



# FEDERAL ACTIONS



## Department of Commerce

IMPORTED FISHERY PRODUCTS ESSENTIAL TO THE UNITED STATES: Imported articles (necessities and semi-necessities) which are not produced in the United States or for which the United States is dependent on foreign sources include certain fishery products, according to the March 26 issue of the Foreign Commerce Weekly issued by the U. S. Department of Commerce. Below are listed the value of the 1950 imports of fishery products essential to the United States and the percentage supplied by the principal countries:

	Imports 1950 (\$1,000's)	Countries of Origin and Percentage Supplied (1950)
Sperm oil .....	\$3,219	Norway (62.2%), United Kingdom (29.9%)
Agar .....	464	Japan (83.6%) Korea (12.5%)
Cod-liver oil ...	2,755	Japan (35.1%) Iceland (24.1%) Norway (15.1%) Canada (14.7%)

The United States was able to produce the necessary requirements of agar during World War II.

## NATIONAL PRODUCTION AUTHORITY

INTENSIFIED MEASURES TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH REGULATIONS: Intensified measures to assure compliance with regulations of the National Production Authority, U. S. Department of Commerce, were announced April 11 by the Administrator of NPA.

They will include an expansion of industry surveys and spot checks on compliance, vigorous prosecution of willful violators, and broadening of NPA's cooperative efforts to assist industry in conforming with the agency's regulations.

NPA will soon begin a compliance survey of a cross-section of each industry affected by NPA controls, covering 25 business concerns in each field and including large, medium, and small enterprises on a broad basis of geographic distribution.

When deliberate violations are found, the NPA will refer the cases to the Department of Justice for prompt and vigorous prosecution.

\* \* \* \* \*

SULFURIC ACID PLACED UNDER LIMITED ALLOCATION: Sulfuric acid was placed under limited allocation on April 18 by the National Production Authority.

NOTE: COPIES OF REGULATIONS, NOTICES, PRESS RELEASES, ETC., ISSUED BY THE NPA ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE NATIONAL PRODUCTION AUTHORITY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON 25, D. C., OR FROM DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FIELD OFFICES.

Specific authorization by NPA to deliver or use sulfuric acid is required by the new order (Schedule 3 to Order M-45, dated April 17, 1951) only in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana.

The order directs purchasers of sulfuric acid in all States to certify to suppliers the end-uses to which the chemical would be put. Suppliers are required to report to NPA (on Form NPAF-47) their customers, quantities ordered, and end-uses certified. Filing date is the 10th day of the month before the proposed delivery month.

Purchasers of 60 tons of sulfuric acid a month or less are exempted from the order.

There is a national shortage of sulfuric acid, NPA said. It is particularly serious in the 11 Far Western States, making it necessary for NPA to set up allocation controls for equitable distribution of sulfuric acid in the region.

Two factors are responsible for the region's shortage: lack of adequate productive capacity to meet local needs and difficulty in transporting sulfuric acid from plants in other parts of the country.

The sulfuric acid order sets up a reporting mechanism for suppliers in all States so that the agency can obtain a national end-use pattern and devise an ultimate method of national control.

Sulfuric acid is used directly or indirectly in nearly all industrial processes, including food testing and processing, and in the production of certain fishery byproducts.

It is understood that NPA hopes to be able to approve all requests for quantities of sulfuric acid for sale to small users—firms purchasing less than 60 tons per month—since the amount required for these users will be only a small percentage of the total supply.

\* \* \* \* \*

MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND OPERATING SUPPLIES ORDER AMENDED: Certain scarce materials have been removed from the list of products which business firms, institutions, and government agencies obtain by using a defense order rating (DO-97) for maintenance, repair, and operating (MRO) supplies, and minor capital additions, the National Production Authority announced April 16.

NPA said the action was necessary to insure an orderly flow of certain materials to the defense effort and to essential civilian production needs.

In accordance with the provisions of Regulation 4 (MRO) as amended April 16, the DO-97 rating may not be applied or extended in obtaining the following materials:

1. ALL BASIC, ORGANIC OR INORGANIC CHEMICALS, THEIR INTERMEDIATES AND DERIVATIVES OTHER THAN COMPOUND END-PRODUCTS NOT CUSTOMARILY SOLD AS CHEMICALS.
2. ITEMS APPEARING IN LIST A OF NPA ORDER M-47, AS THE SAME MAY BE AMENDED FROM TIME TO TIME (NONE DIRECTLY USED IN THE FISHING AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES).

