained by supplying only the domestic market. Initiative and resourcefulness often find such markets. The fullest utilization of the agricultural resources of the country requires us to make the necessary effort in any case in which there is a prospect for increasing profits by production for export.

In estimating the foreign competition and the demand in foreign markets for agricultural products, we must consider the policies of foreign countries with reference to promoting production and restricting imports. The possimist can easily find the basis for arguing that our export markets are closing up in our face. The United Kingdom, our most important market, has invoked imperial preferences on some commodities and a general policy of imperial preference is under consideration. The United Kingdom could obtain a very large share of its needed supplies of food and clothing from her colonies and dominions. Its greatest difficulty would be in obtaining cotton and tobacco. Many of the Continental

European deficit countries are raising tariff barriers and resorting to other methods of restricting imports. Germany is making every possible effort to protect its wheat producers and make a domestic market for its rye by excluding foreign wheat in so far as it is possible to do so. Italy is making every possible effort to become self-sufficient in agricultural products. The Balkan countries and Poland are trying to make a deal with countries to the west for an advantageous exchange of agricultural products for manufactured goods, to our disadvantage. Russia threatens to flood our European markets with wheat.

Dr. Nourse, writing in 1923, presents a gloomy summary of the possibilities of developments in this direction. He says that in such a process of development the United States "falls to a position of small importance as an exporter of food to European markets, the tendency being toward flour for the tropics and the Orient rather than wheat for Liverpool and Hamburg; toward pork products rather than grain; and toward canned and dried fruits and vegetables, and possibly canned and powdered milk for the Orient and the tropics; and probably more rice to Japan or even to China or India in times of crop failure." 1/ This quotation does not represent exactly what Dr. Nourse then considered to be the outlook for agricultural exports from the United States. Recent developments, brought on in part by the world-wide depression, however are in line with what Dr. Nourse in 1923 considered to be a possible development.

Recovery from the present depression - when it comes - will clear away some of the pessimism and probably will lessen some of the obstacles to our exports. It is difficult to persuade the British consumer that he should pay the costs of imperial preference, particularly if the increase in cost will jeopardize his position as an industrial producer for markets beyond the realm of the empire. Continental European food-deficit countries will also hesitate to continue a policy of restricted imports to the disadvantage of their industrial workers. Even Germany may yield in the end upon this point. In spite of the heroic efforts of Italy to become self-sufficient in food production, it must still import and must bear in mind the interests of its industrial as well as its agricultural workers. In Europe outside of Russia agricultural production has barely recovered from the effects of the World War, with few exceptions. The pre-war tendencies for several European countries to industrialize at the expense of agriculture may continue with readjustments from special nationalistic measures resulting from war psychology and the passing of stringent financial depression.

The situation in Russia is different. Should the Russian Government succeed in doing what it is trying to do, Russia will become a great agricultural producer. However, the Russian population is increasing rapidly and special efforts are being made to develop industrial centers which will consume the products of agriculture. Should the Russian program succeed, that country would be producing by 1933 about 8,000,000 bales of cotton and consuming it all. The area of grain crops in cultivation would be increased about 23 per cent and yields per acre would be increased about 25 per cent, thus increasing the production about 50 per cent, or

---

1/ E. G. Nourse. "American Agriculture and the European Market, p. 234.

more, over what it was in 1928. The carrying out of this program would undoubtedly provide substantial exportable surpluses of several agricultural products. With an increased population being fed better than it has been in the past, however, Russia may never have again an exportable surplus of wheat and rye equal to the quantities exported before the war.

On the other hand we must not forget the Orient which is undergoing an industrial and agricultural revolution. To date this has resulted in increased takings of agricultural products from the United States and other foreign countries.

Thus we can build up the basis for a more optimistic view of the long-time prospects for exporting agricultural products from the United States than that which appears on the surface at the present time.

In conclusion we return to our original proposition, that we had best export those agricultural products which will return greater net profits than can be obtained from substitute production to be sold on domestic markets. There is no special merit in producing for the domestic market over the foreign market unless the individual producer can thereby add to his net profits. Reviewing both domestic and foreign demand prospects, it appears that the principal exports from the United States for some time will be cotton, tobacco, and wheat. Domestic market demand may soon be sufficient to absorb the production of food grains and livestock without leaving an exportable surplus of these products except possibly lard. Specialization in quantity and quality production may continue for a long time or provide exportable surpluses of many other commodities including many fruits.

