

SPECIAL SURVEY OF U. S. TRADE POLICIES: A special survey of the foreign trade policies of the United States was ordered by the President, according to a July 13 release from the White House. The full text of the release follows:

The President has sent identical letters to the members of the Public Advisory Board for Matual Security, asking them to undertake a special survey of United States trade policies. This Board was established by the Matual Security Act of 1951 as the successor to the Public Advisory Board created in the European Recovery act of 1948. Under the terms of these Acts the members of the Board have been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Board's membership includes:

Miss Sarah G. Blanding President, Vassar College

James B. Carey Secretary-Treasurer Congress of Industrial Organizations

Jonathan W. Daniels Editor, Raleigh, N. C. News and Observer

Robert H. Hinckley Vice President American. Broadcasting Co.

Eric A. Johnston President, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

Allan B. Kline President, American Farm Burcau Federation Orin Lehman 1 William Street New York, N. Y.

A. E. Lyon Executive Secretary Railway Labor Executives Association

George H. Mead Chairman of the Board The Mead Corporation Dayton, Ohio George Meany

Secretary-Treasurer American Federation of Labor

Herschel D. Newsom Master, National Grange James G. Patton

President, National Farmers' Union

The Director for Mutual Security, Mr. Averell Harriman, is ex officio Chairman of the Public Advisory Ecard, but for purposes of this special study it is expected that the Board will name an acting chairman who is not connected with the Covernment service.

The text of the President's letter follows:

Dear _ _ _ :

I am writing you and the other members of the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security to ask that the Board undertake an investigation of the foreign trade policies of the United States, particularly as they affect our offorts under the Mutual Security Program to achieve economic strength and solvency among the free nations.

I am asking the Board to undertake this assignment because I fear that recent developments affecting our trade policy may work at cross purposes with the basic objectives of the Mutual Security Program.

We are working night and day to help build up the military and commain strength of friends and allies throughout the free world. We are spending very substantial sums of money to do this, to the end that our friends can grow strong enough to carry on without special aid from us. This is why we have urged upon them programs of increased production, trade expansion and tariff reduction, so that through world trade they can expand their dollar earnings and progressively reduce their dependence on our aid.

Yet, at the same time, we find growing up in this country an increasing body of restrictive laws attempting to further the interests of particular American producers by cutting down the imports of various foreign goods which can offer competition in American markets. The so-called "choose" amendment to the Defonse Production Act -- enacted despite a number of existing safeguards -- is a striking example of this trend. On the one hand we are insisting that our friends expand their own world trade; on the other hand we seem to be raising new barriers against imports from abroad. This poses a very real dilemma for our whole foreign policy.

In my judgment, the first stop toward clarifying this situation is for a responsible public group to study this problem and recommend to the President and the Congress the course we should follow in our trade policy. I can think of no group better qualified to do this than the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security. Representatives of business, labor, agriculture, education, and the public at large make up your membership. Both major political parties are represented. Many of you have held other high positions of public trust. From long association with the Marshall Plan and now the Mutual Security Program, you are familiar with the foreign policy of this country and the problems of international relations.

I want you to consider all aspects of our foreign trade policy as coming within the scope of your investigation. In particular, I think you should examine our tariff policy, with special reference to the expiration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1953; import restrictions, including quotas and customs procedures; agricultural policies affecting foreign trade; maritime laws and regulations concorring carriage of American goods; and what to do about the problems of demestic producers who may be injured by certain types of foreign commerce. I would also like to have your views on the role of international agencies in the trade field.

It is extremely important that the whole problem be examined. The effect of raising a tariff to protect a demestic industry, for example, should be evaluated in turns of the counter-restrictions which are raised against American exports abroad. Our tobacco producers know what this kind of discrimination can mean, but I am sure that there are many others who are not fully aware of it. Neither, I feel, have we really though through the full implications of our efforts to proven the rest of the free world from trading with the Iron Ourtain bloc. Having insisted that these countries sourcely restrict their trade in one direction, what can we suggest to replace it?

These are the kinds of problems which I want you to comsider. Mr. Gordon Gray made a significant contribution in his study of foroign economic policies in 1950. More recently, the President's Niterials Policy Commission, under the leadership of Mr. William S. Poley, has emphasized our national dependence on overseas sources of raw materials. Both of these studies, however, were concorned primarily with other problems and touched rather incidentally upon trade policy.

