

Doc.
Pr 32.407
V. 2
no. 8

DEFENSE

★ OFFICIAL BULLETIN
★ of the NATIONAL DEFENSE
★ ADVISORY COMMISSION
★ Washington, D. C. Issued Weekly
★ FEB. 25, 1941 • VOL. 2, NO. 8

Analysis of the use of spiegel as ferromanganese substitute

Use of spiegel as a substitute for ferromanganese, and emergency conservation of manganese through consumer-producer cooperation were analyzed in a report made public February 21 by John D. Biggers, Director of the Production Division, Office of Production Management.

Twenty percent of the consumption of ferromanganese could be saved by emergency conservation, according to the report, prepared by the technologic committee on manganese of the National Academy of Sciences.

This committee, made up of ranking scientists, was appointed on July 25 to review projects for the development of new processes for recovery of manganese from low-grade domestic ores.

In discussing substitution of spiegel for ferromanganese, the committee pointed out that certain domestic ores are available for production of spiegel, and production facilities could be built in sufficient time to cover the emergency. Spiegel is an alloy containing about 20 percent manganese.

In making public the reports, Director Biggers commended the technologic committee on their fine research work on substitutes for critically needed manganese, and their work toward conserving the present supply.

Mr. Hillman's statement before the House Judiciary Committee; recital of the facts concerning defense employment and strikes

Following is the statement prepared by Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management, for delivery before the House Judiciary Committee, February 20:

I am happy to have this opportunity to render whatever assistance I can in your study of what is certainly one of the most important questions of our time: The swift and uninterrupted production of materials needed for national defense.

Unless we fulfill every need of our defense program—completely and without stint—we will not be able to strengthen and to preserve democracy in this hour of its greatest peril.

Depends on coordination

The steady flow of tanks, guns, ships, and planes depends directly upon the ability of both management and labor to coordinate their efforts to assure uninterrupted production and the fullest utilization of both plant capacity and human skill. We can achieve this only when employer-employee relations are harmonious and cooperative. The problem facing us is how best to insure that harmony and that cooperation.

To get a sound answer to that question and to throw some light on legislation now pending before your Committee, it becomes necessary briefly to review the essential facts. A full catalog would exceed your reasonable patience.

At the present time, 37,200,000 persons are employed in the nonagricultural industries of this country. This number is 2,200,000 greater than in May of 1940, when the President submitted his recommendations to the Congress for the defense program. The number of wage

earners employed in the manufacturing industries alone is 9,200,000. This represents an increase of 1,100,000 since last May. This increase, arising primarily from defense activity, is the greatest that has occurred in any similar period on record.

Increase in employment

During the life of the defense program, not only has employment in American industry increased, but the actual man-hours of employment have grown at a faster rate than at any time within this generation. Large numbers of workers in heavy manufacturing industries—vital to the defense effort—are working 50 and 60 hours per week. In machine tools, the average is approximately 51 hours. Many plants are working from 55 to 56 hours per week and some more than 60. Two years ago these same plants averaged less than 40 hours per week.

I mention these facts because the record reveals that every period of rapid increase in business activity has been accompanied by an appreciable increase in the number of labor disputes and strikes.

Now, what has been the record of the past 7 months of the defense effort marked by this tremendous increase in business activity, as far as labor relations are concerned? In contrast to similar periods of increased employment in the past, the last 7 months stand out sharply in the following respects:

Comparison with 1939

1. For the first time in our industrial history, employment has increased sharply without an increase in the number of strikes. In fact, the number of man-days of idleness by reason of strikes in the last half of 1940 was 40 percent

(Continued on page 6)

INDEX

	Page
Mr. Hillman's statement.....	1 and 6, 7
Priorities	2
Mr. Knudsen's Press Conference..	3, 4, 5
Housing	8
Certificates of necessity.....	9, 10
Compilation of contracts.....	11
Consumer Division.....	12
State and local cooperation.....	13
Production	14, 15
Agriculture	16

295231°—41

DEFENSE

OFFICIAL BULLETIN published weekly by the Division of Information for the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, and printed at the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Published with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget (Rule 42, J. C. P.). This issue covers announcements made from Tuesday, February 18, to Monday, February 24.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, BY MAIL
75 cents for 52 issues; 25 cents for 13 issues; single copies 5 cents, payable in advance. Remit money order payable directly to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.



NATIONAL DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMISSION

RALPH BUDD, *Transportation*.
CHESTER DAVIS, *Agriculture*.
HARRIET ELLIOTT, *Consumer Protection*.
LEON HENDERSON, *Price Stabilization*.
SIDNEY HILLMAN, *Labor*.
WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN, *Industrial Production*.
EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, *Industrial Materials*.
FRANK BANE, *State and Local Cooperation*.
ROBERT W. HORTON, *Information*.
STACY MAY, *Research and Statistics*.
PAUL V. McNUTT, *Coordinator of Health, Welfare and Related Defense Activities*.
WILLIAM H. McREYNOLDS, *Secretary of the Commission*.



NELSON ROCKEFELLER, *Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics*.

ARMY DAY, APRIL 7

Since April 6, originally set as Army Day by the Military Order of the World War, falls on Sunday, celebrations this year will be on Monday, April 7, 1941. The Secretary of War has urged all arms and branches of the Army to give cordial and enthusiastic support to the celebration. Cooperation in the form of reviews, open house celebrations, ground exhibits, and other features, has been suggested to all unit commanders.

Priority principle applied to nickel steel production on the basis of voluntary cooperation may alleviate necessity of formal priorities

A program designed to ease the present tightness in the supply of stainless steel and other nickel steels essential in defense industries has been inaugurated by the Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management and the leading steel producers.

E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Director of Priorities, announced that at a meeting in New York at which the Division was represented by Samuel S. Stratton, of the Minerals and Metals Priority Section, the producers agreed to take two steps:

1. To give first call on stainless steel and other nickel steels to defense industries.
2. To consult with and give technical advice to their customers, in both the defense and nondefense spheres, in an effort to help them conserve the use of nickel steels wherever possible.

Representatives of the producers said they felt there were a number of cases in which the shortage of nickel might be relieved to some extent through changes in order specifications.

Substitutions and acquisition of working stocks recommended

There are cases, for example, in which high nickel steel now being specified could be supplanted by steel alloys containing a lesser amount of nickel. It was agreed at the conference in New York that the shortage in the supply of nickel, which comes almost wholly from Canada, was largely responsible for the tight situation in the supply of stainless steel and allied products.

The program designed to ease the nickel situation, as announced Feb. 20, is subject to further review, and in this connection the producers are being asked to furnish the Priorities Division with specific information as to their present stocks of nickel, their anticipated requirements, their rates of consumption, and their delivery schedules.

The effect of the program is to apply the priority principle to nickel steel production in an informal way and on the basis of voluntary cooperation. It is expected that this may mean some diminution in the supply of these products for ordinary civilian channels. If these steps are successful, the imposition of formal priorities may be avoided.

Priority committees appointed for rubber and for hides, skins, and leather

Creation of two new priority committees, one for rubber and one for hides, skins, and leather, was announced February 21 by E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Director of Priorities for the Office of Production Management.

The personnel of these committees follows:

Rubber—A. L. Viles, president of the Rubber Manufacturers' Association, New York City (producers' representative); Maj. G. K. Heiss (Army representative); Commander H. M. Shaffer (Navy representative); W. L. Finger (consultant from the Production Division). A representative of the industrial consumers is to be appointed shortly.

Hides, skins, and leather—Ralph Pope, president of the Northwestern Leather Co. Trust, Boston, Mass. (producers' representative); B. A. Gray, President of the International Shoe Co., St. Louis, Missouri (industrial consumers' representative); Commander F. P. Delahanty (Navy representative); Lt. Col. Robert McG. Littlejohn (Army representative); M. A. Watson (consultant from the Production Division).

The committees, which are advisory in character, come under the General Products Group, of which W. E. Wickenden is the executive. He will serve as chairman of both.



Two new appointments for Division of Priorities

The appointments of Philip D. Reed, chairman of the Board of the General Electric Co., as a consultant, and the addition of Ralph G. Farrell, chairman of the Board of the Fairmont Aluminum Co., Fairmont, W. Va., as producers' representative on the Aluminum and Magnesium Priority Committee, were announced February 21 by E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Director of Priorities for the Office of Production Management.

Mr. Reed received a degree in electrical engineering at the University of Wisconsin in 1921, and was granted his LL.B. from Fordham University in 1924. He was vice president and patent counsel for Van Heusen Products, Inc., from 1922 to 1926, when he joined the staff of the General Electric Co. as a member of the law department. He was made chairman of the Board in 1940.

January plane deliveries; subassemblies for airplanes; labor situation on defense work—discussed by Mr. Knudsen at press conference

Following is a partial transcript of a press conference held by Mr. William S. Knudsen, Director General of the Office of Production Management, on February 19.

Airplane deliveries for January

Previous to the conference, the OPM announced that during January, 1,036 airplanes were delivered by United States manufacturers to the Army, Navy, British, other governments, and commercial airlines. Of these, 957 were delivered to the Army, Navy, and the British.

This announcement was discussed during the early portion of the conference. Mr. Knudsen said that the 1,036 figure represented actual deliveries. He said 26 of the planes are commercial craft and that he hoped the rate of production would pick up in the spring.

Replying to a question as to whether the United States would be producing 1,500 or 2,000 planes a month by the middle of the summer, he said that this is a "little too optimistic."

"I think if we can get 18,000 planes this year we will be doing all right," Mr. Knudsen said. Mr. Knudsen then explained the proposal that the Ford Co. do subassemblies for airplanes. This would be a subcontract and is still being considered. The contract, Mr. Knudsen said, would be with the Army; plant has been approved by the OPM.

(In the material that follows, the "Q" represents a reporter's question; the "A" denotes Mr. Knudsen's reply.)

