## UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

## WATERMELONS

Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 7-99
Under the Provisions of Section 7 of the
Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as Amended



T.C. Publication 14

Washington April 1961

# UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Joseph E. Talbot, Chairman

J. Allen Overton, Jr. Vice Chairman

Walter R. Schreiber

Glenn W. Sutton

J. Weldon Jones
William E. Dowling

Donn N. Bent, Secretary

Address all communications to United States Tariff Commission Washington 25, D. C.

# CONTENTS

		Page
Int	troduction	1
Fir	nding and conclusion of the Commission	2
Cor	nsiderations bearing on the Commission's finding and conclusion	<b></b> 3
Ţ	U.S. customs treatment	<b></b> 3
Ι	Description and uses	4
	J.S. industry	<b></b> 5
Ţ	J.S. production:	,
	Trends	
	Farm value	7
	Principal producing areas	<del></del> 7
_	Production by season	9
	U.S. exports	TT
. (	U.S. imports: Trends	7.0
	Source	
	Imports by customs districts	رد <b></b> -
	Seasonal distribution of imported and domestically produced	1.4
í	seasonal distribution of imported and domestically produced watermelons	15
1	Watermerons	18
	Prices	20
	Summary	2 <u>h</u>
St.	atistical appendix	26
	(TC24943)	
	TABLES	
1.	Watermelons: U.S. production, exports of domestic merchandise,	
	and imports for consumption (total and by principal sources)	
	1937-39 and 1946-60	27
_	The state of the s	
2.	Watermelons: U.S. production by principal States, averages 1949-54 and 1955-60	28
	1949-54 and 1955-60	20
2	Watermelons: U.S. production for the fresh market, by season	
3.	and by principal States, average 1949-54, annual 1955-60	20
	and by principal braces, average 1949-94, annual 1999-00	
4.	Watermelons: Average price received by growers in the United	
4•	States, by season and by principal States, average 1949-54,	
	annual 1955-60	30
5.	Watermelons: U.S. exports of domestic merchandise, by principal	
٠.	markets, 1955-60	31
	•	
6.	Watermelons: U.S. imports for consumption, by countries, 1955-60-	32

7	Watermalons: IIS imports for consumption by	Page
1 •	Watermelons: U.S. imports for consumption, by months, 1955-60	33
8.	Watermelons: U.S. imports, for consumption, by customs districts, 1955-60	34
9•	Watermelons: Weekly rail and truck unloads in 38 U.S. markets, by specified sources, 1959	35
10.	Watermelons: Weekly rail and truck unloads in 38 U.S. markets, by specified sources, 1960	36
11.	Watermelons: Unloads in 22 U.S. markets, by specified sources, May 1959	37
12.	Watermelons: Representative midweek price quotations at specified wholesale markets in the United States, 1959	38
13.	Watermelons: Representative midweek price quotations at specified wholesale markets in the United States, 1960	<b>3</b> 9

#### Introduction

This report, published pursuant to section 7(d) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (U.S.C. 136h(d)), sets forth the finding and conclusion of the U.S. Tariff Commission in connection with its investigation of watermelons (investigation No. 7-99). The purpose of the investigation was to determine whether watermelons in their natural state, provided for in paragraph 752 of the Tariff Act of 1930, are, as a result in whole or in part of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting concessions granted thereon under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, being imported in such increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

The application for the investigation was filed with the Tariff Commission on October 28, 1960, by the Imperial Valley and Palo Verde Valley, California, and Yuma and Central Arizona Watermelon Growers Committee, El Centro, California, which organization represents watermelon growers in the desert counties of Arizona and California. The Commission instituted the investigation on October 31, 1960, and public notice of the institution of the investigation and of the public hearing to be held in connection therewith, was given by posting copies of the notice at the offices of the Tariff Commission in Washington, D.C., and at its office in

New York City, as well as by publishing it in the <u>Federal Register</u> (25 F.R. 11013) and the November 17, 1960, issue of <u>Treasury</u> Decisions.

The public hearing was duly held on February 8, 1961. All interested parties were given an opportunity to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard. In addition to the information obtained at the hearing, data pertinent to the investigation were obtained from other agencies of the Government, from the Commission's files, and by fieldwork by members of the Commission's staff.

Finding and Conclusion of the Commission

On the basis of this investigation, including the hearing, the Tariff Commission unanimously finds that fresh watermelons are not being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. Accordingly, in the judgment of the Commission, no sufficient reason exists for a recommendation to the President under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

# Considerations Bearing on the Commission's Finding and Conclusion

The finding and conclusion stated above are based principally upon the following considerations:

### U.S. customs treatment

Watermelons are not specially provided for in the Tariff Act of 1930, but are classifiable in paragraph 752 of that act under the general provision for "fruits in their natural state." The statutory rate is 35 percent ad valorem. Watermelons from Cuba have been free of duty for many years.

Pursuant to a concession granted by the United States in the trade agreement with Mexico, the general rate of duty on watermelons was reduced from 35 percent to 20 percent ad valorem, effective January 30, 1943. The duty-free status of Cuban watermelons under the Commercial Convention of 1902 between the United States and Cuba was bound pursuant to the trade agreement with Cuba, effective September 3, 1934, and pursuant to a concession negotiated under GATT with Cuba, effective January 1, 1948.

Although the trade agreement with Mexico was terminated effective January 1, 1951, the reduced general rate of duty (20 percent ad valorem) was continued in effect by virtue of the obligation under Article 1 of the GATT not to increase the absolute margin between the duty on articles imported from Cuba and the duty on non-Cuban articles. The current general rate of duty on watermelons, therefore, is 20 percent ad valorem.

### Description and uses

Most watermelons that enter commercial channels range in weight from 10 to 40 pounds, depending upon the variety. Smaller melons—such as the "icebox" and "midget" types—are also grown commercially, but they do not as yet account for an important part of total consumption.

There have been marked shifts in the varieties on the market in recent years as growers have endeavored to improve yields and shipping characteristics, develop strains that are resistant to disease, and improve the flavor of the product. Some of the leading varieties now marketed include the Charleston Grey, which was introduced in 1954; the Garrisonian, which was developed in efforts to breed strains resistant to disease and sunburn and which was first marketed in 1957; the Cannonball (or Black Diamond), which has been on the market for many years; the Congo; the Klondike; the Long Stripe; and the Peacock—an early season variety which is grown extensively in California, Arizona, and Mexico.

Watermelons do best on rich, sandy loams, but almost any well-drained, fertile soil in areas where there is a long, warm growing season is suitable. Chiefly because of problems of disease and of soil nutrition, watermelons are usually grown in rotation with other crops. The same land is seldom used for commercial production more than once in 5 or 6 years. Generally, the melons are shipped in bulk. Trucks are usually used for shipments under 1,500 miles, whereas rail service is commonly used for longer hauls. The product is seldom refrigerated in transit.

Watermelons do not store well and they are customarily kept either at the shipping point or at terminal markets for only short periods of time. Under ideal conditions they cannot be expected to keep more than 2 to 3 weeks.

In the United States the product is used almost exclusively in its fresh state for human consumption. U.S. standard grades, as revised in 1951, provide for U.S. No. 1, U.S. Commercial, and U.S. No. 2. Information supplied by the trade indicates that the bulk of sales at retail, both of domestic and imported melons, conform to the U.S. No. 1 grade. U.S. industry

As noted, the purpose of this investigation is to determine whether watermelons are being imported in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products."

In their brief the applicants urged the Commission to consider the "domestic industry" as producers of "Western spring watermelon. . . in the desert counties of Arizona and Southern California and in Texas." Hence, in this investigation, the position of the applicants with respect to the question of the scope of the industry is analogous to that of the applicants in the recent investigation on cantaloups, wherein it was maintained that the pertinent "domestic industry" consisted of the growing of cantaloups in the desert regions of Arizona and California in the late spring months. 1/

<sup>1/</sup> U.S. Tariff Commission, Cantaloups; Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 7-98 . . ., 1961 (processed).

In its decision on cantaloups, the Commission adhered to its ruling, previously enunciated under the escape-clause procedure, 1/
that the question of injury must be determined on the basis of the impact of imports on the totality of domestic production of the like or directly competitive product, and not on the production of an individual firm or group of firms located in a particular geographic area that represents only a portion or segment of the total domestic production.