In order that your recommundations may have the widest possible influence, I believe that you should proceed on an independent basis, not subordinated in any way to the Government agencies concerned. I recognise that the Director for Matual Sceurity is, by statute, Chairman of your Board. However, Me. Harriman has suggested, and I agree, that he not sit with the Board for the purposes of this undertaking.

I am asking all the dopartments and agencies concerned with trade matters to give you full cooperation and whatever assistance you may desire in carrying this work forward.

Very sincerely yours,

RASRY S. TRUMAN

Department of Agriculture

PROPOSED REGULATIONS GOVERNING ENTRY OF MOLLUSKS: Notice of proposed regulations governing entry into this country of all types of mollusks was published in the Federal Register of July 25, 1952, by the U. S. Department of Agriculture. These regulations have been formulated by the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The inspection, treatment of infestation, and permit procedures are covered by the regulations.

Permits will not be issued for the entry of the giant African snail, Achatina fulica (Bowdich) or and other species of Achatina; Theba pisana (Muller); and species of slug; or any other species of mollusk determined by the Bureau to be similar to the giant African snail in its destructiveness to plant life. Permits will also be refused for the entry of other species of mollusks unless it is determined by the Bureau that the particular shipment will be entered and subsequently handled under such safeguards as deemed necessary to prevent injury to the agriculture of the United States.

Under these new regulations, permits will be required to import edible snails.

The proposed regulations as they appeared in the Federal Register follow:

Notice is hereby given under section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1003) that the Secretary of Agriculture, pursuant to Public Law 152, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 335, 7 U.S.C. Sup. 441), approved September 22, 1951, is considering the adoption of regulations, to appear in Part 324 of Chapter III. Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as follows:

PART 324-MOLLUSKS

- Sec. 324.1
- Definitions. 324.2 Mollusk infestation in Guam.
- 324.3 Inspection.
- 324.4 Treatment
- 324.5
- Entry of mollusks; permits required. 324.6 Restrictions on issuance of permits.
- 324.7 Permit procedure.
- 324.8 Mollusks entered for scientific pur-

poses. AUTHORITY: §§ 324.1 to 324.8 issued under Pub. Law 152, 82d Cong.; 65 Stat. 335, 7 U. S. C. Sup. 441.

§ 324.1 Definitions. Words used in the singular form in the regulations in this part shall be deemed to import the plural and vice versa, as the case may demand. For the purposes of this part, the following words shall be construed, respectively, to mean:

(a) Chief of Bureau. The Chief of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, or any officer or employee of the Bureau to whom authority has heretofore been delegated or may hereafter be delegated to act in his stead.

(b) Bureau. The Bureau of Entomol-ogy and Plant Quarantine, United States Department of Agriculture.

(c) Inspector. Any person authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to enforce the provisions of the Plant Quarantine Act (7 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

(d) Person. Any individual, corpora-tion, company, association, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, or other organized group of any of the foregoing.

(e) Owner. The owner or the person having responsible custody of a carrier or other regulated article subject to the amination to be infested with the gian regulations in this part.

(f) Mollusk. All living stages, including eggs, of the giant African snail or in this part shall be promptly remove other species of terrestrial or fresh-water from the United States or shall b forms of the phylum Mollusca.

District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and the United States possessions, including Pending such action, the carrier or othe but not limited to the Territory of Hawaii and other Territories of the United States, but excluding Guam.

(h) Carrier. Any vessel, vehicle, air-craft, or other kind of conveyance entering any part of the United States.

(i) Regulated article. Any produce, baggage, salvaged war material or other goods entering any part of the United for the services of the inspector durin States

(j) Permit. An authorization allowing the entry into the United States of the owner of his agent, nor the in certain mollusks in accordance with the regulations in this part.

(k) Treatment. Fumigation or any other process designed to eliminate infestation by the giant African snail or any other mollusk prohibited entry under the regulations in this part.

§ 324.2 Mollusk infestation in-Guam. prescribed by the inspector are not al The Secretary of Agriculture finds that plied promptly by the owner or his agen Guam is infested with the giant African the inspector shall apply measur snail. Therefore, the entry of mollusks, necessary to prevent the escape of the carriers, and other regulated articles mollusks. The entire cost of such as from Guam into any part of the United plication shall be borne by the owner States is subject to the same conditions as his agent and shall constitute a debt pa are applicable to the entry thereof from able to the Treasurer of the Unite foreign countries.