List of Tables supplementing this discussion

Table 1.-Exports of specified commodities from the United States as a percentage of production, average 1925-26 to 1929-30

Table 2.-United States production as a percentage of world production, excluding China, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1925-1929.

Table 3.-United States production as a percentage of world production excluding Russia and China, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1925-1929

Table 4.-Cotton, including linters: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 5.-Tobacco, unmanufactured: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1910-1914 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 6.-Wheat, including flour: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 7.-Hogs: Number in principal European countries having 150,000 and over, average 1909-1913 and 1921-1925, annual, 1927-1930

Table 8.-Lard, pure: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 9.-Pork: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 10.-Bacon, including Cumberland sides: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 11.-Ham, including Wiltshire sides: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 12.-Corn, including cornmeal: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 13.-Barley, including malt in terms of grain: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 14.-Rice, including flour, meal and broken rice: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 15.-Apples: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual 1928-1929

Table 16.-Oranges: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Table 1.--Exports of specified commodities from the United States as a percentage of production, average 1925-26 to 1929-30

Commodity	Unit	Production	Exports	
			Quantity	Percentage of production
		Thousands	Thousands	Per cent
Corn (inc. meal)	bushels	2,760,753	23,235	.84
Apples	barrels	38,158	4,871	8.38
Oranges	boxes	38,483	3,287	8.54
Barley(inc.malt in terms of grain)	bushels	265,006	34,745	13.11
Wheat (inc. flour)	bushels	822,114	170,091	20.69
Rice(inc. meal and broken rice)	pounds	1,130,639	468,783	33.77
Lard, pure, United States	pounds	2,419,000	731,146	30.22
Pork	pounds	8,716,000	345,555	3.97
Tobacco (unmanufactured)	pounds	1,357,130	525,066	38.69
Cotton (inc. linters)	bales	16,323	8,774	53.75

Table 2.--United States production as a percentage of world production, excluding China, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1925-1929

Crop	Average		1925	1926	1927	1928	1929
	1909-1913	1925-1929					
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
Wheat	18.2	18.6	16.0	19.1	19.7	19.2	19.2
Rye	2.0	2.5	2.4	2.3	3.1	2.5	2.2
Barley	16.2	14.5	12.4	10.9	15.7	18.2	15.7
Corn	64.7	60.7	61.3	58.3	61.9	64.0	58.1
Flaxseed	17.6	14.0	14.1	12.5	16.5	13.1	13.7
Cotton	64.8	61.9	62.4	67.4	58.6	59.7	60.7
Sugar a/	4.9	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.4	4.2	4.3
Rice	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9
Tobacco	37.3	b/ 35.9	38.5	36.4	33.0	---	---
Hops c/	30.3	---	---	---	---	---	---
Potatoes	6.5	5.7	4.9	6.0	5.9	6.7	4.8

Compiled from official sources.

a/ Figures are for the crop years 1909-10 to 1913-14 and 1925-26 to 1929-30.

b/ Average 1925-1927.

c/ Since the war, no data are available for the production of hops in Russia, except for 1927 when a production of 6,753,000 pounds was reported for Ukraine. Including this figure with the world total, the United States' share of the total production is 21.9 per cent.

Table 3.--United States production as a percentage of world production, excluding Russia and China, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1925-1929

Crop	Average 1909-1913	Average 1925-1929	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
Wheat	22.7	22.8	19.7	24.2	23.9	23.0	23.1
Rye	3.5	4.9	4.6	5.0	6.4	4.4	4.0
Barley	13.0	16.9	14.6	12.8	17.9	21.0	17.4
Corn	65.5	72.7	63.6	60.1	63.6	65.9	60.3
Flaxseed	21.3	16.5	16.6	14.5	19.0	15.3	17.4
Cotton	67.9	64.6	64.4	69.5	61.3	62.6	64.2
Sugar a/	5.4	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.6	4.4	4.5
Rice	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9
Tobacco	40.8	b/40.2	43.2	40.9	36.7	---	---
Hops	31.5	23.3	23.6	26.0	23.0	24.7	20.1
Potatoes	7.6	7.5	6.3	8.2	7.7	8.8	6.3

Compiled from official sources.
a/ Figures are for the crop years 1909-10 to 1913-14 and 1925-26 to 1929-30.
b/ Average 1925-1927.

