

**VEGETABLE OIL PRODUCTS**

Honolulu	—	70
U. S. A.	121	260
Canada	—	2
China	537	66
Japan	—	36
Saigon, Straits, India	—	55
Africa	294	415
S. America	206	739

**WINES & LIQUORS**

Honolulu	220	89
U. S. A.	5	—
China	33	—
Japan	395	220
Saigon, Straits, India	—	14

**TRANSIT CARGO**

U. S. A.	619	264
China	127	3,377
N. E. Indies	29	31
Saigon, Straits, India	1,354	614

**GENERAL MERCHANDISE**

Honolulu	887	600
U. S. A.	52,965	46,813
Canada	—	496
China	13,703	16,529
Japan	24,149	47,855
N. E. Indies	3,713	4,044
Saigon, Straits, India	3,327	6,582
Europe	4,070	1,277
Australia	2,223	4,299
Africa	3,768	5,342
S. America	5,183	10
(Mostly Army Surplus)	—	—

GRAND TOTAL . . . . . 1,564,421 \* 1,821,881 \*

\* Includes bales at 8 to the ton and board feet at 140 to the ton.

## 1948 Imports and Exports

Bureau of the Census and Statistics

	1948	1947
Total trade	P1,774,819,524	1,553,797,312
Imports	1,136,409,068	1,022,700,608
Exports	638,410,456	531,096,704

**Ten Principal Imports**

	1948	1947
1. Cotton and manufactures	P137,363,424	153,442,226
2. Rayon and other synthetic textiles	105,019,904	90,584,900
3. Grains and preparations	84,110,422	98,834,050
4. Mineral oils (petroleum products)	68,503,810	36,842,052
5. Automobiles, parts of, and tires	63,910,034	51,414,052
6. Iron and steel and manufactures	55,888,764	46,144,372
7. Tobacco and manufactures	49,391,482	43,962,246
8. Dairy products	45,824,662	42,625,172
9. Paper and manufactures	44,714,054	38,887,246
10. Machinery, machines and parts of (except agricultural and electrical)	43,170,350	36,422,882
Other imports	438,512,162	383,541,310

**Ten Principal Exports**

1. Copra	309,400,124	354,415,334
2. Abaca, unmanufactured	60,294,087	63,432,374
3. Desiccated coconut	57,491,099	19,054,858
4. Sugar	41,580,077	4,081,186
5. Coconut oil	40,738,581	13,940,603
6. Embroideries	13,917,276	2,335,116
7. Pineapples, canned	7,648,327	—
8. Copra meal or cake	7,425,325	4,391,434
9. Chromite	5,191,779	446,500
10. Rope	4,066,577	2,904,520
Other exports (including re-exports)	46,891,007	66,095,079

## Inter-Island Shipping

BY G. F. VANDER HOOFT  
 Manager, Everett Steamship Corporation

THE Philippine Shipowners' Association has recently protested to government authorities concerning the practice of using Philippine Naval Patrol ships for transporting government cargo between inter-island ports, particularly cement, which is now exclusively being shipped in this manner from Cebu to Manila.

This practice is in direct competition with inter-island shipping and greatly affects its interests. It is hoped that the Government will discontinue this practice in the interest of fostering the country's privately operated merchant marine.

## Land Transportation (Bus Lines)

BY L. G. JAMES  
 Vice-President and Manager,  
 A. L. Ammen Transportation Co., Inc.

IN official and in business circles, there has been a considerable discussion on the proposal to provide bus terminal facilities within the City of Manila and/or its suburbs. These facilities would consist of a central station or stations to serve the incoming and outgoing buses of operators covering lines between Manila and provincial points. They would likewise serve as pick-up points for urban and interurban operators and would, in theory, eliminate a portion of the present traffic congestion which constitutes a major problem.

Operators of buses serving city lines and those covering lines between Manila and the outlying provinces are almost unanimously opposed to the suggested plan. Operators of "jitneys", "jeepneys", and similar small public utility vehicles are, generally speaking, in favor of it.

From the viewpoint of the operator serving lines between provincial points and Manila, there is nothing that the central terminal proposal has to offer, either by way of increase in facility of operation or by way of benefit to public interest. Many of these companies have a substantial capital investment in their own terminals, constructed at high cost under post-war conditions, through the use of which, the interests of their patrons are, in general, efficiently and satisfactorily served. To compel these companies to abandon their own terminals and utilize the facilities of a central terminal or terminals operated by the City or the National Government, would result in great financial loss to them.

The original suggestion regarding central terminals was to provide two such facilities, one south and one north of the Pasig River, thus to eliminate provincial buses from bridge traffic as well as from the more congested of the city's streets. Urban buses and other public utility vehicles would provide shuttle-services, transporting incoming and outgoing passengers between terminals and markets, etc. The disadvantage to the public convenience are apparent:

1. The necessity of disembarking at a point far from market facilities. This would affect public transportation originating at southern provincial points to a greater extent than that from the north.

2. The necessity of paying cargadores for handling produce and other forms of baggage, as well as the risk of loss of such goods through pilferage and looting.

3. The necessity of paying an extra charge for transportation from the terminal to market or other destination.

4. The increased risk from the operations of pickpockets who would find a congested bus terminal a very profitable field in which to do business. Under present conditions, most operators have practically eliminated this hazard at their own terminals.

5. The delay caused by transferring from one carrier to another.

\* See "The Bus Terminals Proposal" by Frank S. Tenny, in the February issue of this Journal.