§ 324.3 Inspection. As a condition of entry into any part of the United States, all carriers and other regulated articles from any foreign country or country or Guam is prohibited, exce Guam shall be subject to examination under permit issued by the Chief of B by an inspector for the purpose of determining whether they are infested with States Public Health Service, and in col the giant African snail or any other mollusk prohibited entry under the regulations in this part.

§ 324.4 Treatment. (a) A carrier of other regulated article found upon ex African snail or other species of mollus

prohibited entry under the regulation promptly treated by the owner or h (g) United States. The 48 States, the agent in a manner prescribed by the in spector and under his supervision regulated article shall be immediated subject to such safeguards against escape of the mollusks as the inspecto may prescribe.

(b) All costs or charges incident to th inspection, handling, cleaning, safe guarding, or treatment of an infeste carrier or other regulated article, except regularly assigned hours of duty and a the usual places of duty, shall be borne b the owner or his agent. Neither th spector will be responsible for an costs accruing for demurrage, shippin charges, wharfage, cartage, labor, chen icals, or the like incidental to suc inspection, handling, cleaning, saft guarding, or treatment. (c) If the treatment or safeguard

States.

§ 324.5 Entry of mollusks; permits quired. Entry into the United States any species of mollusk from any forei reau or authorized official of the Unit pliance with such safeguards as may ance of such permit.

and subsequently handled under such safeguards as he deems necessary to pre-is warranted under its regulations. United States.

the country of origin, the port of entry, the purpose of the entry, and the place where and conditions under which the mollusks will be handled. If available, an mollusks will of the perpose of the purpose of the pur empty shell of the species to be entered The purpose of the proposed regula- in the FEDERAL REGISTER. should accompany the application, for tions is to prevent importations into non-

§ 324.6 Restrictions on issuance of permits. Except as provided in § 324.8, permits will not be issued for the entry of the giant African snail, Achatina fulice (Bowdich), or any other species of fulice. These pisana (Muller): any termination that a particular species in the state plant permits will not be issued for the entry of all ter-restrial and fresh-water mollusks and providing for the inspection, treatment, and safeguarding of carriers and other regulated articles coming from a foreign A chaina; Theba pisana (Muller); any termination that a particular species is species of slug; or any other species of eligible for entry under § 324.6 or § 324.8, of the United States. In administering mollusk determined by the Chief of Bu-reau to be similar to the giant African Bureau specifying the conditions of entry given to such interests as the United small in its destructiveness to plant life. and the port of entry, except that if the States Public Health Service may have Permits will also be refused for the entry species of mollusks unless it is United States Public Health Service, the discussion of the entry of certain mollusks, par-ticularly snails that are known to be determined by the Chief of Bureau that the particular shipment will be entered

purposes. Mollusks not otherwise eli- tors of human diseases that apply to \$ 324.7 Permit procedure. Any person gible for entry under \$ 324.6 may be mollusks affecting human health. desiring to enter any mollusks into the entered into the United States for scien-United States may submit to the Chief of tific purposes under permit issued by written data, views, or arguments con-Bureau an application for permit stating either the Chief of Bureau or by an au- cerning the proposed regulations should the name and address of the importer, thorized official of the United States file them with the Chief of the Bureau the approximate quantity and species Public Health Service, under such safe- of Entomology and Plant Quarantine,

purposes of identification. In consider-ing such applications, the Chief of Bu-reau will confer with other interested which would be injurious to agriculture. agencies, which may include the Division This objective would be accomplished of Mollusks, United States National under the proposed regulations by re-



carriers of human diseases. This Service has regulations (sec. 71.156 of Public Health Service Manual of Laws and Regulations; 42 CFR 71.156) governing vent injury to the agriculture of the § 324.8 Mollusks entered for scientific the entry of etiological agents and vec-

Any person who desires to submit

Done at Washington, D. C., this 22d

K. T. HUTCHINSON, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

Department of Commerce

NATIONAL PRODUCTION AUTHORITY

PERISHABLE FOOD PACKERS GRANTED FIRST PRIORITY ON CANS: A clarification of the recently issued Direction to can manufacturers requiring them to use all available tin plate (or tin plate that may become available) to fill orders for cans for packing perishable foods was issued by the National Production Authority on July 18. The action was taken in an amendment to Direction 4 to NPA Order M-25 (cans), which became effective immediately upon release.