3. NYLON FIBERS AND YARNS.
4. PACKAGING MATERIALS AND CONTAINERS.
5. PAINT, LACQUER, AND VARNISH.
6. PAPER AND PAPER PRODUCTS.
7. PAPERBOARD AND PAPERBOARD PRODUCTS.
8. PHOTOGRAPHIC FILM.
9. RAILS, TIE PLATES, TRACK SPIKES, SPLICE BARS, RAIL JOINTS, FROGS, AND SWITCHES.
10. RUBBER TIRES AND TUBES.

Further changes in Regulation 4 are being considered, in addition to this amendment, but it is not expected that the additional changes will affect the list of items given above and now excluded.

The DO-97 rating continues in use for all other MRO supplies (except those specifically mentioned in the above list) and minor capital additions as provided for in Regulation 4 as amended. Such DO rating shall be applied by placing on the order for MRO or minor capital additions the symbol "DO-97" together with the words "Certified under NPA Reg. 4" and signed as prescribed in section 8 of NPA Reg. 2. This certification shall constitute a representation to the supplier and to the NPA that the person making it is authorized under the provisions of this regulation to use the rating to obtain the materials covered by the order.

NOTE: ALSO SEE COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW, MARCH 1951, PP. 46-7; DECEMBER 1950, PP. 60-1; NOVEMBER 1950, P. 83.

\* \* \* \* \*

CAN MANUFACTURERS REPORT PARTIAL SUCCESS IN CONVERTING FACILITIES TO SOLDER BLACKPLATE: Can manufacturers met on March 27 with the National Production Authority and reported partial success in converting facilities for soldering tin plate and terneplate so that the facilities can be used to solder blackplate.

Technical problems encountered by some members of the Can Manufacturers Industry Advisory Committee delayed completion of conversion beyond March 31, but by June all members expected to have finished converting.

Blackplate cans (often used for dry food pack) are made of uncoated black iron; terneplate cans have a combination of lead and tin on blackplate and are used for nonfood containers, such as oil cans; tin plate, normally used both in food and nonfood containers, has a coating of tin on blackplate.

Producers were reported reluctant to go ahead with the erection of plants for the chemical treatment of blackplate (substitute for tin plate) because of the uncertainties of its commercial future when tin again comes into sufficient supply.

Experiments with the electrolytic coating of .20 tin (pounds of tin per base box of plate) were described by one manufacturer as showing no particular production difficulty. It is not known, however, how satisfactorily such cans will stand up under actual pack conditions.

\* \* \* \* \*

FISHING TACKLE INDUSTRY REQUESTS RELIEF FROM BASIC METALS REGULATIONS: Members of the Fishing Tackle Industry Advisory Committee on March 26 asked the National Production Authority for relief from NPA regulations on basic metals, to keep their industry operating through the transition from civilian to defense production.

NPA told the committee that the industry may be afforded some relief through a controlled materials plan under consideration.

Industry members advised NPA that continued unavailability of steel, aluminum, copper, and nickel, plus the fact that the industry generally has not yet received defense contracts has caused the industry serious concern. Committee members urged that the essentiality of their industry to health, noncommercial food supply, and recreation be considered.

The committee said the industry is unable to substitute to any substantial degree because of difficulty in obtaining materials such as fibre glass and split canes for rods and plastics for handles.



## Economic Stabilization Administration

### OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

COLD STORAGE INDUSTRY REQUESTS NEW CEILING PRICE REGULATION: The Cold Storage Industry Advisory Committee has asked the Office of Price Stabilization to write a new Ceiling Price Regulation which would provide the industry with a method of seeking price adjustments where cost increases cannot be absorbed, according to an April 3 OPS news release.

The industry now is under the General Ceiling Price Regulation (GCPR), which froze prices at the highest level they reached between December 19, 1950, and January 25, 1951. The GCPR now makes no provision for individual price adjustments.

The industry men told OPS that some cold storage companies were caught in a price squeeze by the GCPR. They said any new price regulation should allow adjustments for these so-called "hardship cases." Other firms currently are negotiating new labor contracts and it is possible that wage increases will be too big to be absorbed in full from existing profits, they said.