Table 4.--Cotton, including linters: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 bales a/	1,000 bales a/	1,000 bales a/	1,000 bales a/	
United Kingdom	3,509	1,937	1,935	1,314	Free
Germany	2,515	2,149	2,011	1,840	Free
France	1,087	946	873	887	Free
Italy	501	758	772	713	$0.261 per 100 lbs. gross weigh
Soviet Russia in Europe	88	335	341	165	20% advalorem on c.i.f. basis
Spain	270	318	303	286	$0.99 per 100 lbs. gross weight.
Belgium	184	228	228	191	
Netherlands	24	152	177	147	
Sweden	36	58	56	54	
Other Europe	119	102	105	96	
Total Europe	8,333	6,983	6,801	5,693	
Canada	153	256	286	210	Free
Japan	297	1,243	1,375	1,071	Free
China	13	198	245	239	$0.63 per 100 lbs. n weigh
British India	19	81	11	9	
Other countries	25	13	27	18	
Total	8,840	8,774	8,739	7,240	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
a/ Bales of 500 pounds.

Table 5.--Tobacco, unmanufactured: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1910-1914 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Calendar year: Average 1910-14	Average 1925-29	1928	1929	Import duty
	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	
Belgium	10,476	18,754	16,036	13,961	
Denmark	680	4,793	3,565	3,419	
France	41,419	33,450	21,584	35,847	Imported only by government monopoly
Germany	33,515	27,513	30,332	20,986	Rates range from $6.50 to $8.4[illegible] per 100 lbs. gross wt. according to type and wt. of packing
Italy	37,798	4,980	1,817	2,621	
Netherlands	25,389	24,969	24,463	21,770	Rates range from $0.217 to $0.250 per 100 lbs. gross wt. according to packing
Norway	2,078	3,882	4,446	3,602	
Portugal	1,758	4,790	4,630	7,071	
Spain	17,236	13,766	17,061	12,929	
Sweden	3,494	4,303	4,165	4,431	
Switzerland	2	3,161	3,103	3,790	
United Kingdom	142,761	178,415	173,737	214,713	$315.00 per 100 lbs. net wt. (containing 100% or more of moisture). $238.00 per 100 lbs. net wt. (containing less than 10% moisture).
Canada	15,288	14,755	16,169	14,653	Free
Mexico	1,405	1,363	965	1,686	
Argentina	2,124	2,788	1,762	3,552	$12.09 per 100 lbs. legal net wt
China	7,075	99,692	164,035	108,695	$1.58 per 100 lbs. net wt. (if not valued over $1.50 per 100 lbs. $4.20 per 100 lbs. net wt. (if valued over $1.50 per 100 lbs.
Hongkong	866	798	625	465	
Japan	2,582	10,927	15,355	14,215	35% advalorem on c.i.f. basis a/
Australia	13,964	21,371	21,167	19,915	
British Africa	6,043	10,057	9,604	9,924	
French Africa	3,822	6,779	6,610	7,808	
Other countries	9,968	33,760	42,615	39,019	
Total	380,273	525,066	583,846	565,072	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

a/ $85.15 per 100 lbs. net wt. unstemmed) To be manufactured locally into tobacco or cigarettes
$97.31 " " " " " stemmed, partly stemmed or in strips)
$60.82 per 100 lbs. net wt. unstemmed) To be manufactured locally into cigars
$72.99 " " " " " stemmed, partly stemmed or in strips)

Plus, in each case, 2½% advalorem primage duty and for the cigar tobacco a 2½% advalorem sales tax.