The amendment deletes the words "so far as practicable" from Section 4 of the original Direction in order to insure the maximum number of cans for packing the 1952 perishable food crop. This Section of the Direction, as amended, states: "Subject to the provisions of Section 8 of NPA Order M-25, every can manufacturer shall schedule his operations (including the use of all tin plate in his possession, and his ordering of any such tin plate) so as to insure preference in the filling of orders for cans for packing perishable foods." The amendment was issued to strengthen the intent of the Direction.

Direction 4 to M-25 was originally issued to cushion the impact of the steel strike on the preservation of the 1952 food crop. The action suspended certain can material specifications, directed can manufacturers to give preference to can orders for packing perishable food products, and made it possible for packers to use tin plate containing any weight of tin coating for perishable foods without regard to Schedule 1 of M-25.

For details: See Direction 4 (Emergency Packing of Perishable Food Products) as amended July 18, 1952, to M-25 (Cans).

* * * * *

ALUMINUM FOIL ORDER REVOKED: Removal of all end-use restrictions on aluminum foil for packaging and similar purposes was announced on July 8, 1952, by the National Production Authority. The action was taken by revoking (effective July 14) NPA's aluminum foil order M-67.

The order was issued June 1, 1951, to limit the amount of aluminum foil of a thickness of .005 inches or less which a manufacturer might use in protective packaging. The restrictions superseded aluminum foil usage controls previously established in Order M-7 (Use of Aluminum). M-67 covered foil used for container and packaging purposes and similar uses for household purposes, for florists, gift wrapping, and seal and label usages.

For details: M-67 (Aluminum Foil, Converted) Revocation and News Release NPA-2389, dated July 8, 1952.

* * * * *

ALUMINUM FOIL REMOVED FROM CONTROLLED MATERIALS LIST: Removal of aluminun foil from the list of aluminum controlled materials forms and shapes, was announced July 23 by the National Production Authority.

This was done by NPA's issuance of amendments to CMP (Controlled Materials Plan) Regulation 1, Revised CMP Reg. 6, Direction 3 to NPA Reg. 2, NPA Order M-5 (Rated Orders for Aluminum), NPA Order M-84 (Aluminum for Destructive Uses), NPA Order M-88 (Aluminum Distributors) and NPA Order M-89 (Distribution of Controlled Materials to Retailers).

NPA pointed out that the revised regulations permit unrestricted use of aluminum foil, although the acquisition of controlled materials from which they are produced will be subject to limitations as provided in order M-5.

NPA further explained that this action is in accordance with the determination of NPA's Administrator to revise all controls in an orderly way when the materials situation justifies.

The action eliminates all use restrictions and the necessity of foil conver ers filing CMP-4B application forms or using self-certification. However, NPA emphasized, some rein is kept on the production of foil by issuance of production directives to producers of basic forms from which foil and powder are produced, despite the fact that there will be no control on the amount which may be purchased by converters.

For details see: CMP Reg. 1 amended; Revised CMP Reg. 6 amended; Direction 3 to NPA Reg. 2 amended; Order M-5 amended; Order M-84 amended; Order M-88 amend ed; Order M-89 amendment 2; and press release NPA-2435 dated July 23. NOTE: FULL TEXTS OF MATERIALS ORDERS MAY BE OBTAINED FROM NATIONAL PRODUCTION AUTHORITY, WASHINGTON 25, D. C., OR FROM ANY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REGIONAL OR FIELD OFFICE.



Economic Stabilization Agency

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES: Because of a cut by Congress in stabilization operating funds, the Office of Price Stabilization on July 12 announced a staff reduction program and changes in organization. The organizational changes are as follows:

- 1. In the 13 cities in which OFS now has both a regional and a district office, the staffs will be reduced and combined into one office in each regional headquarters city. There are now 103 OFS field offices, including 14 regional and 89 district offices. The total number of field offices will be reduced to 90 by this change. The cities in which the combining of field offices will occur are: Boston; New York; Philadelphia; Richmond; Atlanta; Cleveland; Chicago; Minneapolis; Kansas City, Missouri; Dallas; Denver; San Francisco; and Seattle.
- 2. In the National Office, the Consumer Durable Goods Division and the Consumer Goods, Distribution, Textile and Apparel Division will be combined into one division.
- 3. The Transportation, Public Utilities, and Fuels Division will be merged with other existing divisions. The Transportation Branch will become part of the Services, Fxport-Import Division. The Solid Fuels and Petroleum Branches will be included in the Rubber, Chemicals and Drugs Division. The Fublic Utilities Branch will be abolished.