Educational contracts for airplane production

Q. It is not clear yet, Mr. Knudsen, who is handing out this experimental contract to Ford—is it the prime contractor?

A. The Air Corps. Let me explain this whole thing. If we approach a man to make a thing that he hasn't made before, we give him what is called an educational or experimental contract. With that he makes a certain amount of tools and facilities so as to be able to produce the piece. You understand he might need a building; he might need jigs; he might need machines. As soon as that is done and is under way and it is feasible to

take the contract for the pieces, then we put him in touch with the prime contractor which in this case is Consolidated and Douglas. On the B-25, it is North American and General Motors. On the B-26, Martin, Chrysler, and Goodyear are tied up. So we have people with lots of present facilities and lots of machines that we could put to work on these subassemblies and send them out to these assembly plants where we put them together and fly them away, but the designer of the plane—the father of the plane must be responsible for the plane's performance—that is his contract with the government. In other words if the thing won't fly, it is his fault and nobody else's.

Q. When will we get production on these bombers under the arrangement?

A. I feel that the latter half of 1941 we will begin to get some of the sections and that by 1942 we will be in fairly good production—100 of the B-24s.

Q. The latter half of 1942?

A. Yes. In 1941 we will have the beginning of it and in 1942 we expect to be up to 100.

Q. Mr. Knudsen, is this Ford contract, an educational contract, the first one given to any motor manufacturers to make subassemblies?

A. It is. You know I went to them in October and got them started on the bomber program.

Q. Any others going to get them?

A. Yes; General Motors is getting one and Chrysler and Goodyear are getting one. Briggs has a subcontract now with Douglas and so has Murray.

Q. When you spoke about 100 a month in the latter part of 1942, Mr. Knudsen, were you speaking only of the Consolidated or were you talking of all the bombers you were going to have made?

A. I was talking about this job.

Q. Has Mr. Hillman said anything about the contract—the experimental contract?

A. No. Mr. Hillman takes the position wherever a job is essential for national defense we are willing to stretch a point.

Q. Doesn't this experimental contract contain the clause that Ford rejected the previous time?

A. No; no negotiated contract contains that clause.

Q. Can you give us any estimate on the size of this educational contract as to dollars?

A. Well, the piece contract isn't written up.

Q. No; but I mean the tools, things, etc.?

A. I would rather let the Army do that. They are going to release the contract in due time. I am giving defense information and I hope you will deal with this as an explanation on how the job is going to be handled. In other words, when you want to build a plane you need tools; on sections of the plane you need assembly plants to put the plane together, but this is the first thing. Next comes the pieces; then comes the assembly plant, and the assembly plants, you know, are under way in Omaha, and Tulsa, Okla. for the B24.

Q. Well Mr. Knudsen, does this experimental contract mean that the Government takes over the tooling of that new plant Ford has built up?

A. The Government provides all the fixtures and, of course, Mr. Ford will use whatever machinery he has available in his own plant to make even smaller pieces. The Ford plant facilities are going in at Ypsilanti, which is a little outside of Detroit.

Q. There is a new plant in Detroit—the 10 million dollar plant?

A. That is the Ypsilanti plant. You have the wrong place.

Q. Does it have to be built?

A. It is quite simple to construct. It won't take long to build it. It has not been built yet.

Labor strikes have not hurt defense program

Q. These strikes that seem to be increasing, C. I. O., are they interfering with production Mr. Knudsen?

A. Well, of course we shouldn't have any strikes; you know that just as well as I do and we have had a few and it is quite annoying. But so far I don't think the program is hurt.

Q. You don't think over the long curve it will interfere?

A. I think we will shape along.

Q. You assume it might be sabotage?

A. I was asked that this morning. I said sabotage is a subversive activity; it could only be combatted with subversive means. In other words you can't bring sabotage out in the open; you've got to catch it and dispose of it; we have laws now to handle it.

Q. Can you suggest any step at all of handling these strikes? The summarization today over our ticker shows a lot

of these strikes, an increasing number in various factories.

A. How many have we?

Q. Fourteen or fifteen?

A. In a country of this size, do you think that is much?

Q. Well, it depends on how many key factories you have involved in strikes.

A. We have no key plants involved. The biggest was International Harvester and Allis-Chalmers.

Allis-Chalmers strike

Q. Mr. Knudsen, would you want to say anything about this Allis-Chalmers strike?

A. Yes; we were in here Saturday night until quite late and we had an agreement between the parties going back to Milwaukee the following day and the new issue sprung up which we are working on now trying to get straightened out. A brand-new point was raised when they got back to Milwaukee. I thought that we were all done Saturday night when there was an agreement on both sides of the table.

Q. What was that new point?

A. They drew up a memo dealing with what the referee's duties were. We have an impartial referee to settle questions of infraction of discipline in the shop, and the union for some reason or other after they got back to Milwaukee insisted that this clause was what we call an emergency union clause where a man would be fired if he didn't pay his dues, but we could see nothing like that in it and that is what we are working on now.

Q. You mean the union interpreted the clause about the duties of the referee as being a maintenance clause?

A. Yes; he could pass on whether a fellow could be fired on not paying his dues—that wasn't in the picture at all.

Q. What is it now, the union wants that clause put in?

A. They are negotiating in Milwaukee. They are having a meeting which started at 10 this morning to try and get it straightened out. You see when we left here we had this memorandum drawn up and the understanding was he was to submit it to the membership on Monday morning or Monday evening so that the men could get back to work on Tuesday. In the meantime this other complication came up. I am so sorry it came up because we thought we had it all fixed. We worked here all week last week and thought we had it settled.

Q. As I understood you a while ago sabotage is a subversive activity and can only be combatted by subversive means?

A. I mean if you want to combat sabotage—that is a subversive activity and

you go out to fight that under cover. You can't fight it right in the open with a policeman and a club.

Q. Well, we are doing that, aren't we?

A. F. B. I.

Q. Have you made any extended inspection trips of defense plants?

A. I made one last Friday. I went through five plants.

Q. Any more than that?

Inspection in Detroit area

A. I am going out tomorrow night again or Friday night. I am going to see some of the plants around Detroit and be home on Sunday and I am going to take in some of the plants in the Detroit area and after that I am going out to some more places.

Q. Do you expect to make Milwaukee?

A. No; I can't do that. I have got to confine myself to the Detroit area.

Q. Are you going to talk to the Governor out there on the strike situation at Lansing?

A. Yes, I heard from Lansing on that account and that is in the process of being settled.

Q. Do these strikes cause you a little concern?

A. Yes; I am frank to say sure they do, if you lose hours you lose material.

Favors mediation

Q. Mr. Knudsen, after you left the House Judiciary Committee there was some misunderstanding among the members as to whether this memorandum you are going to submit is going to contain recommendations for a specific bill or whether it is just going to be a general statement on the labor picture?

A. I told them I would look over these five or six bills that were up here and I selected this Smith bill. I will give them a memorandum on that.

Q. Are you in favor of stronger legislation? Are you in favor of stronger action against strikes in these stern times, so to speak?

A. What do you mean—what kind of strong action?

Q. Are you against strikes?

A. I am. Now what next?

Q. Well, do you favor, for example, a compulsory cooling-off period before the strike?

A. I tried to explain this morning that those kind of things I thought could be done better by negotiating, than by beating. I told a long story of a French experience in 1936 which I happened to be witness to over there and I am not in favor of any strong measures. I think a movement of this sort has got to be

cooperative and has got to be worked out and I favor mediation. You might know that I am practicing it every day.

Q. Mr. Knudsen, are you in favor of some kind of a law compelling mediation?

A. No; I took the stand before the Committee that I did not think that any legislation was needed when they specifically asked me this morning. I said I would take this bill, analyze it and give it my reaction.

Q. No new legislation either?

A. I didn't recommend it.

Q. Well, what if the situation gets worse over there and these strikes continue, then what would be your attitude?

Other treatment for inspired strikes

A. Then I might indicate my attitude. You have to deal with questions like that in the light of your actual experiences—in other words, I feel that the amount of strikes we have here haven't seriously interfered with the program. Now, if they did seriously interfere with the program, I might change my idea about it. Is that clear?

Q. Well, it's clear as of now, but if the situation got worse in England and she were faced with certain defeat, if we didn't regard this arsenal we are talking about and our strikes continued to increase, then you'd have to change your attitude?

A. That's right on these strikes, if they were inspired by Germany.

Q. In other words, it's up to labor and industry to behave?

A. Yes; I don't think I can make it strong enough; I don't want to swing a club over anyone; I want to try to get the feeling of the objective before us that we can all agree on, then we are going to arm quick and well and try to get that by cooperation rather than by laws and poor business, etc.

Q. But if we have continued subversive activities in America on this program, then you would be for stronger action; wouldn't you?

A. That's right.

Q. If this is tying up say 40 percent of our production?

A. There would be trouble, then. I would advocate stronger action. What are you pressing for, anyway?

Q. Well, I'm really pressing on the administration's attitude toward the urgency of the bill 1776 passing.

May have to expand defense production

Q. A London economist takes the position that our long-term program won't be of much help to England; we ought to go out and grab up all the facilities

we can get hold of and start turning out planes and tanks and guns just as fast as we possibly can if we are going to be of any help to England; what would be your reaction to that?

A. My reaction will be that we—if, as, and when we get the schedule that says how much we have to make—we will have to decide how we are going to make it.

Q. You haven't got any such schedule yet?

A. No, sir.

Q. You mean British or ours?

A. Well, you know I have a schedule that is running, but nothing beyond that. I have American schedule and British schedule running now; there is no change in that.

Aluminum, zinc, nickel must be watched

Q. Mr. Knudsen, do you think it will be necessary for additional plant facilities or perhaps new plants to build the additional planes needed by Britain. Of course, the President said they need at least 12,000 more planes than they now have in the present program. Do you think you will have to expand beyond your present program?

A. We might have to.

Q. Can you say anything about acquisition of raw materials, Mr. Knudsen, what your situation is with that?

A. Steel, we have steel; copper, we have copper; aluminum, you know we are tight; zinc, we have to watch; nickel, we have to watch.