Moreover, the Commission found no basis for defining the industry as those growers who produce within a particular season or seasons, and it ruled that the growers of cantaloups in the desert regions of Arizona and California did not constitute a separate and distinct "industry" for the purposes of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. The same principal applies in this investigation.

U.S. production

Trends.--Total reported domestic commercial production of water-melons increased rapidly between pre-World War II years and 1955; it has been fairly stable since that time.

U.S. production averaged about 1.7 billion pounds annually in 1937-39 and about 2.5 billion pounds in 1949-52 (table 1, in the appendix). Thereafter it increased to about 3.5 billion pounds in 1955. Production averaged about 3.2 billion pounds annually in 1956-60 and ranged between a low of 2.9 billion pounds in 1959 and a high of 3.6 billion pounds in 1958; in 1960, output amounted to 3.3 billion pounds—the third highest crop on record.

<sup>1/</sup>U.S. Tariff Commission, Cast-Iron Soil-Pipe Fittings; Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 7-87 . . ., 1960 (processed).

Farm value.—The farm value of the domestic crop averaged about \$33 million annually in 1946-49 and about \$38 million in 1950-54. In 1955-60 it averaged about \$43 million and ranged between a low of \$33 million in 1958 and a high of \$50 million in 1957—the highest level on record. In 1960 the farm value of the crop amounted to about \$40 million (table 1).

Principal producing areas.—Watermelons require a relatively long, warm growing season, and although substantial quantities are grown successfully in northern areas of the United States, the bulk of the domestic production is in the Southern States. Table 2, which shows average annual production in 1949-54 and 1955-60 by principal producing States, indicates that Florida, the leading producer, accounted for about a fifth of the domestic crop in 1949-54, and for nearly a fourth of the total in 1955-60.

In contrast, the share of total output accounted for by Texas, the second ranking producer, declined from about 20 percent in 1949-54 to about 15 percent in 1955-60. Georgia, the third ranking State, accounted for about 14 percent of production in each of the two periods. Combined, these three States accounted for about 54 percent of total average annual production in the years 1949-60.

The equivalent percentages for some of the other principal producing States are as follows: California, 9 percent; South Carolina, 7 percent; and Alabama, 5 percent. These three States, along with Florida, Texas, and Georgia, accounted for about 77 percent of average annual production in 1949-54 and for about 75 percent in 1955-60. As indicated in the table, most of the remaining production also comes from Southern States.

The harvesting and marketing of domestically produced watermelons generally begins about mid-April with a light volume of
shipments originating in Florida. Usually the Florida crop increases
to significant volume in May, reaches it peak in June, and declines
to small proportions by the end of July.

Shipments of watermelons grown in the desert valleys of California usually begin the first or second week of May. The early shipments from this region consist chiefly of melons that have been grown under paper caps or that have otherwise been protected against frost in the early stages of the growing season. Shipments from this section of the country usually do not reach peak volume until late May or early June, at which time the "open" or uncovered crop, which is planted later than the "covered" crop, begins to mature. Shipments from the desert valleys continue to be heavy until the end of June; production in this region virtually ceases the first or second week of July.

Melons grown in Arizona and Texas begin to move to the market in late May or early June. Shipments of the Texas crop normally continue well into August; the peak for the Arizona crop usually has been passed by mid-July. By the end of June, shipments originating in Louisiana,
Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina dominate the
market; during the next 2 months production shifts further north.
Beginning early in July, heavy shipments originate in such States
as Oklahoma, North Carolina, Missouri, and Arkansas, and also in the
San Joaquin Valley of California. Late in July or early in August
there is also a heavy volume of production in the Midwest, in the
Middle Atlantic States, and in the northwestern United States.

Production by season.—In its reports, the U.S. Department of Agriculture publishes data relating to watermelons produced in the United States on a seasonal basis. As indicated in table 3, the recognized seasonal groupings for watermelons are the late spring crop, the early summer crop, and the late summer crop. It is to be noted that such seasonal groupings tend to obscure the fact that production in some areas or States extends throughout one or more of these seasons. Despite the overlapping with regard to seasons, however, the data do serve to give a reasonable measure of the relative importance of the watermelon crop produced in the early season, the midseason, and the late season.

In recent years, about a fourth of the total domestic crop has been produced in the spring months, about three-fifths to two-thirds of the total has been produced in the early summer, and about a tenth in the late summer, as shown in the following tabulation, which is based on the data in table 3 and which indicates the percentage distribution, by season, of the average annual domestic output in 1949-54 and 1955-60:

Season	1949-54	1955-60
	Percent	Percent
Late spring Early summer Late summer Total	24.9 66.7 8.4 100.0	61.8

Florida is by far the leading producer of the early crop; in recent years, it has accounted for more than four-fifths of production in the spring season. Seven States (Texas, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, California, 1/Oklahoma, and Arkansas) normally account for more than 80 percent of the early summer crop, whereas late summer production is accounted for chiefly by Indiana, Missouri, and Virginia.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>l</u>/ Excluding the desert valleys of California, production data for which are reported with the late spring crop.

Late spring production averaged about 677 million pounds in 1949-54, compared with about 886 million pounds in 1955-60 (table 3). Production in the early summer season averaged about 1.8 billion pounds annually in 1949-54 and about 2.0 billion in 1955-60. In contrast, output in the late summer season averaged 229 million pounds in 1949-54 and about 350 million pounds in 1955-60.

The average price received by growers in the late spring season is generally significantly higher than the average price received by all U.S. growers. It amounted to about \$1.86 per hundredweight in 1949-54 and to about \$1.92 per hundredweight in 1955-60 (table 4). In contrast, the average price received by all domestic growers amounted to about \$1.36 per hundredweight in 1949-54 and to about \$1.40 per hundredweight in 1955-60. In each of the periods shown in the table, the average price received by growers in Arizona, California, and Florida was usually significantly higher than that received by growers in other areas.

## U.S. exports

U.S. exports of watermelons have always been larger than imports but small in relation to domestic output. Annual exports averaged nearly 16 million pounds in 1937-39 and about 33 million pounds in 1946-47 (table 1). Unusually small exports in 1948 and 1949 were attributable to Canadian import restrictions temporarily imposed for balance-of-payments reasons. Thereafter, U.S. exports increased rapidly from about 36 million pounds in 1950 to about 65 million pounds in 1959. In 1960 they amounted to about 84 million pounds.

Exports were equivalent to less than 1 percent of domestic output in each of the years 1937-39. The ratio of exports to output was slightly more than 1 percent in 1946 and in 1947. Thereafter, it increased irregularly from slightly more than 1 percent in 1950 to about 2 percent in 1959. In 1960, exports were equivalent to about 2.5 percent of domestic production.

Canada is by far the major export outlet. In each of the years 1955-60, it accounted for more than 98 percent of total U.S. exports. Mexico, Bermuda, Cuba, Jamaica, and the Netherlands Antilles have been the other export markets (table 5).

#### U.S. imports

Trends.--Imports of watermelons have increased steadily in recent years, but they constitute only a very small part of the total domestic supply. As indicated in table 1, imports averaged about 0.5 million pounds annually in 1937-39, and about 3.0 million pounds per year in 1946-50. Thereafter they increased almost without interruption to about 72 million pounds in 1960.

In each of the years 1937-39 and 1946-55, imports were equal to less than 1 percent of total U.S. production. Notwithstanding the increased volume of entries since 1955, they have continued to be very small in relation to U.S. output. In 1956, for example, they were equal to about 1.2 percent of production, compared with 0.8 percent in 1957, 1.2 percent in 1958, 2.0 percent in 1959, and 2.2 percent in 1960.

Source.--Mexico accounted for about 92 percent of total U.S. imports in 1955 and for about 98 percent of the total in 1956; in each of the years since, it has supplied more than 99 percent of total imports (table 6).

Table 7 shows imports by months for the years 1955-60. As indicated therein, imports usually first enter the domestic market in very small quantities in December and reach their peak in the month of May. 1/

For the most part, Mexican exports are of varieties similar to those grown and marketed in the United States; currently they consist almost entirely of "Peacocks," an early maturing variety that is grown extensively in California and Arizona. This melon is generally well regarded by dealers both because of its appearance and taste and because of its shipping characteristics and convenient-to-carry size.

Although precise data are not available, it is known that an important share of the total Mexican production for export (chiefly to the United States and Canada) is financed with U.S. capital 2/ and is grown and distributed under the supervision of the U.S. concerns or individuals.