In announcing these changes, the Director of Price Stabilization said: "The cost-of-living is at an all-time high and defense expenditures are growing. Therefore, even though this slash in our staff will be a big handicap to us, we still intend to carry on the very best price control program we can. And we certainly don't intend to go into a willy-nillyrush of lifting price ceilings just because our staff will be so reduced after September 1.

"Of course we will keep on with the program we have already started for the orderly and reasonable suspension of ceilings where there is little danger that prices will move up rapidly. The Congress approved that program when it passed the new Defense Production Act the other day, and we will stick right to the law."

Department of the Interior

DEFENSE FISHERIES ADMINISTRATION

EFFECT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT 1952 EXTENSION ON FISHERY INDUSTRIES: The extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950, with 1952 amendments, was signed by the President on June 30, 1952, and became Public Law 429. Provisions of the Act affecting controls on prices, wages, and salaries were extended to April 30, 1953, while those affecting materials priorities and allocations were extended to June 30, 1953.

The 1952 amendments' to the Defense Production Act of 1950 do not materially affect the materials priorities and allocations.

Vol. 14, No.

There have been some amendments in the present extension which change the price and wage control provisions of the original Act. According to the Defense Fisheries Administration, fishery products may be affected by Section 412, whice was added to the 1952 extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950, under Title IV:

"Suspension of Controls

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this Act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this Act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this Act, price or way regulations and orders, or both, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressure and wage relationships, or relative importance to business costs or living cost will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension."

The meaning of this Section for fishery products was analyzed in conference with representatives of the Office of Price Stabilization. The result of this analysis is this:

The President shall promote the earliest practical balance between production and demand. In determining this balance, increases in production as well as population will be considered.

It will be kept in mind that general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes of the Defense Production Act of 1950. The policies of the Act are mainly to promote the National defense and to prevent undue strain and dislocations upon prices, production, distribution of materials for civilian use in connection wi the defense effort.

Suspension of price ceilings, where appropriate, also will be effected for the purposes of avoidance of burdensome and unnecessary recording and reportin provisions in ceiling price regulations. As far as is known, no ceiling price regulations applying to fishery products requires recording or reporting of an kind. Ceiling Price Regulation 22 requested reports on ceiling prices for can and otherwise manufactured products, but this reporting has now been discontin Future reporting affects only new products for which a ceiling price has to be established.

The following specific factors have to be considered before suspension of price ceilings can take place:

(a) The conditions of supply must be such that the regular demands of an creased population can be met. In considering the supply, OPS will not only h

to consider domestic production, but also import excesses of fishery products which are in a comparative price range and which are consumed by approximately the same portion of the population by which the domestic production is consumed.

(b) The fishery products for which suspension is sought should have been offered below ceiling prices for a significant length of time.

(c) Historical price movements should be observed and the "below ceiling" prices should follow seasonal patterns which are customary for the fishery products under consideration for suspension.

(d) Suspension can only be considered if the part of the industry producing the fishery products in question is not threatened by strikes, boycotts, or other influences which would significantly increase wages.

(e) In considering suspension, OFS must study the relationship of wages to total cost, and it has to consider any abnormality in this relationship.

(f) Suspension may take place more easily if the item for which suspension is sought is not of great importance to general business costs. For example, the price of fishery commodities used in restaurants may not have great importance in the total sales price and, therefore, the price of such fishery commodities may be suspended if the other criteria prevail.

(g) In non-restaurant items, OPS must consider whether the item is not too important as a general living cost item, and that eventual failure of the suspension (sharply increased price) will not put too much strain on the living costs of the average household.

(h) OPS must check that the suspension will not have an unstabilizing effect on the American economy generally.