Q. How about rubber?

A. Rubber we have.

Q. Tin?

A. We have.

Q. Where did we get that rubber, from the Dutch East Indies?

A. Sure, the only place we can get it.

Q. Can you say anything about the stocks of rubber and tin as to how long they would last? What are the stocks here?

A. Do you think that ought to be public information?

Q. Jesse Jones says so. Jesse says we have enough rubber in the United States and afloat for 18 to 20 months; maybe he is a little optimistic.

A. I think that is pretty fair.

Q. To get back to plane production. Figure on the basis of December, that would be 60 percent of that would be trainers and 40 percent combat. Of the 18,000 for this year would that same ratio hold or would we get better as time goes on; would the training ratio go down and combat come up?

A. No, the combat planes will have to come up a little; it will have to come up.

Q. Is there very much we can do in

the way of aiding England with bombers by Ford? Can we get very much quantity in production?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you say anything about the efforts to increase production of synthetic rubber?

A. Well, there are two methods; there are two ways of making it, one the coal way and the other is the oil way and there are proposals now before Mr. Jones to start on pilot plants to get under way with; in fact, I have a tire they made of that.

Q. Do you anticipate any substantial production of synthetic rubber?

A. Well, I think the method will have to be developed first; you see, we are using quite a lot of synthetic rubber now in very small pieces but for tires there hasn't been any use for it. Still, abroad the Germans are using quite a bit of it. You see, they mix it with old scrap rubber; it's a development process.

"Can't afford to be" satisfied—Knudsen

Q. Mr. Knudsen, in your speech in December in New York you indicated that you were not satisfied with the progress of the Defense Program at that time; are you any better satisfied now?

A. No, I can't afford to be.

Q. You spoke then of a 30-percent lag on aircraft at that time.

A. We were 30 percent short in December.

Q. How does that stack up now?

A. It shows a little improvement in January.

"Might be necessary" to curtail automobile production

Q. Do you believe Mrs. Roosevelt's statement we might be patriotic next year and sacrifice new automobiles?

A. I can quite understand the statement.

Q. Do you think it might be necessary?

A. I don't know yet. If we are short we will go to them and tell them they have to cut down the use of them; when we asked them to cut down on zinc for die casting they all responded right away very favorably.

Q. Is there any possibility we might do with the last year's car in 1942?

A. You have done with it before and you didn't know it.

Conferences on Murray and Reuther plans

Q. Mr. Knudsen, what is the status of the Murray plan and Reuther plan?

A. Mr. Reuther is coming in on his plan; it's not of my doing, but we are waiting for Mr. Hillman to come and when Mr. Hillman comes back we are

trying to match it up with Mr. Reuther's coming in Friday morning.

Q. Will Mr. Reuther be here with Mr. Murray?

A. Yes, Mr. Murray, Reuther, Hillman, and myself on Friday the 28th.

Q. How about the Murray plan on steel?

A. That is waiting for Gano Dunn's report on control of steel industry which will be out the last part of this month.

Decentralization of plants

Q. Are there any new plans afoot which might result in a greater distribution, more decentralization of new plants?

A. I think we have done as well as could be expected. Of course we can never satisfy everybody but ever since we started on this program we were told to try to move west between the Alleghenies and the Rockies. If you have studied the record I think you will find that most of the plants went there. Of course, on both the eastern and western shores there were certain plants we couldn't do away with and we put some pieces on them to start with in order to get better results in production.

★ ★ ★

Representatives of aluminum industry to work with Price Stabilization Division on problems of aluminum scrap prices and supplies

Appointment of a committee of 10 representatives of all groups of the aluminum industry to work with the Price Stabilization Division of the National Defense Advisory Committee on the problems of aluminum scrap prices and supplies was voted February 18 by a meeting of some 60 leaders in the various divisions of the industry. This meeting was held with C. A. Bishop, acting director of the price section of the Price Stabilization Division.

The committee will contain two representatives from each of the five groups represented in the conference—primary producers, secondary smelters, foundries, dealers, and fabricators. The names of the men appointed will be announced later.

It was generally agreed at the meeting that many fabricators of aluminum products are withholding their scrap from the market, thus increasing the present unbalanced situation. It was also evident that some fabricators are building up their inventories and buying aluminum for future requirements.

MR. HILLMAN

(Continued from page 1)

less than in the last half of 1939. The evidence is detailed in an exhibit, Table A (see next page), which I am submitting for the record.

Comparison with 1916

2. Less than half as many persons were involved in strikes during 1940 as in the corresponding period of emergency in 1916, or the war years 1917 and 1918. This is true in spite of the fact that in the meantime employment in nonagricultural activities has increased by 22 percent.

Comparison with accidents

3. The amount of idleness caused by strikes in 1940 was less than one-quarter as great as the time lost because of industrial accidents.

Short duration

4. The strikes that have occurred during recent months of ever-enlarging industrial activity have been small and of short duration.

I am submitting these facts and figures because I know that you will agree that it is extremely important that all of us see the strike situation in its true perspective. With the emphasis on strikes in the daily press, the man on the street can hardly fail to conclude that strikes are increasing greatly. This is simply not true.

A detailed story of industrial relations today is contained in Table B (see next page) that I have had compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which shows the extent of strike activity in 11 vital industries closely related to national defense.

In the industries making the engines and machine tools so vital to our national security, there was only 1 day of idleness due to strikes for each 1,800 man-days worked. Put in other words, this means that in the engine and machine tools industries, strikes in 1940 were responsible for 1 day of idleness for every 6 years of work. Put in terms of percentage, it means that in these vital industries, idleness due to strikes constituted one-sixteenth of 1 percent of the time actually worked. Now, gentlemen, frankly, isn't this a remarkable record of cooperation?

Time made up

And please bear in mind that these figures of idleness caused by strikes, if anything, exaggerate the picture. You fully realize, I am sure, that days of idleness caused by strikes cannot always be

counted as time lost. In many instances, such lost time is quickly made up.

This whole analysis shows what should be self-evident: *Strikes are the rare exception in defense industry.*

This remarkable record of labor relations in defense industry is due to the fact that the defense program has brought forth special efforts on the part of organized labor and on the part of management and Government to settle labor controversies without the interruption of work. As you probably know, one of the first things I did on becoming a member of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense was to create a Labor Policy Advisory Committee, consisting of 16 outstanding officials of unions affiliated with the AFL and CIO, and the Railroad Brotherhoods.

Their first act, on July 12, was to pledge their full and unstinted devotion to the program of national defense. On December 6, this committee, on behalf of organized labor, pledged itself "to take no action which may in any way impede production before all conciliation facilities of the Federal Government for resolving any existing controversies have been exhausted."

"Solemn duty"

This attitude of labor was reemphasized by President Green of the American Federation of Labor in the January 1941 issue of the *American Federationist*, when he said: "We recognize the fact that, in a great emergency such as we are now facing, it becomes our solemn duty to avoid strikes and to prevent interruption of work in defense industries."

In December, Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, lent his emphasis to this policy when he said that "The CIO, operating constructively, proposes to act reasonably and logically to avoid strikes."

Nor is labor alone determined to avoid stoppages in production. I could likewise cite instances of forward-looking management which has sought to further the defense effort by going a long way in satisfying legitimate grievances and demands of their workers.

In reviewing these important achievements, we must not overlook the unstinting cooperation of existing governmental agencies. Every agency with which I have come in contact has done everything possible to help maintain a steady flow of production in our defense industries. The United States Conciliation Service, whose staff has recently been increased with funds made available

by the Defense Commission, has made a real contribution toward bringing about settlements before controversies reached the stage of strikes.

Conciliation machinery

In addition, machinery has been set up in the Defense Commission to assist the Conciliation Service when cases prove unduly difficult. We have secured commitments from labor leaders that they will not permit strikes to be called until sufficient advance notice has been given to the Defense Commission, so that it may be in a position to intervene. And it is largely because such advance notice has been voluntarily given to the Commission that stoppages in defense industries have been relatively few.

For example, after 30 days of negotiations between the union and the management of a large plane factory we were advised that a strike was threatened. Negotiations were breaking down and the union had voted by an overwhelming majority to go on strike.

Such a stoppage, involving 7,000 workers engaged in the production of bombers, would have seriously affected the national defense program. At the Government's request, the strike deadline was twice voluntarily postponed and the threatened stoppage delayed a total of nearly a month and a half, allowing the union and the management to reach an accord. There was no strike.

Effective method

Similar examples could be given, not only in aircraft but in other vital defense industries, which show that this advance notice voluntarily given the Commission, coupled with the self-discipline exercised by the workers themselves, have proved effective in avoiding defense stoppages. In this way, too, it has been demonstrated that our cooperative way of doing things works.

Moreover, through representatives of both the CIO, the AFL, and of management who are members of my staff, all parties in a controversy have an opportunity to tell their sides of the story to understanding listeners. In this way, issues have been clarified and the basis laid for agreements which have averted threatened stoppages of production in the airplane, shipbuilding, machine tool, electrical equipment industries, and many others.

This record of successful industrial relations is positive evidence that every responsible labor leader in this country is, day by day, doing everything possible to further the defense effort and to avoid interruption of production.

In both the National Defense Advisory Commission and in the Office of Production Management, the results I have outlined to you have been obtained by co-operation on the part of all groups.

Teamwork

Teamwork has been the mainspring of our effort. Voluntary cooperation has been its keynote. And in all this, we are as yet only in the early stages of the period of even greater and more effective cooperation. If anything at all is indicated, it is to explore ways and means of increasing voluntary cooperation between management and labor by every means at our command.

Both management and labor in this country are keenly aware of the stake they have in preserving and strengthening democratic institutions and democratic methods. They should be given greater confidence in their use of democratic conference table techniques.