In addition, the industry representatives pointed out that the GCPR fails to provide for price adjustments for long-term contracts entered into before the general price freeze last January. They said this should be corrected in the new regulation.

Indications were, however, that few price increases would result from the issuance by OPS of a specially designed price regulation for the cold storage industry.

OPS officials agreed to study the industry's problem and appointed an industry subcommittee, which will supply OPS with pertinent cost-profit data on the industry.

\*\*\*\*\*

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES TO BE ADMINISTERED FROM WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS: The Office of Price Stabilization on March 26 abolished enforcement activities in the 13 regional offices to improve efficiency by establishing direct contact between Washington headquarters and the enforcement operations in the district offices.

Under the new arrangement, which is based on the successful operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, district enforcement officers will report directly to Washington, and will take their instructions and orders from national headquarters, rather than having them relayed through the regional set-ups.

The offices of regional directors for enforcement will be abolished, and instead a chief inspector and several assistant inspectors will be named for each regional office.

They will be concerned with inspection and general reports of operations in the districts under their region, and will be jointly responsible to Washington and to the regional director.

The district offices will each have a district enforcement director and as many assistants as are needed. The district enforcement director will report directly to Washington.

\* \* \* \* \*

HIGHER FREIGHT COSTS TO BE ABSORBED BY SELLERS: An interpretation covering permissible additions to ceiling prices based on recent higher freight costs was issued by the Office of Price Stabilization on April 9. Interpretation 1 follows:

### Interpretation 1 General Ceiling Price Regulation

APR. 9, 1951

#### TITLE 32A—NATIONAL DEFENSE, APPENDIX

##### Chapter III—Office of Price Stabilization, Economic Stabilization Agency

[General Ceiling Price Regulation,  
Interpretation 1]

##### GCPR, INT. 1—INCREASES IN TRANSPORTATION COSTS

In order to clarify the situation with regard to the general increase in freight rates recently authorized by the ICC, the Office of Price Stabilization has issued the following rules for determining whether a seller under the General Ceiling Price Regulation may pass on to his buyers increases in transportation costs:

(1) Increases in inbound transportation costs, incurred by the seller in obtaining delivery from his supplier, cannot be added to the seller's ceiling prices. The seller must absorb all such increases.

(2) Increases in outbound transportation costs on shipment by the seller to his customers:

(a) If the seller during the base period quoted a delivered price he must, subject to the exceptions in paragraph (d)

below, absorb any increases in transportation costs. Thus a seller who sold to all buyers at the same delivered price, or who had different delivered prices in different zones which do not correspond with the precise difference in transportation costs incurred by the seller for delivery to each such zone, must absorb increases in transportation.

(b) If the seller sold f. o. b. in the base period, adding on only actual transportation costs, increases in outbound transportation costs actually incurred by the seller may properly be passed on to the purchaser.

(c) Where the seller in the base period quoted an f. o. b. price, plus a "transportation charge", but such "transportation charge" did not represent the actual transportation cost incurred by the seller, such sale, for the purpose of this interpretation, is considered as falling within paragraph (a) above and the seller must therefore absorb any increase in transportation costs, as provided in paragraph (a).

(d) If the seller sold at a delivered price during the base period, but such price was computed on the basis of an

f. o. b. price, adjusted for the actual cost of making delivery to each individual purchaser, the seller may pass on increases in transportation costs actually incurred. However, this method of computing the base period delivery price must have been objectively established to purchasers, as where the seller offered both a delivered and an f. o. b. price, the difference being the actual transportation costs, or where the seller quoted, billed actual transportation charges separately, or where the delivered price varied in each locality precisely by the difference in actual cost of transportation incurred by the seller for delivery to the several localities.

(e) If the seller sold only at delivered prices in the base period and now desires to shift to f. o. b. prices, the seller must reduce his ceiling prices, as established for sales on a delivered basis in the base period, by the amount of each purchaser's actual freight cost.

HAROLD LEVENTHAL,  
Chief Counsel,  
Office of Price Stabilization.

APRIL 9, 1951.

\* \* \* \* \*

REPORTS OF CEILING PRICE VIOLATIONS TO BE INVESTIGATED: Teams of enforcement officers of the Office of Price Stabilization have been ordered into several cities to investigate reports of ceiling price violations in three industry fields, the OPS Office of Enforcement said on April 16.