The President may terminate the suspension of ceiling prices and restore ceilings if the suspension results in a price movement contrary to expectations and the restoration is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

In the conference of representatives of the Defense Fisheries Administration and the Office of Price Stabilization, it was considered that the decontrol of fresh and processed (including canned) fruits and vegetables (Section 106) may affect the price of all canned goods, including canned fishery products. However, no definitive forecast on this interrelation can now be made. Also undetermined is the effect of the protection of retail sales prices, established under State Fair Trade Laws (Section 111). In the trade of fishery products, the application of Fair Trade Laws was negligible until now.

By Section 109 of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, small business enterprises are exempt from wage and salary control. The pertinent statutory provision follows:

"Title IV. Price and Wage Stabilization

".....The authority conferred by this title shall not be exercised with respect to the following:.....

"IX. Wages, salaries, or other compensation of persons employed in smallbusiness enterprises as defined in this paragraph: Provided, however, that the

President may from time to time exclude from this exemption such enterprises on the basis of industries, types of business, occupations, or areas, if their exemption would be unstabilizing with respect to wages, salaries, or other compensation, prices, or manpower, or would otherwise be contrary to the purposes of this Act. A small-business enterprise, for the purpose of this paragraph, is any enterprise in which a total of eight or less persons are employed in all its establishments, branches, units, or affiliates. This paragraph shall become effective thirty days after its enactment."

As far as can be seen from the wording as stated above, fishery enterprises in which a total of eight or less persons are employed will be exempt from wage and salary controls. On a Nation-wide average, fishery shore establishments employ twenty-six employees. However, this figure varies very much according to areas, fishery species handled, and seasons.

As far as employment on fishing craft is concerned, the average is, on a Nation-wide basis, about three to a boat. This factor may be of importance to the fishery industries because the owners of smaller boats and vessels will not be able to use the Defense Production Act as a basis for refusing requests for wage increases.

* * * * *

MATERIALS PRIORITY AND ALLOCATION ACTIVITIES FOR FY 1953: The Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended June 28, 1952, continues the authority for the emergency priority system until June 30, 1953. The Defense Fisheries Administration will, therefore, continue to act as claimant agency for the fishery industry and to exercise its priority and allocation functions with respect to the production of fishery commodities or products.

These functions include:

(1) The claiming for controlled materials (steel, copper, and aluminum) for the construction of fish-processing facilities and the allocation of these materials to members of the fishery industry.

(2) Furnishing spot assistance to members of the fishery industry in securing priorities for use in obtaining necessary supplies, materials, and equipment.

(3) Membership on numerous NPA requirements committee in order to insure that the fishery industry receives proper consideration in the allocation of controlled materials to industries requiring these metals. These committees determine the allocation of controlled materials to industries producing equipment and supplies required by the fishery industry.

(4) Membership on the Department of the Interior Order Clearance Committee which reviews proposed NPA material orders and prepares the Department's recommendations relative to these orders.

To carry out these functions, the Defense Fisheries Administration will continue to maintain a small staff in Washington, D. C., and will utilize the services of the field staffs of the Market News Section of the Branch of Commercial Fisheries.

54

August 1952

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO ALASKA COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REG-ULATIONS: The Secretary of the Interior gave notice in the Federal Register of July 3 that he intends to adopt amended regulations permitting and governing the time, means, and methods for taking of commercial fish in the waters of Alaska.

The regulations are to become effective beginning about February 1, 1953, and to continue in effect thereafter until further notice.

Interested persons are hereby given an opportunity to participate in formulating the regulations by submitting their views, data, or arguments in writing to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, Washington 25, D. C., before November 20, 1952, or by presenting their views at a series of open discussions scheduled to be held at the following designated places on the dates specified:

Naknek, Alaska August 8
Dillingham, Alaska August 9
Kodiak, AlaskaSeptember 26
Anchorage, Alaska September 29
Cordova, Alaska October 1
Ketchikan, Alaska October 13

Klawock, AlaskaOctober 14 Wrangell, Alaska ..October 15 Petersburg, Alaska .October 16 Sitka, AlaskaOctober 17 Juneau, AlaskaOctober 20 Seattle, Wash.November 5, 6, 7



Interstate Commerce Commission

ORDER FOR HEAVY LOADING OF FREIGHT RESCINDED: Interstate Commerce Commission Service Order 878, prescribing minimum loading requirements for canned goods and foodstuffs in railroad freight cars, was vacated and set aside effective July 15, according to the Federal Register of July 17. Just recently the order had been extended to November 30, 1952. NOTE: ALSO SEE <u>COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW</u>, JULY 1952, P.50.