I am sure that you will agree with me that if anything is done which will have the effect of destroying or impairing this greater spirit of cooperation, it will only retard our defense effort. Additional legislation, therefore, is not called for. I know that if management and labor will be permitted to improve and perfect their arrangements of voluntary cooperation, the interests of national defense will in that manner be best served.

The self-discipline of a free and independent people will always enable them to out-think, out-produce, and out-live any system of totalitarian slavery.

TABLE B.—MAN-DAYS OF IDLENESS DURING STRIKES IN 11 INDUSTRIES CLOSELY RELATED TO NATIONAL DEFENSE, COMPARED WITH MAN-DAYS WORKED, 1940¹

Industry	Minimum number of man-days worked	Man-days idle as a percentage of man-days worked	Number of man-days worked per man day idle
Aircraft.....	21,624,000	0.17	594
Aluminum.....	6,792,000	.45	222
Automobiles.....	107,424,000	.10	1,031
Blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills.....	116,088,000	.12	849
Electrical machinery.....	57,624,000	.68	146
Engine manufacturing.....	12,528,000	.06	1,685
Explosives.....	1,824,000	.16	601
Foundries and machine shops.....	96,624,000	.27	375
Machine tools.....	1,584,000	.05	1,822
Saw mills, logging camps, and millwork.....	210,352,000	.39	254
Shipbuilding.....	22,488,000	.21	466

¹ Days work estimated as average employment times 240 days per year.

² With allowance for independent logging camps which are included in the strike data but are excluded from the regularly published employment figures.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE A.—STRIKES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1914 TO 1940

Year	Number of—			Index (1927-29=100)		
	Strikes	Workers involved	Man-days idle	Strikes	Workers involved	Man-days idle
1914.....	1,204	(1)	(1)	162	(1)	(1)
1915.....	1,593	(1)	(1)	214	(1)	(1)
1916.....	3,789	1,599,917	(1)	509	514	(1)
1917.....	4,450	1,227,254	(1)	588	395	(1)
1918.....	3,353	1,239,989	(1)	451	399	(1)
1919.....	3,630	4,160,348	(1)	488	1,337	(1)
1920.....	3,411	1,463,054	(1)	458	470	(1)
1921.....	2,385	1,099,247	(1)	321	353	(1)
1922.....	1,112	1,612,562	(1)	149	519	(1)
1923.....	1,553	756,584	(1)	209	243	(1)
1924.....	1,249	654,641	(1)	168	210	(1)
1925.....	1,301	428,416	(1)	175	138	(1)
1926.....	1,035	329,592	(1)	139	106	(1)
1927.....	707	329,939	26,218,628	95	106	178
1928.....	604	314,210	12,631,863	81	101	86
1929.....	921	288,572	5,351,540	124	93	36
1930.....	637	182,975	3,316,808	86	59	23
1931.....	810	341,817	6,893,244	109	110	47
1932.....	841	324,210	10,502,033	113	104	71
1933.....	1,695	1,168,272	16,872,128	228	376	115
1934.....	1,856	1,466,695	19,591,949	250	472	133
1935.....	2,014	1,117,213	15,456,337	271	359	105
1936.....	2,172	788,648	13,901,956	292	254	94
1937.....	4,740	1,860,621	28,424,857	637	598	193
1938.....	2,772	688,376	9,148,273	373	221	62
1939.....	2,613	1,170,962	17,812,219	351	377	121
1940.....	2,450	577,000	6,500,000	(1)	(1)	(1)

¹ No information available.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Iowa legislation establishes State defense agency and legislative committee on defense

By unanimous vote of both houses on February 5, the Iowa Legislature passed a bill creating two defense bodies—the Iowa Industrial and Defense Commission and the Legislative Committee on National Defense Coordination.

Appropriations for the work of these two bodies amount to \$10,000 for the period ending June 30, 1941, and \$20,000 a year for the following 2 years.

Organization of Commission

The Industrial and Defense Commission is to be appointed by the Governor, who is to designate the chairman. Maximum number of members of the commission is 15. They are to receive traveling expenses.

Provision is made for employment of an executive secretary, and clerical and office assistance. Salaries of staff members are to be fixed by the commission, subject to approval by the legislative committee on defense.

The Legislative Committee on National Defense Coordination consists of the chairmen of the national defense committees of the State senate and the house of representatives, plus one other member of each of these committees designated by the presiding officer of each house.

The Legislative Committee is to select its chairman and secretary. Funds are available for staff assistance.

For work when the legislature is not in session, members of the Legislative Committee are to receive \$10 per day, but not to exceed \$420 per year, plus traveling expenses.

Section 5 of the bill requires the Legislative Committee on Defense to advise from time to time with the State Industrial and Defense Commission. It also gives the committee control of and supervision over funds, including expenditures of the Defense Commission.

★ ★ ★

Former Indiana Governor appointed as special adviser on agricultural and labor matters

Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management, announced February 21 the appointment of former Gov. M. Clifford Townsend as a special adviser on agricultural and labor matters. He will join Mr. Hillman's staff on March 1.

Mr. Townsend, who was Governor of Indiana from 1937 to January 1941, is widely recognized as an authority on these problems. While Lieutenant Governor and State Commissioner of Agriculture, posts which he held simultaneously during the 4 years preceding his election as Governor, he set up the Indiana State Milk Control Board, which has become a model for other milk control administrations throughout the country.

DEFENSE HOUSING . . .

Award of contracts for the construction of 1,925 dwelling units under the defense housing program during week ending February 15

Contracts for construction of an additional 1,925 dwelling units under the defense housing program were awarded during the week ending February 15, it was announced by C. F. Palmer, Coordinator.

Besides the units for which contracts were let, the Coordinator reported that new allocations for 200 dwelling units were announced, and 249 were made available for occupancy during the period.

Of the total number of dwelling units for which allocations have now been made, Mr. Palmer said 45,035 will be for the use of families of civilian workers, and 23,597 for the families of enlisted personnel. 2,150 of the dwelling units will be for unmarried civilian workers and 295 for unmarried enlisted personnel.

A summation of the work of each agency in the defense housing program as of last week showed:

Federal Works Agency

Federal Works Administrator John M. Carmody announced the establishment of defense housing management policies on taxes, tenant selection, and rentals. In accordance with the rulings, FWA will pay annual sums in lieu taxes; eligibility of tenants will be dependent upon their being engaged or about to be engaged in industries essential to the national defense, and rentals in houses occupied by industrial workers will be directly related to incomes of the occupants.

As of February 15, the FWA Administrator reported that 20,000 dwelling units were under contract at a total estimated construction cost of \$63,152,892.

United States Housing Authority

The USHA announced that construction was commenced on a 1,000-unit project in Hartford, Conn., which will be the largest of its kind in New England. The new dwelling units will be for workers in Hartford defense industries made

up principally of aircraft and related production.

Out of a total of 50 projects assigned to the United States Housing Authority for construction, it was reported that 23 were under construction or completed, with 1,424 units available for occupancy; 11 were scheduled for ground breaking in March or April with sites being acquired or plans drawn for the remainder.

Farm Security Administration

Farm Security Administration announced it is pushing plans for the construction of 1,000 dwelling units at Greenbelt, Md., to house defense workers coming into the Washington vicinity.

Defense Homes Corporation

Defense Homes Corporation announced it had acquired an option on a site at Nashville, Tenn., where 200 homes will be constructed for defense workers in the Vultee Aircraft plant. Housing is to be of a permanent type, it was announced, and will cost between \$3,500 and \$4,000 per unit, including land and utilities. The project will be financed with a mortgage insured by the FHA and equity capital supplied by the Defense Homes Corporation.

Federal Housing Administration

The FHA announced that since July 1, 1940, private builders had started construction under FHA inspection on 105,920 new small homes, an increase of 31.07 percent over the number started in the same period a year earlier. It was reported that about 85 percent of the new housing has occurred in important defense industrial areas. In some of these areas increases ranged up to 200 percent as compared with a year ago.

These wide increases took place in such areas as Hartford, Cincinnati, Richmond, including the Hampton Roads area, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Chicago, Indianapolis, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Birmingham, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle.

STATUS OF PUBLIC DEFENSE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, FEBRUARY 15, 1941

	Funds allocated	Contracts awarded	Completed
Number of States and Territories.....	44	37	10
Number of localities.....	125	80	13
Number of projects.....	226	124	14
Number of family dwelling units.....	68,632	36,936	1,932
Civilian industrial workers.....	36,352	15,192	636
Other civilians:			
Employees of Army and Navy.....	8,683	5,013	724
Married enlisted personnel.....	23,597	16,731	576

PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION UNDER FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE

	Week ended Feb. 15, 1941	Previous week
New homes started.....	2,733	2,755
New home mortgages selected for appraisal.....	5,051	3,835

Hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on an amendment liberalizing National Housing Act provisions

Hearings were opened before the House Banking and Currency Committee last week on an amendment liberalizing provisions of the National Housing Act.

C. F. Palmer, Defense Housing Coordinator; Jesse Jones, Federal Loan Administrator; Stewart McDonald, Deputy Loan Administrator; and Abner H. Ferguson, Federal Housing Administrator, testified in favor of the measure.

The new amendment to the National Housing Act would set up a separate Defense Housing Insurance Fund of \$10,000,000 to be used to underwrite \$100,000,000 in mortgages on 1- to 4-family dwelling units in defense areas.

Under the proposed legislation, loans to builders would be insured up to 90 percent of the Federal Housing Administrator's appraised value of the property where such advances of credit did not exceed \$4,000 on a single-family residence; \$6,000 on a 2-family residence; \$8,000 on a 3-family dwelling; and \$10,500 on a 4-family apartment building.

In explaining his reasons to the committee for requesting the amendment, Mr. Palmer declared that the magnitude of the Defense Housing Program is such as to require the utmost speed in the production of dwelling accommodations at low cost.

Certificates of Necessity for plant expansion granted to 89 corporations from February 1 through February 15

Speed-up in granting applications for Certificates of Necessity for plant expansion under the national defense program was shown in a report issued February 20 by the National Defense Advisory Commission. From February 1 through February 15, the Commission issued 93 such certificates to 89 corporations as compared with 51 corporations which received certificates in the last half of January, and 67 in the first half.