The Mexican industry has reportedly improved production, grading, and handling techniques materially in recent years. It is estimated that more than 80 percent of its exports to the United States currently meet quality standards for U.S. grade No. 1.

<sup>1/</sup> Actual entries tend to be made somewhat earlier than indicated by the U.S. Bureau of Census reports. The lag is attributable chiefly to unavoidable delays in reporting and tabulating the data.

<sup>2/</sup> Estimates supplied by the trade indicate that from 30 to 40 percent of Mexico's production for export may be so financed.

Much of the commercial output in Mexico is produced from irrigated land supplied with water from either dams or deep wells. Notwithstanding the prevalence of low wage rates, overall production and marketing costs for melons for export tend to be high. Frost, prolonged rains in the planting season, occasional heavy rain in the growing season, and the prevalence of insects and plant diseases make yields of melons of exportable quality erratic. Numerous Mexican State and Federal production and marketing charges (such as production taxes, rail and stamp taxes, Mexican export duties, and miscellaneous fees and charges incident to crossing the border) combine to increase total exporting costs substantially.

Imports by customs districts. -- The bulk of the U.S. imports are entered through Nogales, Ariz., although entries through Laredo and El Paso, Tex., have been increasing rapidly. As indicated in table 8, imports through Laredo and El Paso accounted for 39 percent of total U.S. imports in 1960. The minor quantities of imports from Cuba generally clear through New York or Florida.

Imports through Nogales, Ariz., originate chiefly, but not exclusively, in Sonora and Sinaloa, Mexico, the so-called West Coast District. Entries via Laredo and El Paso consist principally of watermelons grown in the Apatzingan district west of Mexico City.

# Seasonal distribution of imported and domestically produced watermelons

Table 9 shows the carlot equivalents of unloads of domestic and imported watermelons in 38 major U.S. markets, by weeks, for the year 1959. Table 10 shows similar data for 1960. 1/ The data are shown separately for Mexico and for those States which account for the bulk of the early domestic crop (Florida, California, Arizona, and Texas). It is to be noted that the California unloads shown in the table for the period April through June consist almost entirely of melons produced in the desert valleys of California. For the purposes of this discussion, it has been assumed that the last week of June is the effective terminal date for shipments from this region, even though some watermelons are shipped by this area in the first and second weeks of July.

Table 9 indicates that in 1959 California (desert valley) water-melons first appeared on the market in significant quantities in the third week of May, by which time 92 percent of the total imports from Mexico had already been marketed; in that week reported unloads of desert valley melons amounted to 85 carlots. Reported Mexican unloads amounted to 90 carlots.

In the fourth week of May, 160 carlots of desert valley melons were reported on the market, whereas only 60 carlots of Mexican melons were reported; by the end of that week 97 percent of the imported melons—but only about 11 percent of the desert valley production—had been

<sup>1/</sup> The unload data represent about three-fifths of total imports from Mexico in 1959-60 and nearly two-fifths of domestic watermelons sold in U.S. markets. Thus the data, which are representative for purposes of showing periods of marketing, tend to understate the relative importance of domestic unloads.

marketed. Thus about 89 percent of the desert valley production in 1959 was marketed after the virtual cessation of imports from Mexico. Scarcely any of the melons produced elsewhere in California, in Arizona, or in any other State except Florida entered the market until after imports had practically ceased.

Florida melons first appeared on the market in significant quantities in the fourth week of April in 1959, by which time 52 percent of the imported melons had already been marketed. Unloads of Florida watermelons in that week amounted to 100 carlots, and unloads of imported melons amounted to 193 carlots. In the first week of May, unloads of Florida melons amounted to 287 carlots, whereas unloads of imported melons amounted to 266 carlots. In the second week of May, unloads of Florida melons amounted to 722 carlots, compared with 169 carlots of Mexican melons. By the end of the second week of May, 86 percent of imports had been marketed, whereas only 12 percent of the Florida crop had been placed on the market. Thus, about 88 percent of the Florida crop was marketed after the bulk of the imports had been marketed; Florida dominated the market from the end of the first week in May until near the end of June.

In 1960, early shipments from California were delayed by the weather, and imports stayed on the market later than usual. Table 10 shows that California (desert valley) watermelons first appeared on the market in significant volume in the fifth week of May, by which time 91 percent of reported unloads from Mexico had already been marketed. In that week 91 carlots of desert valley melons and 124 carlots of Mexican melons were reported on the market. In the first week of June,

251 carlots of desert valley melons were marketed, compared with 94 carlots of Mexican watermelons. By the end of the first week of June, 97 percent of the imported watermelons had been marketed, but only about 25 percent of the desert valley production had been marketed. Thus, about 75 percent of the desert valley production was marketed after imports from Mexico had virtually ceased. None of the melons produced elsewhere in California or in any other State except Florida entered the market in significant quantities until after imports had practically ceased.

In 1960, Florida melons first appeared on the market in significant amounts in the first week of May, by which time 50 percent of the imported watermelons had already been marketed. Unloads of Florida watermelons in that week amounted to 96 carlots, compared with 133 carlots from Mexico. In the next week (the second week of May) unloads of Florida melons amounted to 186 carlots, and unloads of imported watermelons amounted to 173 carlots. In the third week of May, unloads of Florida melons amounted to 386 carlots, whereas only 137 carlots of Mexican watermelons were unloaded. (Thereafter, Florida dominated the market until well into June). By the end of the third week of May only about 6 percent of the Florida crop had been marketed whereas nearly 70 percent of the imported melons had been marketed. Thus, in 1960, about 94 percent of the Florida crop was marketed after the bulk of the imports had been placed on the market.

The foregoing data indicate that imports usually overlap the Florida marketing season by about 3 weeks and the desert valley marketing season by about 2 weeks. As is shown in the following section, Mexican watermelons are generally marketed nationally. In contrast, the Florida crop is sold chiefly in markets east of the Mississippi River and the California crop is sold chiefly in western markets.

## Market distribution

The market distribution of watermelons produced in Arizona, California, Texas, Florida, and Mexico in 1959 is shown in the following tabulation:

Market area	Arizona .	California	Florida	Texas	Mexico
*	Percent	Percent	: Percent	Percent	Percent
New England and :		:	:	:	:
Middle Atlantic :		:	:	:	:
States:	11.7	• 0.9	: 40.3	: 6.7	: 26.8
North Central States:	23.6	<b>2.</b> 9	: 18.8	<b>:</b> 37.5	: 26.1
Pacific and Mountain:		•	:	:	:
States:	63.2 .	: 96.0	: -	: 9.7	: 40.4
Southern States:	1.5	·	: 40.9	: 46.1	: 6.7
Total:	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The data, which are based on the carlot equivalents of rail and truck unloads in major U.S. markets, 1/were compiled from materials published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The tabulation indicates that about 40 percent of the Mexican imports in 1959 were sold in the western markets; about 53 percent were sold in markets in the North Central States and in the northeastern United States. Whereas virtually all of the Florida crop was sold in markets east of the Mississippi River, about 96 percent of the California crop went to western markets. Most of the remaining California melons

<sup>1/</sup> The data represent rail unloads in 100 major U.S. markets and the carlot equivalents of truck unloads in 38 major markets. For the purpose of this analysis the markets were grouped according to standard geographic divisions used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

were sold in the North Central States. Markets in the west accounted for about 63 percent of the Arizona crop; the bulk of the melons grown in Texas were sold in the Southern and North Central States.

The market distribution of imported and domestic watermelons in the month of May, the period in which the overlap between the two sources of supply is most pronounced, does not appear to be markedly different from that indicated for the entire year. For example, analysis of unloads at 22 markets for May 1959 indicates that more than 90 percent of California's (desert valley) unloads were at western markets and that nearly all of Florida's unloads were in eastern, southern and midwestern markets (table 11). In May 1959 about 46 percent of the unloads of Mexican melons were at western markets; most of the remainder were at markets in the midwestern and eastern States. 1/

l/In their brief, the applicants compared total imports of water-melons from Mexico only with reported rail shipments from the desert valleys of California and from Arizona and Texas in the months of May and June. Such a comparison is misleading and greatly overstates the ratio of imports to production in the late spring season, since (1) it omits truck movements from the aforementioned producing areas, and (2) it omits shipments from Florida, which state accounts for the bulk of the late spring crop. Analysis of unload data at 38 major U.S. markets indicates that in 1959, 75 percent of the early season watermelons produced in the desert valleys of California and in Arizona and Texas were transported by truck; in 1960, 90 percent were transported by truck. As has already been shown, Florida usually accounts for more than 80 percent of the late spring crop; moreover it is the principal domestic supplier in the import season of markets east of the Mississippi River, where more than half of the Mexican melons are usually sold.