Investigators from Washington headquarters are aiding local enforcement officials in Chicago, Kansas City, Houston, Dallas, Omaha, and Columbus and some areas of New Jersey. They are checking into violation reports in scrap steel, automobiles, and food.

The men will spend several days in a concentrated check of reports of ceiling violations, and will report their findings to Washington.

\* \* \* \* \*

CPR 7 (RETAIL CEILING PRICES FOR CERTAIN CONSUMER GOODS) AMENDED: An Amendment 2 to Ceiling Price Regulation 7 (Retail Ceiling Prices for Certain Consumer Goods) was issued on April 5 by the Office of Price Stabilization. This Amendment adds various categories of articles to the coverage of the Regulation. Among the numerous items listed are the following of interest to the fishing and allied industries:

Category 921—Sporting Goods: fishing tackle; fishing rods; and other fishing accessories.

Under various OPS regulations increases in ceiling prices may be provided for manufacturers and wholesalers, all or part of which retailers may be permitted to pass on to their purchasers. This amendment adds to the regulation a provision which requires the retailer to determine his ceiling price on the basis of the basic price and permits him to add to his price so determined the portion of the increase granted his supplier which the regulation granting the increase designates as a "permitted increase."

NOTE: SEE COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW, MARCH 1951, P. 50.

\* \* \* \* \*

FATTY ACIDS CEILING-PRICE REGULATION PROVISIONS DISCUSSED: Members of the Fatty Acids Industry Advisory Committee met on April 27 to discuss with the Office of Price Stabilization provisions to be included in a proposed specific ceiling price regulation covering fatty acids.

Among the things discussed were the commodities to be covered by the proposed regulation, whether to stipulate delivered or f.o.b. producers plant prices, quantity and container differentials, and the means of describing the commodities to be included.

OPS also stated that the proposed ceiling prices would be derived from the ceiling prices of the principal raw materials used. Ceiling price regulations for fish oil and glycerine are now under consideration.



## Department of the Interior

### DEFENSE FISHERIES ADMINISTRATION

ALASKA SALMON CONCENTRATION ORDER NOT TO BE INSTITUTED IN 1951: Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman announced on April 16 that the proposed salmon concentration program in Alaska would not be instituted during the 1951 packing season.

The decision was reached on the basis of recommendations by Maurice Rattray, Deputy Administrator of the Defense Fisheries Administration, who conducted a series of hearings in Seattle in March to investigate the situation.

Rattray explained that because supplies and materials have, for the most part, already been procured for the 1951 season, DFA officials feel that the savings in materials and manpower which would result from the concentration plan might not be sufficient to justify the cost and additional personnel necessary for DFA to administer and supervise the proposed order.

The proposed plan involved the packing of salmon in less than the total number of existing Alaska plants and would have limited the total units of fishing gear in operation. The program was proposed to save critical materials, manpower, and shipping space.

An expanded concentration plan, however, will be considered for the 1952 season, and area criteria similar to those proposed for 1951 are expected to be used in fixing the amount of plants and gear to be utilized, according to Rattray. This plan, he said, would depend entirely upon the state of the emergency existing early in 1952.

If critical materials and manpower are deemed to be in short supply early in 1952, the Defense Fisheries Administration will expect the canned salmon industry and the fishermen to do their part to effect economy in their operations. It would be inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the Defense Production Act to contemplate, in any of the fishing areas of Alaska, the use of either materials or manpower greatly in excess of the amount needed to produce a maximum production of canned salmon.

\* \* \* \* \*

FISHERY ADVISORY GROUP MEETS WITH DFA OFFICIALS: Declaring that "food is as essential as guns in the mobilization program, and fish is an important segment of food," Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman opened a two-day meeting in Washington, D. C., on April 16, of representatives of the commercial fishing industry who were called to Washington to confer with officials of the Defense Fisheries Administration and other Government agencies.

The meeting was held under the joint auspices of the Defense Fisheries Administration of the Department of the Interior, the Office of Price Stabilization, and the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of exchanging information and discussing problems of maintaining a high production of seafood despite shortages of materials and manpower.

Established recently as the Industry Advisory Committee for Fresh and Frozen Fish by the three Government agencies, the industry members are representative vessel owners and wholesale fish dealers from all the important fish-producing areas of the country who deal principally with fish in the fresh and frozen stages.