The approximate cost of facilities covered by the certificates was \$63,977,000 as compared with \$71,864,000 during the last half of January, and \$120,188,000 in the first half of the month. The average per certificate during the first half of February was \$687,925 as compared with an average of \$1,409,098 in the second half of January, and \$1,793,851 in the first half.

Certificates of Necessity are issued to enable manufacturers to avail themselves of the 60-month income tax amortization of plant cost provided for under section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code. Estimates are subject to audit by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Two of the largest plant expansions

The largest item on the list is \$13,752,000 for plant expansion of the General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y., for the manufacture of turbosuperchargers for aircraft engines, turbines, and controls.

The second largest item on the current list is a certificate covering \$10,827,000 for plant expansion by the Electro Metallurgical Co. of New York City for the manufacture of chromium, silicon, manganese alloys, and alloying metals.

The manufacturers who received certificates from February 1 through February 15, the purpose for which the new facilities will be used, and the approximate cost of such facilities are listed below:

Abrasive Machine Tool Co., East Providence, R. I.; surface grinders; \$101,000.

The Acme Machine Tool Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; machine tools; \$83,000.

Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.; strip steel, carbon, silicon and alloy; \$1,045,000.

The American Pulley Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; windshield stampings for Navy projectiles; \$28,000.

American Tube Bending Co., Inc., New Haven, Conn.; aircraft engine parts; \$81,000.

Arter Grinding Machine Co., Worcester, Mass.; rotary surface grinders; \$27,000.

Bath Iron Works Corporation, Bath, Maine; destroyers; \$760,000.

John Bath & Co., Worcester, Mass.; taps and thread gages; \$88,000.

Bauer Bros. Co., Springfield, Ohio; machining of shells; \$549,000.

The Bodine Corporation, Bridgeport, Conn.; automatic machinery; \$47,000.

Borg-Warner Corporation, Auburn, Ind.; gears for machine tools; \$37,000.

Boyar-Schultz Corporation, Chicago, Ill.; aeroplane parts and dies and gages for machine guns; \$102,000.

Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.; Cartridge cases; \$48,000.

Buhr Machine Tool Co., Ann Arbor, Mich.; spindle drill and tapping equipment; \$61,000.

Carolina Aluminum Co., Badin, N. C.; pig aluminum and carbon electrodes; \$1,381,000.

Chain Belt Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; howitzers and parts; \$60,000.

T. M. Chapman's Sons Co., Old Town, Maine; aeroplane engine parts; \$17,000.

Chase Brass & Copper Co., Waterbury, Conn.; cartridge cases; \$60,000.

The Cincinnati Shaper Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; shapers, presses and brakes; \$263,000.

Clearing Machine Corporation, Chicago, Ill.; mechanical and hydraulic presses; \$166,000.

The Cleveland Welding Co., Cleveland, Ohio; casing bursters for shells; \$42,000.

Colonial Broach Co., Detroit, Mich.; broaching machines and fixtures; \$170,000.

Consolidated Machine Tool Corporation, Rochester, N. Y.; machines and presses; \$352,000.

Detroit Tap & Tool Co., Hamtramck, Mich.; thread grinding and tapping machines; \$63,000.

Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.; magnesium metal castings; \$1,105,000.

The Electric Controller & Mfg. Co., Cleveland, Ohio; electrical controllers and magnets; \$29,000.

Electro Metallurgical Co., New York, N. Y.; chromium, silicon, manganese alloys and alloying metals; \$10,827,000.

Enterprise Galvanizing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; pickling and painting of hull for naval vessels; \$30,000.

Ex-Cell-O Corporation, Detroit, Mich.; aircraft engine parts; \$1,670,000.

The Factory Power Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; power, light, heat, air, and water; \$412,000.

Fairbanks, Morse & Co., Chicago, Ill.; opposed piston Diesel engines and parts; \$1,404,000.

Federal-Mogul Corporation, Detroit, Mich.; bronze bushings; \$65,000.

A. Finkl & Sons Co., Chicago, Ill.; breech rings and housing for anti-aircraft guns; \$168,000.

Food Machinery Corporation, Inc., San Jose, Calif.; amphibian tractors; \$320,000.

Foster Machine Co., Elkhart, Ind.; automatic chucking machines and turret lathes; \$58,000.

Franklin Machine & Foundry Co., Providence, R. I.; small arms ammunition and equipment; \$274,000.

The Gear Grinding Machine Co., Hamtramck, Mich.; gear grinding machines; \$150,000.

General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.; turbosuperchargers for aircraft engines, turbines, and controls; \$13,752,000.

General Motors Corporation, Detroit, Mich.; fuses and shells; \$176,000.

Gisholt Machine Co., Madison, Wis.; turret lathes; \$1,172,000.

Goodyear Aircraft Corporation, Akron, Ohio; aeroplane wheels and brakes; \$420,000.

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio; airship rubberized fabric; \$15,000.

George Gorton Machine Co., Racine, Wis.; milling, die-cutting, and profiling machines; \$80,000.

Harris-Seybold-Potter Co., Cleveland, Ohio; shell lathes; \$86,000.

Hercules Powder Co., Wilmington, Del.; smokeless powder and nitrocellulose; \$1,121,000.

R. Hoe & Co., New York, N. Y.; recoil mechanisms and equilibrators; \$83,000.

Hydraulic Press Manufacturing Co., Mount Gilead, Ohio; hydraulic presses and pumps; \$608,000.

Illinois Gear & Machine Co., Chicago, Ill.; gears; \$42,000.

Illinois Tool Works, Chicago, Ill.; metal cutting tools; \$360,000.

Industrial Brownhoist Corporation, Elyria, Ohio; machine tool castings; \$296,000.

The Johnston & Jennings Co., Cleveland, Ohio; smooth force and semifinished machine parts; \$26,000.

Link Aviation Devices, Inc., Binghamton, N. Y.; aircraft engines and parts; \$320,000.

The Lufkin Rule Co., Saginaw, Mich.; measuring tapes and rules and precision tools; \$93,000.

The Marquette Metal Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio; aeroplane precision machine parts; \$223,000.

McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.; bullet cores; \$57,000.

Miehle Printing Press & Mfg. Co., Chicago, Ill.; machine tools, gun sights, and mounts; \$422,000.

Mosler Safe Co., Hamilton, Ohio; machine tool parts; \$22,000.

The National Automatic Tool Co., Richmond, Ind.; machine tools; \$57,000.

National Broach & Machine Co., Detroit, Mich.; machine tools; \$147,000.

National Carbon Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.; carbon and graphite electrodes; \$2,228,000.

Henry B. Nevins, Inc., New York, N. Y.; mine sweepers; \$98,000.

New Process Gear Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; aircraft propeller parts; \$347,000.

Carl L. Norden, Inc., New York, N. Y.; aviation instruments; \$56,000.

Packard Motor Car Co., Detroit, Mich.; marine engines; \$643,000.

Peco Manufacturing Corporation, Philadelphia, Pa.; bomb metal parts; \$107,000.

George P. Pilling & Sons' Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; surgical instruments and supplies; \$23,000.

Potash Company of America, Carlsbad, N. Mex.; muriate of potash, chlorate and hydropide potassium; \$427,000.

Reading Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; transportation; \$7,000.

Republic Aviation Corporation, Farmingdale, N. Y.; aeroplanes; \$5,126,000.

Scottdale Mills, Scottdale, Ga.; khaki and cotton tent duck; \$26,000.

The Sheffield Gage Corporation, Dayton, Ohio; gages; \$910,000.

J. Sklar Manufacturing Co., Inc., Long Island City, N. Y.; surgical instruments; \$88,000.

Smalley-General Co., Bay City, Mich.; thread milling machines; \$20,000.

The Snow & Petrelli Mfg. Co., New Haven, Conn.; gears and clutches for boats; \$79,000.

Superior Tube Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; metal tubing; \$347,000.

Taft Pierce Mfg. Co., Woonsocket, R. I.; gages for aircraft and small arms production; \$400,000.

Taylor-Wharton Iron & Steel Co., Easton, Pa.; machining of shells; \$552,000.

The Textile-Finishing Machinery Co., Providence, R. I.; machine tool parts; \$147,000.

Thompson Products, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio; aircraft engine parts; \$86,000.

Todd-California Shipbuilding Corporation, Oakland, Calif.; magnesium products; \$5,000,000.

Todd Galveston Drydocks, Inc., Galveston, Tex.; reconditioning and repairing of vessels; \$2,254,000.

Union Twist Drill Co., Athol, Mass.; machine tools; \$221,000.

United Aircraft Corporation, East Hartford, Conn.; aeroplanes and parts; \$1,633,000.

United Drill and Tool Corporation, Chicago, Ill.; machine tools; \$607,000.

The Vilter Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; howitzers; \$188,000.

O. S. Walker Co., Worcester, Mass.; magnetic chucks and grinding machines; \$16,000.

Weston Electrical Instrument Corporation, Newark, N. J.; electrical measuring instruments; \$160,000.

Worthington Pump & Machinery Corporation, Harrison, N. J.; aircraft propeller cams; \$269,000.

Wyckoff Drawn Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; carbon, alloy, and steel; \$191,000.

★ ★ ★

Defense photos available for publication

The Picture Office of the Information Division of the NDAC-OPM functions as a clearing house for photographs on every phase of our defense effort. Pictures are available covering the manufacture of arms, munitions, and equipment, tanks, uniforms, construction of cantonments, defense housing, types of workers, training courses, small industries, shipbuilding, and a number of other subjects. The files are constantly being expanded.

Prints of photographs made by NDAC-OPM are distributed directly by the Picture Office. In other cases, requests for pictures will be checked against the samples in the file and routed to an agency which has available for distribution pictures of the type requested. Photographs are supplied for publication only.