#### Prices

Representative midweek price quotations for watermelons at four U.S. wholesale markets (Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, and New York) for the year 1959 are shown in table 12. Similar data for the year 1960 are shown in table 13.

The tables indicate the range of prices most frequently quoted for melons of average quality; quotations for melons of exceptionally high quality or of poor quality or condition are excluded. The tables also indicate the principal, but not necessarily the exclusive, sources of the melons to which these price quotations are applicable.

As has been noted, imported watermelons first appear on the market early in the year, whereas domestic melons do not usually appear until mid-April. Characteristically, the first melons to arrive on the market sell at prices that are significantly higher than those that prevail in midseason, when the supply is much greater. Since the imports arrive on the market first, they sell at relatively high early-season prices that would otherwise be received for the first domestic shipments.

The demand for watermelons selling at these high, early-season prices is limited. And while it is clear that the opening price for the domestic watermelons would be higher in the absence of imports, by far the largest share of domestic watermelons is sold in the season when foreign melons are no longer on the market. Moreover, in the period when the bulk of the domestic crop is sold, the supply originates in a number of different U.S. producing areas, many of which compete with

one another on a price basis in common markets. In this period any effect of imports on the prices of domestically produced watermelons must be negligible.

As indicated in table 12, watermelons were not consistently quoted in all four markets in 1959 until the month of March, when the price was materially higher than that prevailing a few months later. In March, however, the supply was quite small. For example, in the fourth week of March only 28 carlots of watermelons (all from Mexico) were recorded as having been unloaded at the major U.S. markets (table 9). At that time the midweek price was about 12 cents per pound at Los Angeles, whereas it was between 17 and 18 cents per pound at San Francisco. At Chicago, melons were selling at about 12 cents per pound and in the New York wholesale market the price quotations ranged between 12 and 14 cents.

The table indicated a steady decline in prices as the supply of watermelons increased. For example, in the second week of May in 1959, prices ranged between 6 and 6-1/2 cents per pound at Los Angeles and San Francisco, and between 6-1/2 and 7 cents per pound at Chicago; in New York, the price ranged from 6 to 8 cents per pound. 1/In that week, total reported unloads in the major U.S. markets amounted to 901 carlots. Of this amount, 722 carlots were from Florida, and 169 were from Mexico.

<sup>1/</sup> At that time, the midweek price for Florida melons on the New York market ranged between 6 cents and 7 cents per pound; price quotations for Mexican melons ranged between 7 and 8 cents per pound.

Market prices continued to decline and of course were significantly lower in the summer months, when supplies, which were entirely of domestic origin, were very much greater. In the last week of June, total reported unloads amounted to 3,999 carlots, of which 1,157 were from Florida and 1,337 were from California, Arizona, and Texas. Other States accounted for 1,505 carlots. Prices in this week ranged from 2-1/2 to 2-3/4 cents at Los Angeles, from 3-1/4 to 3-1/2 cents at San Francisco, and from 4 to 4-1/4 cents at Chicago and New York.

In 1959, Mexican watermelons were last regularly quoted at New York in the second week of May, when they were selling at 7 to 8 cents per pound. Florida melons were quoted at 6 to 7 cents per pound at that time. In the third week of May when Florida was the principal source of supply, the price was between 5 and 6 cents per pound.

At Chicago, prices for Mexican melons were last regularly quoted in the fourth week of May, when the market price ranged from 7 to 7-1/2 cents. In the following week (the first week of June) the market was between 6-1/2 and 7 cents, and Florida and Texas were the principal suppliers. In the San Francisco market the midweek price for Mexican melons was about 6 cents per pound in the fourth week of May; in the following week melons from California were quoted at 4-1/2 to 5 cents per pound. At Los Angeles, Mexican melons were selling at about 6 cents in the second week of May, and in the third week of May both Mexican and California melons were commonly quoted at 5-1/2 cents per

pound. In the fourth week of May the price ranged between 5 and 5-1/2 cents, and California was the principal supplier.

Table 13, which shows similar data for the year 1960, indicates much the same pattern with regard to the behavior of market prices.

Mexican melons were not continuously reported in all four markets until the third week of March. At that time the price, which ranged from 7 cents (at Chicago) to 10 cents (at New York and San Francisco), was high relative to that later in the season. The supply, however, was small—only 48 carlots were reported on all markets (table 10).

As in 1959 the market price declined steadily as the supply increased. By the fifth week of May the price had declined to 5 to 5-1/2 cents at Los Angeles, to 6-1/2 to 7 cents at San Francisco, and to 5 to 6-1/2 cents at the Chicago and New York terminals. In that week the unloads reported at all U.S. markets totaled 991 carlots, of which 772 came from Florida, 124 from Mexico, and 91 from California.

By the fourth week of June the price was down to 2-3/4 to 3-1/4 cents at Los Angeles, 3-1/2 to 4 cents at San Francisco, and 3 to 3-1/4 cents at Chicago and New York. In that week there were 3,713 carlots on 38 U.S. markets, all of which were of domestic origin.

In 1960 the price quotation for domestic watermelons in all four markets was significantly lower in the week following the last reported quotation for Mexican melons.

It is to be noted that in the Chicago market Mexican melons were quoted, in 1960, until the third week of June. In that week, Florida melons were selling at 3 to 3-1/2 cents and Mexican melons were quoted at 4 to 4-1/2 cents. In the fourth week of June, when the quotations applied chiefly to melons from Texas and Florida, the price was 3 to 3-1/4 cents per pound.

#### Summary

The information obtained in this investigation shows that the U.S. average annual output of watermelons was significantly higher in 1955-60 than in 1949-54, when imports were much lower; that although imports have increased substantially they continue to be small in relation to domestic output and in each of the years 1959 and 1960 were equivalent to only about 2 percent of U.S. production; that there has been no decrease in the farm value of the domestic crop; that the great bulk of the imports have usually been sold by the time the domestic producers begin to ship in significant volume; that the overlap period, when both imported and domestic melons are being marketed in significant volume, seldom exceeds 3 weeks; that the principal U.S. producing areas in the import season are Florida and the desert valleys of California, but that about nine-tenths of the Florida crop and more than three-fourths of the crop grown in the desert valleys of California are usually marketed after the bulk of imports have been marketed; that none of the melons produced elsewhere in the United States enter the market in significant quantities until after imports have virtually ceased; that after the first shipments from Florida and the desert valleys of California are placed on the market. the price of watermelons declines steadily and significantly

as a result of pressure of increasing supplies from these and other domestic producing areas; that imported watermelons have not been able to compete in the U.S. market after prices have declined to the levels at which the bulk of the Florida and desert valley watermelons are sold; that the late spring crop produced in Florida and California was larger in 1960 than in 4 of the preceding 5 years; and that the average annual price received by growers of the late spring crop was higher in 1955-60 than in 1949-54.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the Commission concludes that watermelons are not being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry concerned and that, therefore, no sufficient reason exists for a recommendation to the President under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. The Commission observes further that its decision would have been no different even if it had regarded the industry in question as that producing "western spring watermelons."

