

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.	610	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	3,766	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.

From the broader aspect, the construction and operation of a bus terminal capable of handling several hundred departures and arrivals per day would require a colossal investment. The Government would obviously liquidate this investment and cover operational costs by charging operators for the use of the facilities. These charges would, without doubt, be far in excess of the current cost of operating their own terminals and would probably require an upward adjustment in basic passenger and freight rates. In addition, the record of the Government in business vs. that of private enterprise speaks for itself. The chances for successful and efficient government operation of a project of this nature are very small.

There are various theories on the causes and cure of traffic congestion in the City of Manila. Our traffic problems are not primarily caused by the large provincial buses or by the urban buses which operate on the city's streets. Their capacity is 30 to 50 passengers each depending upon type, 5 to 6 times as great as that of the thousands of individual jeeps and other similar vehicles which crowd the main arteries of traffic, whose drivers pay little attention to regulations or to the rights and safety of others.

The elimination of a few hundred provincial buses from the bridge and crowded city traffic would have no appreciable effect on current congestion. The elimination of 2,000 jeeps and their substitution by the use of 200 buses of 40 passengers capacity each, operated by a few reputable companies, would do far more toward the desired end.

It has been stated that it is feasible for provincial operators to utilize bus terminals and reduce their fares by an amount equivalent to the cost of the additional transportation called for plus extra baggage and freight handling charges accruing to passengers. Current rates between provincial points and Manila vary from 1 to 1½ centavos per passenger per kilometer. A passenger from a point in Laguna province, 100 km. distant from Manila, pays ₱1.00 for his fare from embarkation to a bus terminal opposite the Divisoria market. Under the central terminal proposal, he might have 5 centavos deducted from that basic fare due to location of the terminal south of the Pasig River.

Additional charges, on the other hand, would involve at least 10 centavos fare in getting to his destination (possibly 20 centavos). There would also be a minimum charge of 20 centavos, and in many cases more than that, for cargadores' service necessitated by the transfer. The disadvantage to the public is obvious.

It is admitted that central bus terminals are successfully operated in every large city in the United States, but the circumstances cannot be compared to those in Manila. In United States cities the urban service is maintained by a single bus company or at most 2 or 3 such companies whose operations are properly scheduled and efficiently operated under adequate and strict government supervision. Manila is served by literally thousands of operators whose fleets consist of from one or two small jitneys in many cases, to as many as 200 or so modern buses in others. With the exception of the operations of the larger companies, fixed routes, schedules, and fares are not followed. We have a mass of public transportation on the streets which it is impossible for the authorities to supervise except most superficially. The greatest stretch of imagination could not present a picture of the added bedlam that would be created in the traffic by the concentration of this accumulation of public carriers within and around a central terminal.

The same comparative conditions prevail with respect to bus services from outside points into Manila when considering inter-city and cross-country land transportation in the United States. Here there are approximately 1,500 bus units of one type or another operating from provincial points to Manila and vice versa. Possibly 60% of these units are owned by reputable and efficient operators who have their own terminal facilities, which might vary in rating from excellent in some cases to poor in others. The rest of these vehicles are operated by irresponsible small concerns that have no facilities and pay little attention to schedules, routes, rates, and other regulations. The problem of housing these operations would be a serious one, whereas in a typical United States city not more than 2 or 3 operators are involved; schedules, rates, and routes are fixed, and the buses are all modern and of maximum capacity.

In an American city terminal, passenger traffic only is handled. Into any bus terminal in the Philippines come not only passengers but large quantities of produce such as fruits, vegetables, and manufactured articles, in addition to the substantial numbers of chickens, pigs, and other livestock to be marketed, plus other items such as charcoal, firewood, coco-

nuts, etc., that help to make up the load of any incoming provincial bus.

The operators, controlling a majority of the provincial buses entering Manila and who have their own terminal facilities, have developed the necessary procedure and technique for efficiently handling the loads described. Under a central terminal arrangement, the total volume of this type of traffic would be so great that it would be almost impossible to handle it efficiently.

It has been stated that the central terminal plan would eliminate over-night street parking of buses. This could be eliminated very simply by the passage of proper city regulations and their subsequent enforcement. It is difficult to visualize in Manila a central terminal facility capable of housing a minimum of 700-800 buses, plus the office and maintenance space necessary in the cases of the many operators concerned.

Bus operators as a group consider the plan to be unsound and impractical of operation.

Note by Mr. Tenny: Advocates of the bus terminal plan appear to differ with the opponents of the plan, not on the basic points involved but only on questions of detail. Private rather than governmental operation is acceptable to the advocates of the plan if this could be arranged to the satisfaction of all concerned. The matter of the exact locations of the terminals is of secondary importance and there is no intention on the part of the advocates of the plan to cause the abandonment of suitable terminals which have already been constructed by progressive operators. In view of the fact that the terminal plan has been successfully adopted elsewhere, I believe that an acceptable local plan could be worked out which would take into full consideration all of the various facts brought out by both sides.

Mining

BY CHAS. A. MITKE
Consulting Mining Engineer

I AM a consulting engineer, and have made the Philippines my home since March, 1938. I am one of many Americans who like the country, and believe in its future. For this reason, after liberation, in February, 1945, I did not return to the United States immediately, but remained here to see what I could contribute toward the rehabilitation of the mining industry.

After considerable effort, over a three-year period, I succeeded in interesting the largest copper-mining corporation in New York in properties in the Philippines. The corporation sent out an engineer, who remained six months, studying the properties and business conditions generally. In January, 1948, two additional engineers, one of them the late Dr. H. Foster Bain, came out for the same purpose, and an option contract was drawn up. It was understood that if preliminary investigations and drilling proved satisfactory, the American corporation would invest (apart from the purchase price of the property) some ₱50,000,000 in plant, townsite, equipment, wharf, etc. This would have given employment to many thousands of Filipinos. It would have involved large expenditures for monthly payrolls, purchase of local supplies, etc. and would have resulted in mining on a scale heretofore not seen in the Philippines.

Everything was going smoothly, when a bill to license mining engineers was introduced in the 1948 Congress which was passed by both Houses. Besides containing many objectionable and restrictive features, the wording of certain clauses in this bill (according to the copper corporation's attorneys and other legal authorities) would have prohibited American mining engineers from practicing their profes-