The meeting was devoted to production problems; a discussion of the general agriculture situation and the program being followed as a means to increase production of most agricultural commodities; an examination of the possible military requirements for fish during the coming year; the present aspects of the manpower situation; the function of the Selective Service System and the possibilities of obtaining deferments for fishermen in critical occupations; methods of adjusting wage rates controlled under the January 25 freeze order; a discussion of shortages of materials and priorities assistance as well as the possible impact of a controlled materials plan on the fishing industry; a discussion of the probability of increased imports of many varieties of fish; and a discussion of price controls on fresh and frozen fish.



## Interstate Commerce Commission

### DECISION CONTINUES EXEMPTION OF MANY TRUCKS CARRYING FRESH AND FROZEN FISH:

On April 13 the Interstate Commerce Commission reaffirmed its decision of September 23, 1949, in its docket MC89207, better known as the "Monark Egg Case."

This decision confirms broad exemptions from the Interstate Commerce Act to trucks transporting fresh and frozen fish. Shipments of these products may continue to be made in trucks which will be subject to only a minimum of regulation in the form of safety requirements with respect to equipment, brakes, lights, and with respect to hours of service. Trucks carrying fresh and frozen fish, provided these trucks do not carry for compensation any passengers and property other than exempt property as defined in Section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, will continue to be exempt from regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission which require that they obtain permits or licenses from the Commission, file schedules of tariffs, etc.

\* \* \* \* \*

INCREASED EXPRESS CHARGES AUTHORIZED: On April 13, 1951, the Interstate Commerce Commission authorized the Railway Express Agency to increase their charges on the majority of less-than-carload shipments, including fish and shellfish shipments. The increase authorized amounts to 20 cents per shipment. Present information indicates that this increase will become effective May 3.

The authorization is made on an interim basis pending the Commission's final decision in Ex Parte 177 wherein the Railway Express Agency is asking for changes in their rates and charges which will drastically affect various segments of the fishery industry. Further hearings were scheduled for this docket during April and May in various regions of the United States.

\* \* \* \* \*

FISH MEAL NOT SUBJECT TO RAILROAD LOADING REQUIREMENTS: In the interest of more efficient utilization of freight cars in the transportation of grain products and byproducts (including fish meal, fish roe meal, and/or fish scrap meal), the Interstate Commerce Commission on April 3 issued Revised Service Order No. 874 which specifies certain requirements for loading byproducts and grains. Carriers were authorized not to accept or ship any carload shipment of byproducts or grain in a freight car unless one of the following requirements had been satisfied: the quantity equals or exceeds the marked weight capacity of a car; loading has been



carried out to an elevation not lower than 24 inches from the ceiling of the car at its side walls; for packaged products, in straight or mixed carloads, a weight of not less than 60,000 pounds is loaded; or loading has been performed to full visible capacity. These particular regulations became effective April 9, 1951, and were to expire on September 15.

However, the Commission on April 18 amended these regulations and granted any railroad common carrier, subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, permission to disregard the provisions of Revised Service Order No. 874 "insofar as it applies to any shipment of fish meal, fish roe meal, and/or fish scrap meal because said commodities are listed as inflammable solids in Explosives and Dangerous Articles Tariffs and tend to heat and burn when confined." This general permit became effective on April 19, 1951, and shall expire on September 15, 1951. Therefore, the loading requirements for freight cars listed in Revised Service Order No. 874 do not apply to fish meal, fish roe meal, and/or fish scrap meal.



## Department of State

FISHERIES NOT TO BE SPECIFICALLY INCLUDED IN JAPANESE PEACE TREATY: With reference to the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty and peace in the Pacific, the Department of State reports that John Foster Dulles at the Fiftieth Anniversary Dinner of Whittier College at Los Angeles, California, on March 31, made the following comments with reference to fisheries:

"It has been suggested, particularly along the Pacific coast, that the treaty of peace might itself attempt permanently to regulate the problem of Japanese participation in high-seas fisheries. To attempt that would almost surely postpone indefinitely both the conclusion of peace and the obtaining of the results which are desired.

"There is, I believe, a considerable possibility of agreement between the United States and Japanese fishing interests. However, the treaty of peace is not a treaty merely between the United States and Japan; it is a treaty which we hope will be signed by all of the fifty-three allies. Most of these nations have their own fishing problems and their own theories of solution, which differ widely. No quick results can be won by attempting to make the peace treaty into a universal convention on high-seas fishing.