Statistical Appendix

Table 1.--Watermelons: U.S. production, exports of domestic merchandise, and imports for consumption, (total and by principal sources) 1937-39 and 1946-60

Year	: Production	: Domestic :	In	ports for	r consumpt	Lon				
i ear	:	exports:	All : countries :	Mexico	Cuba <u>1</u> /	All other				
			ntity (1,000							
	:	:								
37	: 1,773,150	: 17,649 :	493 :	174 :	319 :	-				
38		: 14,489 :	<u>ын6</u> :	25 :	421 :	<u>2</u> /				
39			505 :		490 :	1				
46	<b>:</b> 2,564,500			- ,						
47										
<sub>1</sub> 8			,			6				
19										
0										
<u> </u>										
2										
53	2,928,900			10,300						
5 <u>4</u>	3,156,700			11,790						
55				17,367						
56				36,875						
57				24,407						
58				43,160						
59 <b>3/</b>				57,747						
60 3/		-,		71,656						
	:	Value (1,000 dollars)								
	/	:				1				
37										
38					: 5					
39				<u> </u>	: 12					
46										
47										
48					-					
49	29,450									
50										
51										
52										
53										
54										
55										
56										
57					_					
58	1 = 0=0									
59 3/						· -				
60 <u>3</u> /	: 59,000	: 1,001		: 2,20)		:				
	:	Unit	value (cent							
27	: 01.				-	: -				
37										
38										
39	: 0.5									
lı6	1.5	: 2.3								
40 <b></b>	: 1.1									
47										
47 48	<b>:</b> 1.5		. 17	. 1.4	· 1.0					
47 48 49	: 1.5 : 1.1	: 4.0			. 20					
47 48 49 50	1.5 1.1 1.1	: 4.0 : 2.1	: 1.9	: 1.6						
47 48 49 50	1.5 1.1 1.1 1.4	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1	1.9	: 1.6 : 2.3	: 1.9	: 3.4				
47 48 49 50 51 52	: 1.5 : 1.1 : 1.4 : 1.7	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5	1.9 2.1 1.6	: 1.6 : 2.3 : 1.4	: 1.9 : 1.9	: 3.4 : 8.2				
47 48 49 50 51 52 53	: 1.5 : 1.1 : 1.4 : 1.7 : 1.6	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5 : 2.3	1.9 2.1 1.6 2.5	: 1.6 : 2.3 : 1.4 : 2.5	: 1.9 : 1.9 : 2.4	: 3.4 : 8.2 : 8.3				
47 48 49 50 51 52 53	: 1.5 : 1.1 : 1.4 : 1.6 : 1.6	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5 : 2.3 : 1.6	1.9 2.1 1.6 2.5 1.6	: 1.6 : 2.3 : 1.4 : 2.5 : 1.5	: 1.9 : 1.9 : 2.4 : 2.0	: 3.4 : 8.2 : 8.3				
17	: 1.5 : 1.1 : 1.4 : 1.7 : 1.6	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5 : 2.3 : 1.6 : 2.0	1.9 2.1 1.6 2.5 1.6 1.9	: 1.6 : 2.3 : 1.4 : 2.5 : 1.5 : 1.9	: 1.9 : 1.9 : 2.4 : 2.0 : 1.8	: 3.4 : 8.2 : 8.3 : -				
47	: 1.5: 1.1: 1.4: 1.7: 1.6: 1.1: 1.1: 1.1	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5 : 2.3 : 1.6 : 2.0 : 1.8	1.9 2.1 1.6 2.5 1.6 1.9	: 1.6 2.3 : 1.4 : 2.5 : 1.5 : 1.9 : 1.4	: 1.9 : 1.9 : 2.4 : 2.0 : 1.8 : 2.8	: 3.4 : 8.2 : 8.3 : - : 3.9				
147	: 1.5: 1.1: 1.4: 1.7: 1.6: 1.1: 1.7: 1.7: 1.7	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5 : 2.3 : 1.6 : 2.0 : 1.8 : 2.2	1.9 2.1 1.6 2.5 1.6 1.9 1.5	: 1.6 2.3 : 1.4 : 2.5 : 1.5 : 1.9 : 1.4 : 2.2	: 1.9 : 1.9 : 2.4 : 2.0 : 1.8 : 2.8 : 5.3	: 3.4 : 8.2 : 8.3 : - : 3.9 : -				
117	: 1.5: 1.1: 1.4: 1.6: 1.6: 1.1: 1.7: 1.7: 1.7	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5 : 2.3 : 1.6 : 2.0 : 1.8 : 2.2 : 1.7	: 1.9 : 2.1 : 1.6 : 2.5 : 1.6 : 1.9 : 1.5 : 2.2 : 2.5	: 1.6 : 2.3 : 1.4 : 2.5 : 1.5 : 1.9 : 1.4 : 2.2 : 2.5	: 1.9 : 1.9 : 2.4 : 2.0 : 1.8 : 2.8 : 5.3 : 2.2	: 3.4 : 8.2 : 8.3 : - : 3.9 : -				
117	: 1.5: 1.1: 1.4: 1.7: 1.6: 1.1: 1.1: 1.2: 1.4: 1.7: 1.4: 1.7	: 4.0 : 2.1 : 2.1 : 2.5 : 2.3 : 1.6 : 2.0 : 1.8 : 2.2 : 1.7 : 2.3	: 1.9 : 2.1 : 1.6 : 2.5 : 1.9 : 1.5 : 2.2 : 2.5	: 1.6 : 2.3 : 1.4 : 2.5 : 1.5 : 1.9 : 1.4 : 2.2 : 2.5 : 3.2	: 1.9 : 1.9 : 2.4 : 2.0 : 1.8 : 2.8 : 5.3 : 2.2 : 2.7	: 3.4 : 8.2 : 8.3 : - : 3.9 : -				

Source: Production, compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; exports and imports, compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

<sup>1/</sup> Duty-free.
2/ Less than 500 pounds.
3/ Preliminary.
4/ Less than \$500.
5/ Calculated from the rounded figures.

Table 2.--Watermelons: U.S. production by principal States, averages 1949-54 and 1955-60

: :	Quant	tity	Percent of total		
State	Average 1949-54	Average 1955-60	1949-54	1955-60	
•	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds			
Florida	562,200	766,533	20.7	23.7	
Texas	529,900	497,367	19.5	15.4	
Georgia	393,000	445,667	14.4	13.8	
California:	247, 200	299,583	9.1	9.3	
South Carolina	215,400	229,567	7.9	7.1	
Alabama	146,000	178,750	5.4	5.5	
Arkansas	79,300	109,916	2.9	3.4	
Indiana:	82,800	99,367	3.0	3.1	
Mississippi:	61,400	92,367	2.3	2.8	
Arizona:	72,600	81,117	2.7	2.5	
Oklahoma	101,400	75,467	3.7	2.3	
North Carolina:	50,000	75,033	1.8	: 2.3	
All other:	180,100	285,616	6.6	: : 8.8	
Total	2,721,300	3,236,350	: 100.0	: 100.0	

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Table 3.--Watermelons: U.S. production for the fresh market, by season and by principal States, average 1949-54, annual 1955-60

: diforp languages				Quantity						Percent of	t of total	al		
and State	Average :	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 1/	Average: 1949-54:	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	75 0961
	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds	1,000 pounds				 			
U.S. total:	2,721,300	3,487,800	3,165,400	2,975,700	3,630,600	2,858,500	3,300,100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Late spring, total:	676,700	925,500	975,000	736,200	1,038,600	646,200	994,300	211.9	26.5	30.8	24.7	28.6	22.6	30.1
Florida: California:	562,200 114,500	809,600	864,500	6145,000	950,000	156,600	839,500 154,300	20.7	23.2	27.3	21.7 : 3.0 :	26.2	5.5.	25.4
Early summer, total:	1,815,600	2,243,500	1,876,900	1,938,500	2,241,200	1,833,000:	1,866,900	66.7	64.3	59.3	65.2	61.7	64.1	56.6
Texas	529,900 :	496,800	1440,000	470,400	595,000	510,000 :	172,000:	19.7	14.2	13.9	15.8	16.4	17.0	14.3
South Carolina:	215,400	352,500	208,000	184,900	252,000	170,000	210,000	0.7	10,	, O L	100 m	0,0	W. 4	, , , , , , ,
Alabama: California:	132,700:	152,900	179,200:	189,000:	176,000 :	180,500	203,200 :	 1	7.7		 6.7. 9.	ν. 	 	6.2
Oklahoma:	101,400::	99,000	: 69,000 :	82,500 :	74,800	. 000,89	67,500:	 	 9.0 	2 c 2 c	0, m	2 % 4.0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0,4
Arizona:	72,600 :	61,200	82,500:	101,500 :	70,300	99,200 :	72,000 :	2.7 :	 	200			س آبڻ	200
Mississippi: North Carolina	61,400 .	78,000	93,800 :	97,000	104,000	65,000:	57,500 : 87,000 :	∾	 	3.0 :	۳. د. د. د.	0, 0, 0, 1,	 	7.7
Louisiana	33,900 :	37,400	33,200 :	33,600	33,600 :	32,000 :	37,800:	1.2	1.0	0.1	1.1		  	1.1
Late summer, tctal:	229,000	318,800	313,500	301,000	350,800	379,300	438,900	8.4	9.2	9.6	10.1	9.7	13.3	13.3
Indiana	82,500	119,500	: 100,000 :	101,400	82,000	87,100	102,200	3.0	3.4 :	 3	3.4 :	 5°3	3.1	3.1
Maryland	37,100 :	45,200	: 40,500 :	32,200	43,500:	47,200:	50,000	1.4		 		 		i⊣ (
Missouri: Illinois:	24,100:	18,700	: 66,000 : : 19,800 :	11,100	16,000 :	19,500	20,000	· ·			 N V		w w r-	ن ره
Virginia	19,000:	30,700	28,900	35,200	68,800	80,600	119,600:	٠. ١	0,4	6.	1,2	1.9:		9.6 8
Toware	. 009.6	7,900	: 006.9	7.200	6,100	. 000. 6.300				- ~	- ~	- ~		۰ م
Oregon:	9,100:	16,200	18,000 :	24,000	19,800 :	12,600:	14,800:	ښ. •	,		ω. 	ν. 	: 7.	т
Washington: New Jersey:	. 00 <sup>1</sup> ,6 3,600 :	000,4	: 2,400 :	1 1		 i i			 ! !	 Ng 1	 I I	 1 1		1 1
					***************************************	-	÷	j	•	,			-	