Requests should be directed to Robert Collyer, Special Assistant to the Director of Information, OPM, Room 3523, Social Security Board Bldg., Washington, D. C.

In all cases, it is asked that a copy of any publication using a NDAC-OPM photograph be sent to the Picture Office when prints supplied by the office are returned.

Simplification of forms for Certificates of Necessity expected to expedite handling

Speedier handling of requests for Certificates of Necessity for plant expansion is expected as a result of simplification in application forms, the National Defense Advisory Commission announced February 19.

Revision of the forms was made necessary by adoption of Public Act No. 3, Seventy-seventh Congress, amending section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code, which made it possible to file applications for the Certificates within 60 days after acquisition or beginning construction on a new plant. Formerly it was necessary to obtain a certificate before construction could be begun or new facilities acquired or constructed.

Simplification of tables to be filled in by the applicant, and clarification of some of the questions asked, are expected to enable the Commission to act with greater speed upon new applications for certificates. Applicants are urged to give complete information in order to facilitate a decision by the Commission.

The new forms of application for a Government Protection Certificate and for the Non-Reimbursement Certificate also have been altered to conform with changes in the law. In each instance, application must now be filed before the expiration of 60 days after making of a contract with the United States. Before the new act these certificates, to be effective, had to be issued within 90 days after making of a contract.

The new forms supersede instructions issued on November 1, 1940. Copies may be obtained at the office of the Assistant Secretary of War or the office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, Certification Unit.

★ ★ ★

Retired enlisted men may be called to active duty

The War Department has announced that retired enlisted men, who have special qualifications and who are physically qualified for duty, will be ordered to duty when desired by corps area or department commanders. Enlisted men so called to duty will serve in corps area service commands or overhead installations, and will not be assigned or transferred to units of the field forces.

Compilation of defense contracts cleared and awarded, February 13 through February 19

A total of \$85,519,833.68 in defense contracts was cleared and awarded during the period February 13 to February 19, inclusive. This compares with a total of \$33,491,192 for the previous week, and \$21,204,000 for the period ended February 5.

All contracts over \$500,000 are cleared by the Division of Purchases of the Office of Production Management.

During the latest period, cleared contracts awarded by the War Department totaled \$50,303,434; by the Navy Department, \$32,451,400; and by the Maritime Commission, \$2,765,000.

ORDNANCE

WAR DEPARTMENT

American Brass Co., Waterbury, Conn., brass, \$1,050,000.

Remington Arms Co., Bridgeport, Conn., small arms materiel, \$695,043.25.

Western Cartridge Co., East Alton, Ill., small arms ammunition, \$1,165,263.26.

Auto Ordnance Corporation, Bridgeport, Conn., small arms materiel, \$2,576,123.27.

Kennedy-Van Saun Manufacturing and Engineering Corporation, Danville, Pa., \$819,072.

LeTourneau Company of Georgia, Toccoa, Ga., artillery ammunition, shells, machining, \$1,190,000.

CONSTRUCTION

A. W. Kutsche, Detroit, Mich., motor supply warehouse at Fort Wayne, Mich., \$629,700.

Three contractors: The Arthur A. Johnson Corporation, Long Island City, N. Y., Necare Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., and Vermilya-Brown Co., Inc., New York City, for construction of a defense base at Bermuda, initial contract \$2,456,000 (ultimate total estimated at \$19,000,000).

Four contractors: Al Johnson Construction Co., Minneapolis, Minn., Nick F. Helmers, Inc., New York City; McWilliams Dredging Co., Chicago, Ill., and A. Guthrie & Co., Inc., St. Paul, Minn., for construction of defense base at Newfoundland, initial contract \$3,360,000 (ultimate total estimated at \$23,400,000).

Minder Construction Corporation, Chicago, Ill., for construction of defense base at St. Lucia, British West Indies; initial contract \$900,000 (ultimate total estimated at \$3,000,000).

Elmhurst Contracting Co., Inc., Long Island, N. Y., for construction of defense base at British Guiana, South America; initial contract \$900,000 (ultimate total estimated at \$3,000,000).

Two contractors: George F. Driscoll Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., and Walsh Construction Co., Davenport, Iowa; for construction of a defense base at Trinidad, British West Indies; initial contract \$5,190,000 (ultimate total estimated at \$51,000,000).

S. J. Groves & Sons Co., Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., for construction of air base at Antigua, British West Indies; initial contract \$900,000 (ultimate total estimated at \$2,880,000).

J. A. Terteling & Sons, Boise, Idaho; for construction of Ordnance Depot at Hermiston, Oregon, \$7,547,661.

EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

WAR DEPARTMENT

Autocar Co., Ardmore, Pa., tractor-trucks and chassis, \$1,248,963.56.

General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y., superchargers, \$18,040,429.78.

Western Electric Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., microphones, \$824,967.76.

U. S. Rubber Co., New York, N. Y., cable assemblies with reels, \$810,209.80.

NAVY

Donald Roebling, Clearwater, Fla., tractors, amphibian, \$3,240,000.

Jack Heintz, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, starters, hand, electric, \$944,400.

AIRPORTS

NAVY

Three contractors: James Stewart & Co., Inc., and H. J. Deutschbein Company, and the Peter F. Connolly Co., New York, N. Y., aviation facilities at the Naval Air Stations, Trinidad and British Guiana, \$11,487,000.

Two contractors: Geo. A. Fuller Co. and Merritt-Chapman and Scott Corporation, New York, N. Y., aviation facilities at Naval air station, Argentia, Newfoundland, \$9,425,000.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION

NAVY

General Motors Corporation, Cleveland Diesel Engine Division, Cleveland, Ohio, construction of propelling machinery and Diesel-engine driven generators for a submarine tender, \$1,475,000.

General Motors Corporation, Cleveland Diesel Engine Division, Cleveland, Ohio, construction of propelling machinery for 14 submarine chasers of the PC476-488 class, \$5,880,000.

MARITIME COMMISSION

Federal Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., Kearny, N. J., construction of eight C-2 type, steam propelled cargo ships, \$2,765,000.

★ ★ ★

CONTRACT FOR BAG-LOADING PLANT

The War Department announced February 20 the award of a contract totaling \$14,394,001 to the Brecon Loading Co., Wilmington, Del., a wholly owned subsidiary of the Coca Cola Co., Atlanta, Ga., on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, for management services, training personnel, and operation of an artillery ammunition bag-loading plant, on a site of approximately 20,000 acres, located at Childersburg, Ala., to be operated in conjunction with the smokeless powder plant.

Of this total award, \$1,091,000 represents the cost of equipment, leaving \$13,303,001 for the operation of the plant. The contract was cleared by the Office of Production Management.

Broadening field of purchase of domestic meat supplies for the armed forces; procurement of some South American canned beef necessary

A material broadening in the field of purchasing domestic meat supplies for the armed forces was announced February 22 by Donald M. Nelson, Director, Division of Purchases, Office of Production Management, following a conference with representatives of the American National Livestock Association.

This program provides broad support for the entire domestic meat market, Mr. Nelson said, through the new development of an all-round emergency ration, with its proportionate share of meat products, which opens an entire new field in the preparation of canned meat supplies for the armed forces.

South American purchases

It was recognized, Mr. Nelson said, by the representatives of the livestock producers that due to this development, which requires all of the domestic canned meat facilities, that some purchase of South American canned beef is necessary to provide immediately canned meat requirements for use by the armed forces in the field.

Purchases will be made in such a way as to minimize any disturbance in the domestic market.

The Army, Mr. Nelson explained, is also increasing substantially its use of boneless meat products as a space-saving device through packaging in frozen form. This, he said, makes it more adaptable to rapid handling in a fast-moving, mechanized Army.

Importance of meat

It is interesting to note, he said, that the producers were impressed by the fact that the Army is stressing the increasing importance of meat in a well-balanced ration, as indicated in the current requirements, which, on a basis of per man per day exceed by more than 60 percent per capita consumption of meat in the United States during 1940.

The program, Mr. Nelson said, was developed through cooperation of the Army and Navy. The Division of Purchases has had the benefit of the advice and suggestions of the livestock producers.

CONSUMER DIVISION . . .

Increased consumer purchasing power can make up for loss of agriculture's export markets—address by Commissioner Elliott

Domestic markets for agricultural commodities, expanding as a result of increased consumer purchasing power arising out of the defense program, can make up for a substantial part of lost export markets, Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumer Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Commission, told the National Farm Institute at its annual meeting, held in Des Moines, Iowa, on February 21.

Miss Elliott spoke on "The Effects of National Defense on the Consumer," and reported that an encouraging new consumer demand is making itself felt in agricultural as well as industrial markets.

She pointed out that food expenditures are the largest single item in the average family budget, and said increasing employment and buying power of industrial workers will result in increased farm income as well.

"Recently, I urged businessmen to stand firm against the great temptation to advance prices 'just a little,'" Miss Elliott said.

"Every increase in the price of consumer goods means an increase in the cost of living. I make the same recommendation to agriculture. Let profits come from large volume rather than through high prices."

Demand for meat

Citing recent recommendations of the United States Department of Agriculture, Miss Elliott said, "Rapidly increasing consumer demand is of particular importance to the producers of hogs and beef. Farmers will profit more, if, in the months ahead, they will send more cattle to market and increase hog production for 1941."

"Maintaining the standard of living, eliminating malnutrition, feeding low-income families and undernourished children have a defense significance which I do not need to spell out. We need the farmer's help and support in protecting the buying power of the consumer's dollar. Unjustified increases in the price of foods are as dangerous as

unwarranted rises in the price of other commodities."

"Citizens who are engaged in agriculture need to look into the problems of staking out a larger claim in the national well-being for the underprivileged outside, as well as inside the agricultural economy. Managers and workers in industry, on the other hand, have a responsibility to those engaged in agricultural as well as industrial occupations."

Industry in rural areas

Miss Elliott said that new industrial plants necessary for defense production, which are being built in rural areas, will bring benefits to communities with low-income farm families and to farm consumers. She reported that defense officials are considering the utilization of surplus farm manpower in planning the location of industrial plants.