Table 6.--Wheat, including flour: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	
Belgium	7,255	6,449	3,301	6,374	Free
Denmark	1,710	2,395	2,290	2,770	Free
Estonia	a/	16	15	12	
Finland	1,146	1,961	1,879	1,601	
France	3,034	5,279	2,243	2,232	$1.43 per 100 lbs.gross wt.
Germany	7,036	6,527	3,143	6,892	Wheat,119.9¢ per bushel; flour 4.16¢ per pound
Gibraltar	131	351	1,161	3	
Greece	67	4,588	3,823	7,152	$0.926 per 100 lbs.net wt.
Italy	2,420	6,047	5,144	1,088	
Irish Free State	a/	3,610	3,736	3,700	Free
Malta,Gozo & Cyprus	169	338	188	356	
Netherlands	12,198	14,378	10,241	11,045	8 per cent advalorem on c.i.f.for wheat and flour in packages weighing 2.65 lbs. or less; other wheat, free
Norway	1,044	1,566	1,248	1,788	Wheat,free;flour $0.462 per 100 lbs. net weight
Poland and Danzig	a/	75	3	225	
Portugal	562	482	862	1,179	
Russia in Europe	450	17	19	3	
Spain	33	697	3,178	129	
Sweden	259	770	592	673	Wheat,unground 15.9¢ per bushel
Switzerland	b/	1	0	3	
Turkey in Europe	8	26	0	0	
United Kingdom	34,556	32,313	20,439	31,265	Free
Other Europe	63	933	566	469	
Total Europe	72,131	86,819	64,071	78,957	
Canada	2,165	30,643	41,653	17,331	$0.70 per 100 pounds net weight
Mexico	1,326	2,498	3,015	3,146	$1.54 per 100 lbs.gross wt. in bags including $0.0114 for wt. of jute bags
Panama	625	3,844	6,071	6,153	15 per cent advalorem on f.o.b.basis,plus 2 per cent advalorem consular charge
Cuba	4,053	5,655	5,697	5,682	
Brazil	2,668	4,621	3,907	3,666	
Chile	224	222	78	103	
Peru	727	1,028	1,408	457	
Venezuela	755	976	1,165	1,447	
China	1,250	3,782	7,080	2,741	
Hongkong	5,277	3,529	4,079	3,548	
Kwantung	151	1,797	2,018	4,168	

Continued

Table 6.--Wheat, including flour: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929--Continued

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	
Japan and Chosen	5,224	6,786	4,799	9,863	Wheat, $0.56 per 100 lbs. net wt; flour $1.08 per 100 lbs.
Australia	a/	38	69	5	
Philippine Islands	1,310	5,317	3,770	3,429	
British So. Africa	110	85	56	87	
Other countries	9,107	12,651	14,751	12,513	
Total	107,103	170,091	163,687	153,316	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

a/ Figures for the pre-war years are included in the countries of the pre-war boundaries.

b/ Less than 500 bushels.

Table 7.--Hogs: Number in principal European countries having 150,000 and over, average 1909-1913 and 1921-1925, annual, 1927-1930

Country	Month of estimate	Average 1909-1913 a/	Average 1921-1925 a/	1927	1928	1929	1930
		Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands	Thousands
England and Wales	June	2,390	2,658	2,692	2,971	2,367	2,306
Scotland	"	150	167	197	196	142	141
Northern Ireland	"	215	134	236	229	192	216
Irish Free State	"	1,046	947	1,178	1,183	945	1,052
Sweden	"	1,023	1,056	b/ 1,369	-	-	-
Denmark	July	2,715	2,314	3,731	3,363	3,616	4,928
Holland	May-June	1,305	1,519	-	-	-	1,990
Belgium	Dec. c/	1,533	1,081	1,144	1,124	1,139	1,237
France	Dec. c/	7,529	5,302	5,777	6,019	6,017	-
Spain	Dec. c/	2,544	4,500	5,032	-	-	-
Portugal		d/ e/ 1,111	1,019	-	-	-	-
Italy	May-Apr.	2,685	2,630	f/ g/ 2,850	-	-	-
Germany	Dec. c/	22,533	15,776	19,424	22,899	20,106	h/ 19,944
Austria	Dec. c/	1,932	1,399	-	-	-	-
Czechoslovakia	Dec. c/	2,516	2,201	f/ 2,539	-	-	-
Hungary	Apr.-July	3,322	2,424	2,387	2,662	2,582	2,362
Yugoslavia	Jan.	3,956	2,875	2,770	2,613	-	-
Rumania	Dec. c/	3,262	2,976	3,168	3,076	2,832	2,412
Poland	Nov.	5,487	5,287	6,333	-	4,829	-
Lithuania	Spring	1,358	1,521	1,010	1,060	-	-
Russia, European & Asiatic i/	Summer	j/ 20,336	21,124	23,202	26,120	20,533	12,183