1/ Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Table 4.--Watermelons: Average price received by growers in the United States, by season and by principal States, average 1949-54, annual 1955-60

	(Pric	e per h	undredwe	ight)			
Seasonal group and State	:Average :1949-54	: 10cc		1957	1958	1959	1960 1/
U.S. average	\$1.36	\$1.29	\$1.43	\$1.67	\$1.05	\$1.67	\$1.26
Late spring, average	1.86	32.12	1.85	2.22	1.29	2.45	1.58
FloridaCalifornia		2.00 2.85	1.75 2.60				
Early summer, average	1.21	.96	1.24	1.46	<u>.95</u>	1.43	1.11
Texas	1.27 1.30 1.33 1.68 1.00 1.23 2.05 1.16 1.33 1.49	.90 .87 :1.20 :1.60	1.10 1.10 1.05 1.70 1.30 1.10 2.10 1.15 1.00 1.40	1.30 : 1.30 : 1.30 : 1.60 : 2.25 : 1.00 : 1.60 : 3.25 : 1.35 : 1.35 :	.55 .75 .75 .1.10 .85 .90 .80 .80 .80 .80 .1.30	1.15 : 1.40 : 1.10 : 2.90 : 1.00 : 1.15 : 1.85 : 1.25 : 1.20 :	.90 1.05 .95 1.40 1.00 1.10 1.85 1.25 .65
Indiana	1.40 : 1.31 : 1.24 : 1.16 : 1.38 : 1.60 :	.85 : 1.55 : 1.50 :	1.25 : 2.45 :	1.55 : 2.40 : 1.35 : 1.25 :	1.10:	2.10 : .90 : 1.95 :	1.45 .70

<sup>1/</sup> Preliminary.

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{2}{1949-52}$  average.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Table 5.--Watermelons: U.S. exports of domestic merchandise, by principal markets 1955-60

(In thousands of pounds)	7 1961 / 1958 1958 1959 1 1960 1	62,387: 60,726: 61,665: 62,917: 63,631: 82,082	399; 315; 184; 771; 593; 872	280: 100: 387: 270: 266: 88	70: 52: 124: 123: 150: 361	35:	1 52	26 14 61 3 9 9 237	63,162 : 61,207 : 62,421 : 64,084 : 64,709 : 83,640	
(In thousands of	Country 1955		Netherlands Antilles 399	Mexico	Bermudammenammenammes 70	Cuba	Jamaica	All other 26	63,162	]/ Preliminarv.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 6.--Watermelons: U.S. imports for consumption, by countries, 1955-60

Source	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959 1/	1960 1/				
			Quantity (por	unds)						
Total, all countries	18,882,462	37,685,485	24,539,582	: : 43,520,781	57,966,980	71,993,723				
Mexico	•		1	•	2					
Cuba	1,515,166	578,843	132,445	360,518	219,977	338,127				
Republic of Panama	·	231,181	: -	•	-	: -				
	Foreign value									
Total, all countries	\$363,805	\$552,011	\$550,578	\$1,096,418	\$1,836,397	\$2.213.770				
Mexico	335,859	527,326	:		1,829,976	•				
Cuba	27,946	15,807	6,588	: 7,744	6,421	8,762				
Republic of Panama	-:	8,878	<b>-</b> :	: : - :	~	-				
	:	Uni <sup>.</sup>	t foreign val	ue (cents per	pound)					
Average, all countries	1.9	1.5	2.2	2.5	3.2	3.1				
Mexico	1.9	1.4	2.2	: /						
Cuba	1.8	2.7	5.0	2.1	2.9	2.6				
Republic of Panama	·: -	3.8	- -	: : -	-	: : –				

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 7.--Watermelons: U.S. imports for consumption, by months, 1955-60 (In thousands of pounds)

Month         1955         1956         1957         1958         1959 1/ 1960 1/           January			`				
February: 215 : 226 : 1,522 : 474 : 287 : 891  March	Month	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959 <u>1</u> /.	1960 <u>1</u> /
	February: March: April: May: June: July: August: October: November: December:	215 : 41J4 : 3,374 : 10,575 : 3,696 : 74 : - : - : 52 : 52	226 1,11,6 7,031 23,1,140 1,521, 1,085 81 -	1,522 3,315 6,907 10,113 2,365 90 -	474: 388: 1,683: 30,599: 9,918: 11,0: 34: 96:	287: 2,786: 21,759: 28,834: 4,083: 67: 9:	891 10,888 9,783 35,590 14,411 197 - - 24 49

<sup>1/</sup> Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 8.--Watermelons: U.S. imports for consumption, by customs districts, 1955-60

Customs : district :	1955	1956	1957	1958	19591/	1960 <u>1</u> /
		Quanti	ity (1,000	pounds)		
	:				:	
Arizona:	16,968:		: 20,847		: 44,621	
Laredo:	136 :	2,186 :	<b>:</b> 538 :	: 6 <b>,</b> 8 <b>7</b> 9 :	: 10,108 :	
El Paso:	130:		<b>:</b> 1,537 :	2,031 :	2,866:	6,276
New York:	418:	675	: 130	: 1J <sub>1</sub> 7 :	175:	
Florida:	1,097:			177	25:	338
San Diego:	78 :	1,268	: 1,373	: 42 :	: 110:	721
Other:	55 :	1)49 :	: 113	89 :	62 :	636
Total	18,882:	37,685	24,540	43,521	57,967:	71,99l
:	:		:	•	:	
•			D			
:			rercent	of total		
<b>.</b>	:		:	:	:	
Arizona:	89.9	85.6	: 84.9	: 78.5	: 77.0:	58.6
Laredo:	.7 :	5.8	: 2.2	: 15.8	: 17.5:	30.3
El Paso	.7 :	2.7	: 6.3	: 4.7	: 4.9:	8.7
New York		1.8	• 5	: .3	3:	-
Florida:	5.8 :	-4	: 2/	: .4	: <u>2</u> /:	•5
San Diego:	.4:	3.4	<b>5.</b> 6	: .1	:2:	1.0
Other:	•3 :		•5	2	: .1:	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	: 100.0	: 100.0	100.0:	100.0

<sup>1/</sup> Less than 0.05 percent.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Table 9.--Watermelons: Weekly rail and truck unloads in 3? U.S. markets, by specified sources, 1959