Agriculture is playing a major role in building the Nation's human defenses, Miss Elliott said, through the use of surplus farm products to raise nutrition levels under the food stamp plan and the school-lunch program. She also described the efforts to protect civilian needs and to balance military and civilian requirements in the defense program.

★ ★ ★

Herbert Emmerich, Secretary, Office of Production Management

The Office of Production Management announced February 17 appointment of Herbert Emmerich as secretary.

Mr. Emmerich has had extensive experience in Government since 1933, and has also served during the last 3 years as associate director of the Public Administration Clearing House in Chicago. Born in New York City in 1897, he was graduated from the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce in 1918. His services with the United States Government included work in the Farm Credit Administration where he served as deputy governor.

Unwarranted rumors of increase in sugar prices; existing stock is now larger than usual

Rumors of sugar shortage, sugar rationing, and price increases have no basis of fact and are entirely unwarranted, Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumer Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Commission, declared this week.

"Existing stocks of sugar readily available to consumers in the United States are now considerably larger than usual," Miss Elliott pointed out. "If necessary, sugar production can be expanded materially in domestic areas as well as in nearby foreign areas. Cuba has large surplus stocks of sugar currently because of the drastic curtailment of European markets."

Miss Elliott pointed out that the power of the President to suspend quota restrictions on sugar and certain powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under existing legislation can make these large supplies of sugar available to consumers when necessary.

Action on quotas

In September 1939, when the European war started a rush in sugar buying which developed into price increases and local sugar shortages, the President suspended the quota provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937. Following this action, the price of raw sugar declined and sugar hoarding ceased.

In reestablishing the quota system on sugar in December 1939, the President said: "It should be noted that under this law the quotas may again be suspended if such action becomes necessary to protect the consumers."

The power to remove marketing restrictions, which would permit the more accessible producing areas to market sugar in the United States and release reserve sugars already stored here, coupled with powers to make shipping available where needed, should make it possible for American consumers to obtain adequate supplies of sugar at all times and at retail prices around existing levels.

Program to protect consumers from hidden price rises due to the use of short weights

A program to protect consumers from hidden price increases resulting from the use of short weights and measures was outlined in a bulletin issued this week by Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumer Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Commission.

The bulletin, entitled "Check Your Weights and Measures," is being distributed to State and local defense councils and to civic and consumer organizations to help them maintain living standards by protecting consumer purchasing.

Local responsibility

"The major responsibility for seeing that hidden price rises do not occur through unobserved reduction in quantity, rests upon States and municipalities," Miss Elliott said. "It is important that consumers understand the problem of insuring full and accurate weight and measure, and take the necessary steps to provide effective machinery for protection in their localities.

"This protection is of value to the honest merchant as well as to the consumer."

The bulletin describes what is being done currently in States and cities to enforce weight-and-measure standards and to test measuring devices.

Program outlined

Pointing out that millions of dollars are saved each year for consumers by these activities, the bulletin outlines a program for individual consumers and organizations to supplement and strengthen existing agencies and methods of enforcement where necessary.

A summary of a model State law on weights and measures, prepared by the National Conference on Weights and Measures, is included in the bulletin.

"Check Your Weights and Measures" is available on request from the Consumer Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission.

★ ★ ★

MR. HARRIMAN TO LONDON

President Roosevelt has designated W. A. Harriman, OPM Materials Branch Director, special Defense "Expediter" in London to keep the United States apprised of defense needs and Great Britain apprised of production in this country.

Survey by engineering consultants of the need for community facilities

A group of engineering consultants especially experienced in municipal management is assisting the Division of State and Local Cooperation in appraisal of necessary community facilities in "defense areas," Frank Bane, Director of the Division, announces. These consultants have been sent to various parts of the country where a lack of defense-connected community facilities might impede national defense.

Such facilities include, for example, water supply, sewage disposal, city streets, schools, recreation centers, and others.

This intensive survey, which is expected to be completed within 30 days, is being made by the Division of State and Local Cooperation in connection with operations of the Office of Production Management and the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. It was launched at a conference called by the Division in Washington February 21.

Purposes of the survey

Purposes of the survey include determination of the need for defense-connected community facilities the absence or lack of which will impede, or is impeding national defense; what resources the locality or State has to meet these needs; what, if any, amount of Federal funds appears necessary; and the degree of urgency of the need for various facilities.

The plan of the survey provides for consultation with State and local officials, executive officers of the State and any local defense councils, and others concerned with problems involved.

"States and localities generally are cooperating with the Division in its efforts to see that no lack of necessary community facilities impedes or retards the general defense effort," states Mr. Bane. "Within the near future, the Division of State and Local Cooperation will have in hand facts and figures with respect to some 60 or 70 such areas."

Two types

So-called "defense areas" can be divided into two general categories, those in which there are defense industries, and those adjacent to military concentrations.

In general, the city managers have been made available to the Division by municipalities throughout the country which have, without exception, cooperated wholeheartedly and effectively in the national defense program. The cities in question are lending their city managers to undertake this survey of community facilities in defense areas.

Procedures and assignments of specific areas to be surveyed were determined at a conference of the engineers held under the direction of the Division in Washington on February 21.

Agencies represented

At this conference were representatives of Federal agencies concerned with various aspects of community problems, including representatives of the United States Office of Education, the United States Public Health Service, United States Public Roads Administration, the Federal Works Agency, the Defense Coordinator for Health, Welfare, Recreation, and related defense activities, and other interested agencies.

Following is a list of the city managers serving with the Division as engineering consultants, together with the States in which specific areas are to be surveyed:

Alabama and Mississippi—Mr. R. W. B. Hart of Lynchburg, Va.; Georgia and Florida—Mr. Roy Braden of Greenbelt, Md.; Tennessee and Arkansas—Mr. R. M. Cooksey of Thomasville, N. C.; Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina—Mr. I. C. Brower of Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Louisiana and Missouri—Mr. Carl Smeddburg of Greensboro, N. C.; Oklahoma, Iowa, and Minnesota—Mr. Bryan Miller of Wichita Falls, Tex.; Texas—Mr. H. I. Stites of Burbank, Calif.; California—Mr. John Ames, of Ames, Iowa; Oregon and Washington—Mr. Don McMillan of Ventura, Calif.; Wisconsin and Indiana—Mr. Edward S. Clark of Kalamazoo, Mich.; Illinois—Mr. D. E. A. Cameron of Toledo, Ohio; Michigan—Mr. James E. Barlow of Portland, Maine; Rhode Island—Mr. C. A. Harrell of Schenectady, N. Y.

★ ★ ★

4,741,971 ALIENS

Attorney General Jackson announced 4,741,971 aliens in continental United States and 100,511 aliens in the Territories were registered from July 15, 1940, to January 15, 1941, exclusive of 48,620 alien seamen and 23,038 foreign consular officials and employees.

Approximately 37 percent of the Nation's alien population, the report stated, is concentrated in two States—25.7 percent in New York and 11.1 percent in California.

PRODUCTION . . .

Newly appointed production board will undertake industrial planning for defense and civilian requirements for the emergency, and for post-emergency readjustments

Appointment of a Production Planning Board was announced February 20 by John D. Biggers, Director of Production, with the approval of the Director General and the Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management.

This Board, which held its first meeting in Washington February 21, will advise both as to industrial planning during the emergency and as to post-emergency readjustments. As bases for such recommendations it will study production experience during the World War, the Industrial Mobilization Plan of the War and Navy Departments, and the procedure followed during the past 8 months by the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense and the War and Navy Departments. The Board will make recommendations both for defense and civilian requirements.

Representatives of the Army and Navy, industry, labor, and scientific research will have places on the Board, which also will have the benefit of the most authoritative current information on the defense requirements of Great Britain. Members of the Board have had broad experience in their respective fields, particularly as they apply to the problems of industrial mobilization.

"This Board has been established in recognition of the importance of both short- and long-term planning of the defense effort and its effects on the national economy as a whole," Mr. Biggers declared.

Members of the Board are:

Samuel Richard Fuller, chairman. Mr. Fuller is president of the North American Rayon Corporation, whose manufacturing plant is in Tennessee, and also president of the American Bemberg Corporation. Mr. Fuller's earlier years were spent in the steel and malleable iron casting industry. He had charge of steel and machine tool procurement for the Navy Department during the World War and won high commendation from Bernard Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board, and others for his services.

Harry E. Hopkins, former Secretary of Commerce, former WPA Administrator, and recent special representative of the President in England.

Admiral William Harrison Standley, U. S. N. (retired). Admiral Standley was Chief of Naval Operations from 1933 to 1937, and during that period frequently served as Acting Secretary of the Navy during the illness of the late Secretary Claude Swanson. He was a member of the delegation of the United States to the London Naval Conference of 1935, and signed the London Naval Treaty on behalf of the United States. He is a recipient of the Spanish Campaign Medal, the China Relief Expedition Medal, the Philippine Campaign Medal, the Mexican Campaign Medal, and the Victory Medal.

Maj. Gen. James Henry Burns, U. S. A. Gen. Burns, a graduate of West Point in 1908, has served in this country, Mexico, France, and the Philippine Islands. His tours of duty include assignments in the office of the Chief Ordnance Officer, the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, Commander of the Raritan Ordnance Depot, the office of the Chief of Staff and, in 1936, Executive Officer, office of the Assistant Secretary of War. He was promoted to the rank of Major General on October 1, 1940. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his accomplishments during the World War, when he served in France in the office of the Chief Ordnance Officer.

George W. Meany, secretary-treasurer, American Federation of Labor, and former president of the New York State Federation of Labor. He is a member of the United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters.

James B. Carey, secretary of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and general president of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. Mr. Carey is also chairman of the Committee on Unemployment, CIO, and a member of the Board of Directors of the National Consumer's League. He has served on Labor Department committees and was a United States labor delegate to the Havana Conference in 1939.