a/ Average for 5-year period if available, otherwise for any year or years within that period unless otherwise stated. In countries having changed boundaries, the figures are estimated for one year only for number within present boundaries. For the pre-war average the years immediately preceding the war have been used. b/ September. c/ Countries reporting as of December have been considered as of January 1 of the following year, i.e., the figures for the number of swine in France as of December 31, 1925 has been put in the 1926 column, etc. d/ Nearest census figure. e/ 1906. f/ 1925. g/ Unofficial. h/ Number in September 1930, 23,414,000 against 19,604,000 in September, 1929. i/ 1916 from the Soviet Union Review, April 1928, page 52. 1924-1925, Statistical Review, October, 1928. 1927 to 1930 Agricultural Statistics of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Moscow, 1930. j/ 1916.

Table 8.--Lard, pure: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1				Import duty
	Average				
	1909-10 to 1913-14	1925-26 to 1928-30	1928-29	1929-30	
	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	
Belgium	17,076	14,979	14,841	18,700	Free
Denmark	2,481	2,819	2,381	2,403	
Germany	142,312	187,140	195,695	180,074	$0.572 per 100 lbs., gross wt. (in cases or in barrels containing less than 331 lbs.
Italy	4,656	18,197	29,200	19,865	$0.70 per 100 lbs., gross wt.
Netherlands	36,502	41,782	36,992	48,584	8 per cent advalorem on c.i.f. basis.
United Kingdom	169,176	228,768	229,899	240,147	Free
Other Europe	18,166	35,586	46,689	53,628	
Total Europe	390,369	529,271	555,697	563,401	
Canada	10,182	15,279	17,864	15,113	
Cuba	41,379	79,924	84,316	79,630	$2.67 per 100 lbs., gross weigh
Other countries	32,425	106,672	122,037	128,787	
Total	474,355	731,146	780,914	787,160	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Table 9.--Pork: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Item and country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	
Pork:					
Fresh					
France	0	52	29	124	
Italy	8	1,047	2,183	2,289	($0.654 per 100 lbs., gross weight, fresh or refrigerated; free if frozen.
United Kingdom	710	7,861	4,547	10,527	Free
Other Europe	3	593	303	1,272	
Total Europe	721	9,553	7,062	14,212	
Canada	398	851	582	1,091	($2.50 per 100 lbs.net weight, unless otherwise specified. ($5.00 per 100 lbs., pork loins.
Cuba	131	1,762	1,732	1,618	($3.63 per 100 lbs.(including immediate packing)
Other countries	774	1,278	1,265	1,850	
Total	2,024	13,444	10,641	18,771	
Pickled					
Belgium	254	215	213	383	
Norway	477	848	854	799	
United Kingdom	10,225	4,943	7,608	5,094	
Other Europe	1,715	1,064	1,573	1,139	
Total Europe	12,671	7,070	10,248	7,415	
Canada	10,118	8,110	8,596	11,211	
Panama	1,427	321	240	395	
Newfoundland & Labrador	5,920	4,034	4,530	4,792	
Haiti	1,818	900	838	719	
Cuba	7,287	8,334	10,550	9,798	
Other countries	9,034	4,926	4,904	5,503	
Total	48,275	33,695	39,906	39,833	
Canned					
France	67	9	18	10	
Italy	5	a/	a/	1	
United Kingdom	3,350	7,143	6,555	10,737	Free
Other Europe	221	112	127	227	
Total Europe	3,643	7,264	6,700	10,975	
Canada	22	267	427	387	
Panama	36	31	54	61	
Mexico	45	78	66	128	
Cuba	48	77	74	165	
Argentina	167	57	55	43	
Other countries	266	636	598	1,024	
Total	4,227	8,410	7,974	12,783	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
a/ Less than 500 pounds.