(In carlots 1/) Domestic Scurces Period Total Florida California Arizona Texas 1 January: 4th week, total 2/--February: 1 **-**: - : - : - : 1 2d week----: - : - : - : 3d week---: 4th week----Total-----: March: - : 10 - : - : - : 15 - : - : - : 2d week----: 26 1: - : 1: 3d week----: 28 1: 4th week----: - : 35 3: 114 1 Total-----April: lst week----3: 69 - : - : 135 169 16: - : 2d week----: 16: - : hh : 1: - : 3d week----: 43: 193 104: 100: lith week----566 167: 162: 5: Total----: May: 3: 291 266 - : 1st week-----287 : ٦: - : - : 732 169 90 10: 2d week----: 722: 726 811 : 3d week----: 60 1,007: Lth week----829 160 2,841 585 3: 256: 5: 13: Total----: 2,564: 1,599 23 94: - : 1st week----1,230: 264 11: - : 8 : 1,850 : 2 2d week----: 1,073 : 848 : 20: 348 : h09: 469 : 709 2,154 : 2 120: 3d week----3,024: 1,271: 355 567: 264 : Lith week----: ,505 1,157 419 419: 5th week-----27 2,128: 12,626 Total----: 2,137: 1,777: 1,005 5,579: .Tulv: 383 **:** 589 **:** 4,563 : 3,924 : 3,476 : 195 **59** 2,751 : 2,571 : 2,517 : 871 : 1 363: 382 : 323: 2d week----: 499 : 10 86 345 : 29: 3d week----: 592 1,924 : 2,863 Lth week----35 310: 14,826 : 12 Total----: 1,400: 9,763: 318: 2,063 1,282 : August: 2,765 1,82 1,999 Ь lst week-----2,087 1,643 316 273 6 213 114 1,549 2d week----: 3 3d week----: 48 1,080 : 1,388 260 4th week-----857 : 5,884 : 7,883 8: 10 Total-----1,124: September: 1,115 848 : 39 : 18 : 228 1st week-----

\_

:

2d week----:

5th week-----

2d week----:

Total----:

Grand total----:

3d week-----

lith week-----

Total-----

3d week-----

4th week----

Total----November: 3/

1st week-2d week-----

October:

1st week

Source: Compiled from data published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service.

128:

99

46

526

14

6

1:

:

- :

12

12

84 :

2

8

1:

422 :

194:

106:

52

,622

28

9

777

19,093 :

568

305

161

232

ևև

22

18

8

92

40,673:

2 :

1,312

80

Note. -- Shipments of California watermelons are chiefly from the desert valleys, through June. Shipments from the desert valleys virtually cease by the 2d week of July.

<sup>1/</sup> Represents the carlot equivalents of rail and truck unloads.
2/ No unloads were reported for the 1st, 2d, and 3d weeks of January, 1959.
3/ No unloads were reported after the 2d week of November, 1959.

Table 10.--Watermelons: Weekly rail and truck unloads in 38 U.S. markets, by specified sources, 1960

Period	(In carlots 1/) Domestic sources						
	Florida	California	Ari.zona	Texas	Other :	Total :	Mexico
January: 2/		:		:	:	:	,
3d week:	~	: ' - :	- :	-:	- :	- :	2
4th week:		: -:	:	·:	:	:	1
Total:	-	- :	- :	- :	- :	- :	6
February:		: :	:	:	:	:	
1st week:	- :	: -:	- :	- :	- :	~ :	16
2d week:	- :	: - :	- :	-:	- :	-:	52
3d week:	-	: -:	- :	-:	- :	- :	39
4th week:		::	:	:	:	:	16
Total:		·:			:	:	96
March: :		: :		:	:	:	
lst week:	-	: 1:	- :	-:	- :	1:	20
2d week:	-	: -:	- :	· - :	- :	- :	35
4th week	-	: - : :	- :	- :	- :	-:	148 148
5th week:	_	·			- :	-:	7
The second secon		·			<u>-</u>		228
Total:		<u> </u>				:	
April:		: :		: :	:	:	• •
2d week		: 2: : 6:	_	: :	- :	2:	10:
3d week	- 5		_	- : - :			
4th week:	32	: -:	-	-:	_ :		
Total:	37	8:		- 1		45 :	35
May: :		: :					
lst week:	96	:	-	- :	- :	96 :	13
2d week:	186		- :	-:	- :	186 :	17
3d week:	386		- :	: 2:	- :	388 :	13
Lth week:	. 873	: 11:	- :	: 1:	_ :	885 :	231
5th week:	772 2,313	:91 : : 102 :		3	<u>l</u>	867:	12 <i>l</i> 801
June:	ر ۱ ر	. 102		6:	<u>-</u>	2,422:	001
1st week:	1,176	251 :	8	75 :	7 :	1,517 :	9
2d week:	1,649				28 :		
3d week:	2,145		<b>1</b> 48 :	282 :	156 :	3,066:	1
Lth week:	2,090		254		672 :		
Total:	7,060	:1,284_:	456	911:	863:	10,574_:	10
July: :		: :	0	:	: :	:	
1st week: 2d week:	917 543						
3d week	. 169						
Lth week	101				2,407		
Total:	1,730	<del></del>			8,798		·
	1,100	: 1,010			0,790 :	14,549	·
August: :	73	: :			:	:	
2d week:	73	: 393 : : 294 :			2,360:		
3d week:	Ĺ				2,146: 1,906:		
4th week:	6				1,563:	2,011:	
5th week:	6	:301:		130:	1,438:	1,875:	
Total:	98	1,609:	34	1,261:	9,413:	12,415:	
September: :		: ::		: 01	27.0	:	
lst week:		: 118: : 213:		: 84: : 50:	918 : 504 :		
2d week:					228 :	767 : 355 :	
4th week:							
Total:		486 :			1,787		
October: :		:		: :			**************************************
1st week:	-	: 27 :					
2d week:	-	: 5 : : 5 :					
4th week:	-	: 5:		: 5: Ц:			
Total:		140		35	128		
November: 3/		:		: <u>-</u> :			
lst week:	-	: 1:					
2d week:		:1:				2 :	
Total:	_	? :		:2:	- :	4:	
:	2	:			00.000	10.4	- /
Grand total:	11,238	: 5,196:	850	: 4,367 :	20,990	42,641:	1,62

Source: Compiled from data published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service. Note. -- Shipments of California watermelons are chiefly from the desert valleys through June. Shipments from the desert valleys virtually cease by the 2d week of July.

<sup>1/</sup> Represents the carlot equivalents of rail and truck unloads.

2/ No unloads were reported for the 1st and 2d weeks of January 1960.

3/ No unloads were reported after the 2d week of November 1960.

Table 11.--Watermelons: Unloads in 22 U.S. markets, by specified sources, May 1959

(Carlot equivalents of rail, truck, and boat unloads)

Market	<b>:</b>	Mexico				
TIGH NOV	Arizona	Cali- fornia	Florida	Texas	Total	
Atlanta	: -	•	: 56	• _ •	56	
Baltimore	-	• -	118		118	
Birmingham		_	90		90	
Boston	: -	1	116		117	10
Chicago	<b>.</b> -	12			153	
Cincinati	: -	: - :	47	: - :	47	
Cleveland	The state of the s	. 1	107	· • -	108	
Dallas		<b>.</b> -	17			-1
Denver	: -	: 2	-	: 4:		31
Detroit	: -	: 4	122	: (- :	: 126 :	7
Fort Worth	: : -	: -	3	: - :	3	2
Kansas City	: 1	- : 460 <b>-</b> 1	32	: 1:	34	21
Los Angeles	,	: 204	: -	: -:	204	
Louisville	-	<b>:</b> :	: 15	: - :	: 15 :	· ·
Minneapolis-St. Paul	: 2	: -	53	<b>:</b> - :	55	9
New York-Newark		: :	701	: : -:	701	81
Philadelphia	: -	: -	: 213	: - :	213	1
Pittsburgh	: -	: 1	: 116	:	: 117	: 12
Portland, Oreg	: ÷	: 13	: -	: -	: 13 :	. 11
St. Louis	<b>.</b>	<b>:</b> -	: 46	: -	46	18
San Francisco-Oakland	: 2	<b>5</b> 0		: - :	52	70
Washington, D.C	•	: -	: 120	: - :	120	. ·
Total, 22 markets	5	288	2,113	:7	2,413	568

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service.