"When I was in Japan, the Prime Minister advised me that the Japanese Government stood ready to negotiate fisheries agreements as soon as peace restores to Japan the possibility of independent sovereign action. He said that in the meantime the Japanese Government would prohibit Japanese nationals and Japanese vessels from going into conserved fisheries in all waters, and he mentioned specifically those off the coasts of the United States, Canada and Alaska.

"The Japanese now see the importance of avoiding practices which in the past brought Japan much ill will,

and if we can hold to our tentative time-table, there can, I believe, be an early and equitable settlement of this thorny problem."

NOTE: SEE COMMERCIAL FISHERIES REVIEW, MARCH 1951, PP. 30-2.

\* \* \* \* \*

TERMINATION OF TRADE AGREEMENT WITH COSTA RICA: Representatives of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Costa Rica exchanged notes on April 3 providing for termination of the trade agreement between the two Governments signed November 28, 1936, and effective August 1937, a State Department release announced on April 4. The trade agreement will cease to be in force on and after June 1, 1951, and the Costa Rican importations of certain fishery products are affected.

In October 1948, Costa Rica applied an exchange surcharge on imports of products appearing in two lists of items considered to be less essential than items not so listed. The stated purpose of this action was to improve the country's foreign-exchange position by curtailing imports, particularly from the United States.

Since the two lists included most of the items on which concessions were granted to the United States in the trade agreement, the United States protested the application of the exchange surcharge as being in violation of Article I of the agreement. This article provides that scheduled items shall be exempt from all charges other or higher than those specified in the agreement. The United States made its protest in December 1948, but during 1949 Costa Rica took no action to correct this violation of the agreement.

In an exchange of notes on April 4, 1950, the U. S. agreed to a waiver of Article I, effective April 1, 1950, for a period of one year. During that year, Costa Rica was expected to solve its financial difficulties so as not to conflict with Article I. The Costa Rican Government has indicated that it will be unable to remove the exchange surcharges which necessitated the waiver in the foreseeable future. The two Governments, therefore, agreed to a joint termination of the trade agreement effective June 1, 1951.

In the trade agreement, Costa Rica in 1937 granted reductions and bindings on a wide range of agricultural and industrial products. The Costa Rican customs duties which will be applied to these items after termination of the trade agreement have not been announced.

The commodities covered by the trade agreement of concern to fishery interests with the rate of duty applicable under it are as follows:

<u>COSTA RICAN TARIFF</u> <u>ITEM NUMBER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION OF ARTICLES</u>	<u>MAXIMUM RATES OF DUTY IN</u> <u>COSTA RICAN COLONES</u>
EX 118	CANNED SALMON, CANNED MACKEREL, CANNED SHELL-FISH, PREPARED OR PRESERVED IN ANY FORM, AND CANNED SARDINES, PREPARED OR PRESERVED IN TOMATO, MUSTARD OR OTHER SAUCES.	0.50 COLON PER GROSS KILO <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>

The United States bound on its free list, turtles, but the status of this item will be unchanged since it is bound free in another agreement with the United Kingdom, under the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The Governments of Costa Rica and the United States are considering the possibility of negotiating a comprehensive treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation.

<sup>1</sup>/APPROXIMATELY 4 U.S. CENTS PER POUND BASED ON THE CONTROLLED RATE OF EXCHANGE OF ONE COSTA RICAN COLON EQUALS 17.64 U.S. CENTS.

## Eighty-Second Congress (First Session)

APRIL 1951

Listed below are public bills and resolutions introduced and referred to committees, or passed by the Eighty-Second Congress (First Session) and signed by the President, that affect in any way the fisheries and allied industries. Public bills and resolutions are shown in this section only when introduced and if passed when they are signed by the President. 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 AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED:

Aid to Underdeveloped Foreign Areas: H. R. 3798 (Meador) - A bill for the establishment of a commission on aid to underdeveloped foreign areas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Collisions at Sea Regulations: H. R. 3670 (Hart) - A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Commercial Fisheries Activities Transfer: H. R. 3682 (Dawson) - A bill to expand the activities of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. (Includes the transfer to the Secretary of Commerce of "all functions of the Secretary of the Interior and the Department of the Interior in relation to commercial fisheries.")