Table 10.--Bacon, including Cumberland sides: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	
Belgium	4,901	3,544	2,146	4,699	
France	2,689	603	358	697	
Germany	1,205	9,030	5,982	8,468	$1.35 per 100 lbs.
Italy	7,561	7,242	15,106	8,289	$1.04 per 100 lbs. gross wt.
Netherlands	4,409	2,734	1,198	2,959	
Norway	3,637	3,620	2,742	2,642	
United Kingdom	133,760	67,213	53,364	57,443	Free
Other Europe	8,718	18,925	22,339	21,192	
Total Europe	166,880	112,911	103,235	106,389	
Canada	4,964	5,185	5,769	5,617	$3.65 per 100 lbs. net wt.
Cuba	7,697	18,983	16,698	15,957	$4.75 " " " gross wt.
Other countries	2,933	3,237	3,546	3,707	
Total	182,474	140,316	129,248	131,670	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Table 11.--Ham, including Wiltshire sides: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	
Belgium	7,864	1,636	1,003	2,136	
France	146	185	53	366	
Netherlands	163	270	199	14	
United Kingdom	143,087	124,535	100,959	103,169	Free
Other Europe	670	1,340	1,772	775	
Total Europe	151,930	127,966	103,986	106,460	
Canada	4,510	6,945	6,309	11,370	$3.25 per 100 lbs., net wt.
Cuba	4,696	7,802	7,435	6,307	$5.34 " " " gross wt.
Mexico	723	769	695	692	
Panama	984	874	864	1,936	
Other countries	3,970	5,336	6,087	5,707	
Total	166,813	149,690	125,396	131,572	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Table 12.--Corn, including cornmeal: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	
Belgium	1,389	173	688	1	
Denmark	2,524	678	902	1	Free
France	605	321	982	14	$0.178 per 100 lbs.gross wt., plus sales tax 20 per cent advalorem on duty-paid value.
Germany	5,362	1,501	4,241		$0.271 per 100 lbs.gross wt.
Italy	12	522	2,567		(1.44 per 100 lbs.g.wt(wh.corn) (0.10 " " " " "(other ")
Netherlands	5,136	2,988	6,274	140	8% advalorem on c.i.f.basis.
United Kingdom	11,248	2,907	8,280	43	Free
Mexico	2,503	1,757	574	1,299	
Cuba	2,342	1,293	811	246	
Canada	8,585	8,928	11,300	7,599	Free
Egypt	0	16	0		
Japan		73			
Bermuda	50	24	15	16	
Barbados	a/ 164	92	106	85	
Jamaica	b/ 546	278	339	220	
Oth.B.W.Indies	b/ 162	113	119	113	
Dutch W.Indies	151	198	211	206	
Virgin Islands	70	49	45	42	
Other countries	560	1,324	4,400	254	
Total	41,409	23,235	41,874	10,279	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

a/ Four-year average.

b/ One year includes Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, and other British West Indies.

Table 13.--Barley including malt in terms of grain: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1				Tariff rate
	Average				
	1909-10 to 1913-14	1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	
	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	1,000 bushels	
Belgium	283	1,303	1,816	652	
Denmark	0	196	42	75	Free
Finland	0	51	64	60	
Germany	1,562	8,437	13,117	1,521	a/
Netherlands	153	1,747	3,916	489	8 per cent advalorem c.i.f. basis
United Kingdom	5,056	11,015	13,309	9,412	Free
Other Europe	9	748	741	700	
Total Europe	7,063	21,497	32,905	12,909	
Canada	153	10,730	24,733	8,772	$0.52 per 100 lbs.
Mexico	216	649	641	566	
Cuba	2	475	579	397	
Argentina	0	257	313	263	
Brazil	b/	626	834	599	
Other countries	653	451	289	548	
Total exports	8,087	34,745	60,294	24,054	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

a/ $1.61 per 100 lbs. gross weight in bags.
$1.29 per 100 lbs. gross weight in bags - imported for fodder under customs control.

b/ Less than 500 bushels.