Department of State

NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES COMMISSION--SECOND ANNUAL MFETING: The Second Annual Meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries opened on June 30 at St. Andrews, New Brunswick, Canada, and continued until July 9, 1952. The United States Delegation was:

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS:

JOHN L. KASK, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR. BERNHARD K. KNOLLENBERG, CHESTER, CONNECTICUT.

FRANCIS W. SARGENT, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF MARINE FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

ADVISERS:

HERBERT W. GRAHAM, CHIEF, NORTH ATLANTIC FISHERY INVESTIGATIONS, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERV-ICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

LIONEL A. WALFORD, CHIEF, BRANCH OF FISHERY BIOLOGY, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPART-MENT OF THE INTERIOR.

OBSERVER FROM THE UNITED STATES INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

PATRICK MCHUGH, SECRETARY-TREASURER, ATLANTIC FISHERMAN'S UNION (AFL), BRIGHTON, MASSA-CHUSETTS.

In accordance with the terms of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, which entered into force in July 1950, the Commission provides the machinery for international cooperation in the scientific investigaion and development of the fishery resources of the waters off the west coast of Greenland and the east coasts of Canada and New England. While the Commission has no direct regulatory powers, it may recommend to governments the regulatory measures that it considers necessary for maintaining, at a maximum level for sustained production, the stocks of fish which support the international fisheries in the Convention area. Upon approval by the governments directly concerned, regulations become applicable to all member countries. The First Meeting of the Commission was held at Washington in April 1951.

This Meeting served as an opportunity for a review of the first year of the Commission's operations. The Commission heard committee reports on research and statistics, finance and administration, permanent headquarters site, ratifications of the Convention, staff matters, and certain panel reports. The 1952-53 budget was considered in accordance with decisions concerning a permanent headquarters and secretariat. Membership of the panels, established under the Convention to exercise primary responsibility concerning each of the five subareas into which the Convention area is divided, was reviewed. The Commission elected a new Chairman to serve for one year, and appointed a permanent Executive Secretary. Policies on the collection, compilation, and dissemination of statistical data; on the development of research programs for the entire Convention area and its five subareas; and on the Commission's Working relationship to other international organizations with related objectives were discussed and formulated.

The United States and Canada are the members of the Panel for subarea V, covering that portion of the total area adjacent to the New England coast. The Commission considered a report from this panel, which met in February 1952 to determine whether measures for the regulation of fisheries in subarea V should be recommended to the Commission for adoption. The Panel recommended that the Commission: (1) instruct its Research and Statistics Committee to make a detailed study of all fish resources falling within the purview of the Convention; (2) consider a proposed regulation for haddock fishing, including a proposal to increase the average mesh size of the nets used in fishing for haddock off the New England coast; and (3) call the attention of interested governments to a recommended research program concerning haddock.

Invitations to participate in this meeting were extended to Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States, which are parties to the Convention; to France, Italy, Norway, and Portugal, which have signed but not yet ratified the Convention; and to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.



56

August 1952

Tariff Commission

TUNA INVESTIGATION ANNOUNCED: A public notice announcing a tuna investigation under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 was issued by the U. S. Tariff commission on June 30, 1952. The full text of the notice follows:

"PUBLIC NOTICE

"TUNA FISH

"INVESTIGATION UNDER SECTION 332 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

"By direction of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate on June 26, 1952, the United States Tariff Commission, on the 30th day of June 1952, instituted a general investigation under the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh or frozen tuna fish on the livelihood of American fisherman.

"The purpose of the investigation is to determine the facts relative to the production, trade, and consumption of tuna fish in the United States, taking into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy, including the interests of consumers, processors, and producers. Upon completion of the investigation the Commission will submit a report of the results thereof to the Senate Finance Committee. Such report will include a statement of findings as to the effect upon the competitive position of the domestic tuna fishing industry of the present duty-free entry of fresh and frozen tuna.

"A public hearing at which all interested parties will be given opportunity to express their views will be held in connection with this investigation. The time and place of such hearing will be announced at a future date.

"I hereby certify that the above investigation was instituted by the United States Tariff Commission on the 30th day of June 1952."