Table 12.--Watermelons: Representative midweek price quotations at specified wholesale markets in the United States, 1959

(In cents per pound. Capital letters in parentheses following the price quotations indicate the principal source of the merchandise, as follows: M, Mexico; T, Texas; F, Florida; C, California; A. Arizona; and X. other)

Period	Los Angeles	San Francisco	Chicago	New York
January: 4th week 1/	: 15.0-16.0(M)	- :		-
√. <del>.</del>	:	•		• <b>:</b>
February: 1st week 2/	: 15.0(M) :	18.0(M) :	. <del>-</del>	: -
March:	· :	· :		:
lst week	•	18.0(M) :	15.0-20.0(M)	<b>:</b> -
2d week		- :	14.0(M)	: 14.0-15.0(M)
3d week		18.0(M) :		: 12.0-13.0(M)
4th week		-1.00 -0.00(11)	···	: 12.0-14.0(M)
5th week	: 10.0-11.0(M) :	14.0-15.0(M) :	11.0(M)	: 12.0-13.0(M)
April:	:	•		:
lst week		11.0-12.0(M) :		: 10.0-12.0(M)
2d week		7.5 - 8.0(M):	8.0(M)	: 9.0-11.0(M,F)
3d week		7.0- 7.5(M) :	-	8.0-10.0(M)
4th week	: 6.5-7.0(M) :	6.5 - 7.0(M):	<del>-</del> ,	: 9.5-12.0(M,F)
May:	:	:	()	:
1st week	. , , , , , , , ,	6.5- 7.0(M) :	7.0(M)	: 6.0 - 8.0(M,F)
2d week	()			: 6.0 - 8.0(M,F)
3d week				: 5.0-6.0(F)
4th week	: 5.0-5.5(c) :	6.0(M) :	7.0- 7.5(M,F)	: 7.0-8.0(F)
June:	:		/	:
lst week		4.5- 5.0(C) :	6.5- 7.0(F,T)	: 7.0(F)
2d week		4.5(C):		6.5-7.0(F,T)
Lith week			5.0- 7.0(T,C)	: 5.5- 6.5(F,T)
5th week		3.5(c,A):		: 5.0- 6.0(F,T)
July:	: 2.5-2.75(0,A):	3.25- 3.5(A) :	4.0- 4.25(F,T,C,A)	: 4.0(F,X)
lst week	: 2.75- 3.0(c)	3 O 3 T (A ) .	2 2	: ספר אליש)
2d week		3.0- 3.5(A) : 3.5- 4.0(C) :		: 2.75- 3.5(X) : 2.75- 3.75(X)
3d week				: 2.5- 2.75(X)
Lth week			2.25 - 2.7 (X)	: 2.5- 3.0(X)
August:	• 7.0- 4.5(0,1) •	4.7- 7.0(0,A):	2.25- 2.1 (A)	· 2.5- 3.0(A)
1st week	: 3.0-3.5(c) :	3.0- li.0(c)	2.25- 2.5(T,X)	: 2.25- 2.75(x)
2d week				: , 2.0- 2.5(X)
3d week		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		: 4.0- 4.5(x)
4th week	: 2.50- 2.75(c) :			: 3.25- 4.5(X)
September:	:	:	2.0 0.0(1311)	· J·cJ- 4.5(A)
1st week	: 2.25-2.50(C) :	2.5- 3.0(C) :	3.0- 3.25(X)	: 3.25- 3.75(x)
2d week			/ \	2.5 - 3.0(X)
3d week				3.0- 3.5 (x)
4th week			., ,	: -
5th week				- -
October: 3/	:	:		:
lst week	: 2.0-2.50(c) :	3.0(C) :	<del>-</del>	: -
2d week	: 2.25-2.50(C) :	- 1 1	<b>-</b>	-
3d week		-:	<del>-</del>	<b>.</b>
4th week		<b>-</b> ':	<del>-</del>	· -
	:	•		•

Source: Compiled from data published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

<sup>1/</sup> No price quotations were available before the 4th week of January 1959.

2/ No price quotations were available for the 2d, 3d, and 4th weeks of February 1959.

3/ No price quotations were available after October 1959.

Table 13.--Watermelons: Representative midweek price quotations at specified whole-sale markets in the United States, 1960

(<u>In cents per pound</u>. Capital letters in parentheses following the price quotations indicate the principal source of the merchandise, as follows: M, Mexico; T, Texas; F, Florida; C, California; A, Arizona; and X, other)

F, Florida; C, California; A, Arizona; and X, other)							
Period	Los Angeles	San Francisco	Chicago	New York			
January: 1/			:				
3d week:	15.0(M)	19.0(M)					
4th week		19.0(M)	-	-			
February:		. 17.0(11)	- :	-			
lst week	13.5(M)	19.0(M)	:	11. 0.16.000			
2d week	-2-2 ()	1/.0(11/	- :	14.0-16.0(M)			
3d week	11.0-11.5(M)		-	11.0-12.0(M)			
4th week	10.0-10.5(M)	·		12.Q(M)			
March:	2010 2019(11)		-	-			
lst week	10.0(M)	14.0-15.0(M)	•	<i>r</i> *.			
2d week		10.0(M)	- :	77 0(%)			
3d week	, , ,, ,,	10.0(M)	7.0(M) :	11.0(M)			
4th week		10.0(M)	8.0(M):	10.0(M)			
5th week			8.0- 9.5(M) :	8.0-10.0(M)			
April:	, ,	· 10.0-11.0(N) .	0.0- 9.5(H) :	10.0-11.0(M)			
lst week		10.0(M)	8.0-8.5(M) :	10 0 11 0(34)			
2d week		9.0-10.0(M)	A /. \	10.0-11.0(M)			
3d week		/:	8.0-10.0(M,F):	10.0-11.0(M)			
4th week		10.0(M)	9.0-10.0(M) :	10.0-11.0(M)			
May:	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	10.0(H)	9.0-10.0(M) :	11.0-12.0(M,F)			
lst week	8.0(M)	10.0(M)	8.0- 9.0(M) :	11 0 12 0/M E)			
2d week		<b>~</b> . / \	(\	11.0-12.0(M,F)			
3d week		~ / \	7.5-8.0(M) :	7.5-10.0(M,F)			
4th week		- 4/ \	6.0- 7.5(M,F):	6.0- 9.0(M,F)			
5th week:			5.5- 6.5(M,F):	6.0- 7.0(M,F)			
June:	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	. 0.7- 1.0 dr. 907.	2.2- 0.5(H,F):	5.0- 6.0(F)			
lst week	4.0-4.5(c)	5.0(C)	•	E O 4 O(E)			
2d week:		4.5- 5.0(C)	4.5- 6.0(M,F):	5.0- 6.0(F)			
3d week:				4.0- 4.5(F)			
4th week:	2 75- 3 25 (CA)			3.25- 3.75(F)			
July:	2017- 7027 (094)	4.0(U,A):	3.0-\3.25(f,T):	3.0(F,X)			
lst week:	275-30(0)	3.5- 4.0(C,A):	30 37 (n n).	2 0/8)			
2d week:		3.5- 4.0(C,A):		3.0(X)			
3d week:	2 25- 2 75(C·A)	3.0- 4.0(C,A):	2.75- 3.25(F T):	2.25- 2.75(F,X)			
4th week:			2.5- 3.0(T,X):	2.25(F,X) 2.0- 2.5(F,X)			
August: :	2.0 0.0(0)	·	2.7- 7.0(1, 1/1.	2.0- 2.5(1,1)			
lst week:	2.25- 2.75(C)	2 75- 3 0(0)	2.5- 3.0(T,X):	1.75- 2.0(X)			
2d week:	2.0- 2.25(C)	2.5- 3.0(C)	2.0- 3.0(T,X):	1.75- 2.0(X)			
3d week:		2.25- 2.75(C) :	1.75- 2.0(X)	1.75- 2.0(X) 1.25- 1.75(X)			
4th week:	2.0- 2.5(C)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.25- 1.75(X) 1.25- 1.50(X)			
5th week:		2.0- 2.5(C) :		2.0(X)			
September: :			U- 2.5(A) ·	C.U(A)			
lst week:		2.0-2.5(c)	2.0- 2.5(X) :	3.0 X			
2d week:	2.5- 3.0(C)	2.25- 2.5(c) :	//\	3.0 X			
3d week:	2.0 - 2.75(c)	2.25- 2.5(c)	>(A)	J.0 4			
4th week:							
October: 2/		:	•	,			
lst week:	2.5(c) :	2.25-2.5(c) :					
2d week:		2.5- 3.0(c) :	Ţ.,	- -			
3d week:	<u>-</u> :	2.5(c) :		•			
		=======================================		Victoria de la companya de la compa			
		·	•				

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{1}{2}$ / No price quotations were available before the 3d week of January 1960.  $\frac{2}{2}$ / No price quotations were available after the 3d week of October 1960.

Source: Compiled from data published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.