Table 14.--Rice, including flour, meal and broken rice a/: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1				Import duty
	Average				
	1909-10 to 1913-14	1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	
	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	
United Kingdom	1,513	32,701	45,643	35,904	Free
France	131	10,730	22,005	13,419	$0.613 per 100 lbs.gross wt. plus 2% on duty-paid value (whole rice)
Belgium	295	17,841	28,774	9,149	Free
Netherlands	5,140	19,245	21,031	14,858	8% advalorem on c.i.f. basis
Germany	13,831	38,788	48,643	45,135	$0.162 per 100 lbs.gross wt. unpolished 0.271 per 100 lbs. gross wt. polished. Free when imported for production of starch under customs controlled.
Greece	b/	3,538	6,739	4,696	$1.39 per 100 lbs.net wt.cleaned rice. $0.772 per 100 lbs. gross wt. uncleaned rice.
Sweden	1	2,647	4,154	2,726	
Denmark	10	3,773	7,211	3,949	
Norway	0	1,654	3,417	1,416	
Canada	803	13,429	22,214	20,664	$0.75 per 100 lbs. net wt.
Cuba	5,490	12,856	17,569	7,345	$0.229 per 100 lbs. gross wt.
Mexico	572	1,154	1,561	957	
Dominican Rep.	0	1,808	1,985	746	
Chile	4	11,673	13,610	19,393	$0.554 per 100 lbs.gross wt.
Argentina	1,524	18,725	35,983	29,170	$0.264 per 100 lbs.gross wt.in bags, husked rice
Columbia	43	9,399	18,103	19,083	$0.516 per 100 lbs.gross wt. plus 3% advalorem
Other So.America	52	4,084	11,765	2,519	
Japan	0	53,710	64,241	42,516	$0.373 per 100 lbs. net wt.
Other countries	2,113	11,028	18,036	15,261	
Total	31,522	268,783	392,684	288,908	

Compiled from official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

a/ The average 1909-10 to 1913-14 includes rice bran and polish but no flour, meal and broken rice; the average 1925-26 to 1929-30, and the years 1928-29 and 1929-30 include flour, meal and broken rice, no rice bran or polish reported.

b/ Less than 500 pounds.

Table 15.--Apples a/: Exports from the United States, by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1: Average 1909-10 to 1913-14	Average 1925-26 to 1929-30	1928-29	1929-30	Import duty
	1,000 barrels	1,000 barrels	1,000 barrels	1,000 barrels	
United Kingdom	1,021	2,801	3,332	1,838	Free b/
Germany	157	553	1,135	365	In barrels-$0.659 per 100 lbs. gross wt. In boxes-from $0.538 to $0.675 per 100 lbs. according to character of boxes and interior packing.
Sweden	2	167	227	187	$1.22 per 100 lbs. net wt.
Norway	6	55	53	54	
Denmark	10	121	146	75	
Other Europe	8	418	1,246	181	
Total Europe	1,204	4,115	6,139	2,700	
Canada	221	272	275	207	20% advalorem on a minimum of 6¢ per lb. valuation
Mexico	21	33	41	27	
Cuba	18	36	33	24	
Argentina	11	192	238	251	c/
Brazil	17	60	72	65	
Other countries	59	163	216	152	
Total	1,551	4,871	7,014	3,426	

Compiled from official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

a/ Includes boxes and barrels; boxes converted on the basis of 3 boxes = 1 barrel.

b/ Imports from the United States prohibited between July 5 and November 15 each year unless certified as "United States Fancy" or "United States No. 1".

c/ An Argentine presidential decree of August 11, 1930, modifies the regulations governing the importation of fresh fruits, which were contained in the Argentine presidential decree of May 14, 1930, to permit the importation of apples packed in barrels throughout the present crop year. The previous regulations had prescribed certain packing regulations which would in effect have excluded barreled apples.

Table 16.--Oranges: Exports from the United States by principal countries, average 1909-1913 and 1925-1929, annual, 1928-1929

Country to which exported	Year beginning July 1	Calendar year			Import duty
	Average 1909-10 1913-14	Average 1925-1929	1928	1929	
	1,000 boxes	1,000 boxes	1,000 boxes	1,000 boxes	
Germany	2	24	9	81	
Denmark	a/	a/	a/	1	
Norway	0	3	1	12	
Sweden	a/	10	8	14	
Netherlands	a/	22	a/	103	
United Kingdom	23	480	149	1,383	Free
Other Europe	a/	2	a/	5	
Total Europe	25	541	167	1,599	
Canada	1,135	2,541	2,323	3,628	Free
British Malaya	0	7	10	12	
China and Hongkong	1	56	50	78	
Japan	a/	4	5	5	
Philippine Islands	2	42	41	49	
Australia	1	6	4	7	
New Zealand	14	36	40	76	
Other countries	8	54	38	68	
Total	1,186	3,287	2,678	5,522	

Compiled from records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
a/ Less than 500 boxes.

# # # # # # # #