> /s/ Donn N. Bent Secretary

On July 10, 1952, the Tariff Commission ordered that a public hearing be field in connection with this investigation, beginning at 10 a.m. November 17, 1952, in the Hearing Room, Tariff Commission Building, 8th and E Streets, N.W., Tashington, D. C. All interested parties will be given an opportunity to appear and to be heard with respect to the subject matter of the investigation.

Interested parties desiring to appear and to be heard at the public hearing should notify the Secretary of the Commission in writing at its offices in Wash-Ington, D. C. in advance of the date set for the hearing.



Eighty-Second Congress (Second Session)

JULY 1952

The Eighty-second Congress adjourned sine die on July 7, 1952. All bills and resolutions introduced and not passed by this Congress will have to be reinroduced in the Eighty-third Congress if they are to be considered.

Vol. 14, No. 8

Listed below are public bills and resolutions introduced and referred to committees, or passed by the Eighty-second Congress (Second Session) and signed by the President. However, the more pertinent reports, hearings, or chamber actions on some of the bills shown in this section from month to month are also listed.

BILLS INTRODUCED:

Interstate Shipment of Fish: S. 3438 (Magnuson) - A bill to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILLS PASSED:

<u>Interior Appropriations: H. R. 7176</u>, Interior appropriations for 1953, was cleared by the Senate for the President by adoption of conference report thereon. (Includes Fish and WildlifeService appropriations.)

House adopted by a voice vote the conference report on <u>H</u>. <u>R</u>. <u>7176</u>, after rejecting a recommittal motion.

Seaward Boundaries: House adopted by a voice vote \underline{H} . Res. $\underline{676}$, to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to study the seaward boundaries of the United States.

<u>Territorial School-Lunch Program</u>: House cleared for Presidential action, after taking by unanimous consent from the Speaker's table with Senate amendments thereto and the amendments agreed to, <u>H. R. 1732</u>, which would put Alaska and Hawaii on the same basis as the States in the apportionment of funds for the school-lunch program.

Senate passed with amendment and sent back to the House <u>H</u>. <u>R</u>. <u>1732</u>, to place Alaska and Hawaii on the same basis as the States in the apportionment of funds for the school-lunch program.

Undersized Fish--To Prevent Shipment in Interstate Commerce: Senate passed on the call of the calendar <u>H. R. 5083</u>, to regulate further the interstate shipment of undersized fish.

<u>Water Pollution</u>: On call of the calendar Senats passed without amendment and cleared for the President <u>H. R. 6856</u>, providing a 3-year extension of the Water Pollution Control Act.

<u>North Pacific International Fisheries Conven-</u> tion: Resolution of ratification was adopted by Senate on the treaty and international convention for high-seas fisheries of North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol on behalf of U. S., Canada, and Japan (Exec. S, 82d Cong., 2d sess.).

BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT:

<u>Defense Production Act:</u> S. <u>2594</u>, amending and extending the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, was signed by the President June 30, 1952 (\underline{P} . \underline{L} . <u>429</u>).

Sea Lamprey Studies: <u>H. R. 6500</u>, authorizing \$446,000 during fiscal year 1953 for investigations and studies of the sea lampreys of the Great Lakes, signed by the President July 1, 1952 (<u>P. L. 434</u>).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS:

Interstate Transportation of Fish: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in executive session ordered favorably reported without amendment <u>S. 3438</u>, to regulate further the interstate shipment of fish.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS:

Committee reports on bills reported in this section of interest to the fishery and allied industries (available only from the committee submitting the report).

Amending the Joint Resolution on August 8, 1946, as Amended, with Respect to Appropriations Authorized for the Conduct of Investigations and Studies Thereunder, Senate Report No. 1793 (June 19, 1952, 82d Congress, 2d Session), 3 p., printed, to accompany H. R. 6500. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom H. R. 6500 was referred, recommended passage of the bill, which would authorize the continuation of the investigations and studies of the Great Lakes sea lampreys. Authorized limit of cost for fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, is set at \$446,000 by the bill.

Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1953, House Report No. 2451, (July 3, 1952, 82d Congress, 2d Session), ll p., printed, to accompany <u>H.R. 7176</u>. Gives recommendations of Committee of Conference on disagreement of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the <u>H. R. 7176</u>, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (includes Fish and Wildlife Service appropriations).