Defense Production Act Amendment: S. 1397 (Maybank) - A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also: H. R. 3871 (Spence)...

Interior Appropriations: H. R. 3790 (Kirwan) - A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. (Includes appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service.)

Inspection of Steam and Internal-Combustion Engine Driven Vessels: S. 1286 (Capehart) - A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1936, so as to broaden the application of laws governing the inspection of steam vessels to vessels propelled by internal-combustion engines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Inspection of Vessels Propelled by Gas, Fluid, Naphtha, or Electric Motors: H. R. 3646 (Shelly) - A bill to provide that certain vessels propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha, or electric motors shall be subject to certain laws relating to the inspection and personnel of steam vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Shrimp Import Duty: H. R. 3546 (Bentsen) - A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also: H. R. 3551 (Lyle)...

H. R. 3555 (Thompson of Texas)...

The following are additional bills introduced during March and not previously reported in this section:

Tidelands Jurisdiction: H. R. 3300 (Rankin) - A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Water Pollution Control Encouragement: H. R. 3360 (Fulton) - A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CHAMBER ACTION--HOUSE:

President's Message--Defense: House heard a message from the President on April 26 in which he recommended 2-year extension of the Defense Production Act of 1950 and submitted certain recommendations for strengthening the act. The message was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed as a House document (H. Doc. 118).

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS:

Trade Agreements: Committee on Finance: The Senate Finance Committee on April 26 unanimously approved and ordered reported H. R. 1612, with amendments. The bill would extend for 2 years the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The House-approved bill contained a 3-year extension.

The committee approved a peril point amendment similar to the one adopted by the 80th Congress and identical with the House-approved bill except for the deletion of the section which prohibited the Tariff Commission from participating in the negotiation of trade agreements. The principle of the deleted section will be adequately covered in the Committee Report.

An amendment was adopted similar to that in the House-approved bill which would "suspend, withdraw, or prevent" the application of concessions made in trade agreements to imports from any areas dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement.

The Committee approved an amendment which would require an escape clause in all future agreements. The President is required, as soon as practicable, to bring all existing agreements into conformity with the escape clause policy. The President is to report at regular intervals on the action taken by him in this respect. The Committee amendment, while following the general principles of the House-approved bill, made a number of administrative improvements.

The operation of the escape clause when injury occurs in or threatens a domestic industry is set out very clearly in the Committee-approved bill. The Tariff Commission makes its recommendations to the President who "may" take the action recommended by the Commission. If he does not take such action within 60 days, he shall submit a report to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee stating why he has not followed those recommendations. The Tariff Commission, if it finds no reason for making recommendations, must make and publish a report stating its findings and conclusions. The criteria for inquiry in the House-approved bill was included in the Committee-approved bill with some modifications.

The Committee added an amendment which would restore to domestic producers the right to protest in customs courts the classification of imported articles whether or not these articles were included in any trade agreement.

The House-approved amendment which would prevent tariff concessions from applying to imported agricultural products if they were selling below the domestic price support level was not agreed to.

The Committee approved that part of the agricultural amendment proposed by Senator Magnuson which would prevent foreign agreements from operating in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Although the amendment regarding perishable agricultural products proposed by Senator Holland was not adopted in its original form, the Committee approved an amendment providing for emergency action with regard to perishable agricultural commodities. In such cases, after a recommendation to The President and to the Tariff Commission by the Secretary of Agriculture,

The President may take immediate action, or if it is practicable, he may wait for a Tariff Commission report which must be submitted not later than 20 calendar days after the Secretary of Agriculture has made his original recommendations.

The Committee took a firm stand as far as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is concerned by providing as a part of the bill a statement that the enactment of this Act shall not be construed to indicate that the Committee is approving or disapproving the General Agreement originally made at Geneva in 1947.

#### 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):

Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1952, House Report No. 339 (April 20, 1951, 82d Congress, 1st Session), 38 p., printed, pursuant to H. R. 3790, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior (including the Fish and Wildlife Service) for the fiscal year 1952.

Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, Senate Report No. 299 (April 27, 1951, 82d Congress, 1st Session), 8 p., printed, from Committee on Finance, pursuant to H. R. 1612, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. Passage of this bill was recommended by Committee with certain amendments. Amended version of bill is included as well as general statements on the two-year extension, peril point, withdrawal of concession benefits from Communist areas, and the escape clause.