John L. Pratt, of Fredericksburg, Va.: Mr. Pratt retired 5 years ago from his position as executive vice president of General Motors Corporation in charge of all parts and accessory divisions. He has had broad experience in the chemical and mechanical industries, and has made a study of industrial mobilization as a member of the War Resources Board, appointed to study the Industrial Mobilization Plan after the outbreak of the European War in the fall of 1939.

William E. Levis, of Toledo, Ohio: Mr. Levis is chairman of the Board of the Owens-Illinois Glass Company. In addition to broad manufacturing experience in the glass container, metal, paper, and plastic fields, Mr. Levis has a distinguished record of active foreign service in the Infantry during the World War, and a knowledge of the War Department's Industrial Mobilization Plan gained through active participation in the problems of the Production Planning Division of the Surgeon General's Office. He has been a member of the Officer's Reserve Corps since the close of the World War.

Robert E. Doherty, president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology: Dr. Doherty holds degrees from the University of Illinois, Yale University, Tufts College, and the University of Pittsburgh. He was dean of the School of Engineering at Yale from 1933 to 1936, and has been president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology since 1936. After varied experience in test, designing, and construction engineering, Dr. Doherty was assistant to Dr. C. P. Steinmetz from 1918 to 1923. He is a member of the Pittsburgh Housing Authority, the American Institute of Electrical Engineers and the Society for the Promotion of Engineering. He is co-author of *Mathematics of Modern Engineering*.

★ ★ ★

At present consumption rate tin supplies sufficient for at least 15 months

A warning against continuance of the present unstable condition in the tin market was issued February 20 by W. A. Harriman, chief of the materials branch, Division of Production, Office of Production Management. This condition might have unfortunate repercussions on the defense program and the national economy as a whole, he said.

Mr. Harriman pointed out that, as an apparent result of the unsettled situation in the Far East, heavy buying on the New York market has advanced the price of tin for early delivery from around 50 cents a pound to 54 cents a pound within the past week.

He declared that actual supplies of tin already stored in this country and already afloat beyond any danger zone are sufficient to meet requirements at the present rate of consumption for at least 15 months without resorting to conservation or substitution.

"Under these circumstances," Mr. Harriman stated, "buying practices which increase the price of tin are not only prejudicial to the interest of general price stability but are extremely short-sighted."

"Everyone should realize that in the event our supplies of tin from the Far East should be interrupted, immediate steps would be taken to conserve our supplies, and all stocks, whether in Government or private hands, would become subject to allocation on the basis of the requirements of the national defense. It therefore should be apparent that the bidding up of prices will neither increase the total supply of tin in the country nor the amount available to particular consumers, no matter what they may have paid for it."

Aircraft, Ordnance, and Tools Sections, Division of Production, get additional key personnel

Further organization and key personnel of the Division of Production, Office of Production Management, were made public February 17 by John D. Biggers, Director of the Division.

The Division of Production, operating under the Director General and Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management, has three branches—Materials; Aircraft, Ordnance, and Tools; and Ships, Construction, and Supplies.

Mr. Biggers announced appointment of key personnel of the Aircraft, Ordnance, and Tools Branch. Subsequent announcements will be made covering the other two branches.

As previously announced, Chief of the Aircraft, Ordnance, and Tools Branch is E. F. Johnson, who served as director of the light ordnance section of the Production Division, National Defense Advisory Commission. Before retirement from private business, Mr. Johnson held an executive position with General Motors Corporation.

Under Mr. Johnson's branch are three sections—Aircraft, Ordnance, and Tools.

Aircraft Section

Chief of the Aircraft Section is Merrill C. Meigs, publisher and advertising executive, who was formerly director of the Aeronautical Section, Production Division, National Defense Advisory Commission. Mr. Meigs was advertising director of the *Chicago American*, and in 1926 became publisher of the *Chicago Herald-Examiner*, now the *Herald-American*. He is now on leave from that position.

T. P. Wright, former vice president and chief of research engineering of the Curtiss-Wright Airplane Corporation, will be assistant to Mr. Meigs.

Under the Aircraft Section are three units: Engineering, production planning, and manufacturing.

Engineering unit.—The chief is Maj. E. M. Powers, who has been assigned to work with the Office of Production Management by the Air Corps of the United States Army. Major Powers has been in Army service since 1918, and was gradu-

ated from the Air Corps Aeronautical Engineering School in 1931.

Production planning unit.—The chief is Dr. A. E. Lombard.

Manufacturing unit.—The chief is A. J. Brandt, who has had wide experience in the explosives, chemical, and automobile industries. Mr. Brandt resigned his business connections as president of A. J. Brandt, Inc., consulting engineers, and president of the National Tool Co. to join the staff of the Aircraft Division.

Ordnance Section

Chief of the Ordnance Section is A. R. Glancy, who was graduated from Lehigh University as a mechanical engineer. Mr. Glancy was associated with E. I. duPont de Nemours during the World War, and later joined General Motors Corporation of which he became vice president. He also served as president of the Pontiac Motor Co., holding both positions until 1931. Since 1931 he has headed A. R. Glancy, Inc., Detroit, Mich.

There are four units under the Ordnance Section: Artillery, fire control, and optical; explosives, artillery, ammunition, bombs; small arms and their ammunition; and tanks and combat vehicles.

Artillery, fire control, and optical unit.—The chief is L. E. Osborne, who is on leave of absence from his position with the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.

Explosives, artillery, ammunition, bombs unit.—The chief is Louis de B. McCrady, who was graduated as an engineer from Clemson College in 1909. Mr. McCrady was associated with E. I. du Pont de Nemours and was sent to Canada to renovate various commercial explosives plants and the plant of the Dominion Cartridge Co. in 1911. He held the position of chief engineer of Canadian Industries, Ltd., at the time of his retirement in 1939.

Small arms and their ammunition unit.—The chief is E. S. Chapman. Mr. Chapman formerly held an executive position with the Gisholt Machine Co. at Madison, Wis., and in 1928 joined the Chrysler Corporation, later becoming vice president of the Plymouth Division. He is now on leave of absence from Chrysler Corporation.

Tanks and combat vehicle unit.—The chief is W. W. Knight, Jr. Mr. Knight

is a graduate of Yale University and Harvard Business School. His past business connections was with the Michigan Alkali Co. where he held the position of assistant general manager in charge of engineering, research, personnel, and accounting. Mr. Knight was one of the first men to become affiliated with the Defense Commission in his capacity as assistant director of the tank truck, and tractor section, and administrative assistant to Mr. Biggers.

Tools Section

Chief of the Tools Section is Mason Britton, who was in charge of the machine tool section of the National Defense Advisory Commission from its inception. Mr. Britton is vice chairman of the McGraw Hill Publishing Co., from which position he has taken a leave of absence to work with the defense program.

Mr. Britton will have two assistant chiefs: Howard Dunbar and Alvin B. Einig.

Mr. Dunbar, who will have the title of technical chief, is vice president and general manager of the machine division of the Norton Co., with which he has been associated for 27 years. He is a past president of the National Tool Builders' Association and of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Worcester division. He is on leave of absence from his company at the present time.

Mr. Einig is general manager of the Motch-Merryweather Machinery Corporation. During the World War he was assistant chief of the machine tool section of the War Industries Board.

Under the Tools Section will be eight units: Machine tools; foundry equipment; gauges; heat treating equipment; cranes; mill equipment and supplies; machine tool electrical equipment; and forge equipment and presses. The first six units have been established, and the other two will be set up at an appropriate time.

Machine tools unit.—The chief is Mason Britton.

Mill equipment and supplies unit.—The chief is H. H. Kuhn, president of the Hardware & Supply Co.

Heat treating unit.—The chief is Bradley Stoughten, dean of the Department of Metallurgical Engineering of Lehigh University.

Crane unit.—The chief is Sidney Buckley, president of the Sheppard Niles Crane Co.

Personnel of the additional units will be announced later.

AGRICULTURE . . .

Discussion of the livestock situation of the United States—by J. B. Hutson, Deputy Commissioner of the Agriculture Division

Difficult problems facing livestock producers, due to their inability to maintain an adequate labor force in the face of expanding industrial activity in the defense program, were discussed by J. B. Hutson, deputy commissioner of the Agricultural Division, at the sixteenth annual meeting of the Producers Cooperative Commission Association at Cincinnati, Ohio, February 20. However, Mr. Hutson said that livestock producers are much more favorably situated than many farmers in the export crop areas.

"In the past, livestock prices have not been such as to enable livestock operators to pay labor rates equal to those paid industrial workers," Mr. Hutson said. "Consequently, you may be forced to call upon labor that may not understand livestock farming and perhaps many of you will have to give more attention to labor-saving devices."

Mr. Hutson pointed out that the defense program had stimulated industry to the highest level on record and that although agriculture as a whole would not share proportionately in the increase, livestock producers would.

Past experience

"In the past, consumer expenditures for meat and meat products have shown a tendency to increase in direct proportion to changes in the income of workers in the industrial areas," he said. "During the 5-year period 1935-39, the nonagricultural income averaged about 60 billion dollars annually. In 1940, it was 67 billion dollars, and with increased expenditures for defense purposes the nonagricultural income in 1941 probably will exceed 75 billion dollars."

"If this increase in nonagricultural income takes place this year, an increase in consumer expenditures for meat and meat products of fully 12 percent above 1940, and fully 25 percent above the annual average expenditure of the 1935-39 period, would be in line with past experiences."

He added that according to present indications the combined production of

beef, veal, lamb, and mutton in 1941 will be about 4 to 5 percent above that of the 1935-39 period, and pork production in 1941 will be about 15 or 20 percent above that of the five-year period.

"This would suggest that roughly between one-third and one-half of the increase in demand in 1941 will be taken care of by larger marketings and the remainder will be reflected in prices higher than those prevailing during the 1935-39 period," Mr. Hutson said. "In recent weeks hog prices have been about one dollar per 100 pounds below the average of the 1935-39 period, and the beef-cattle prices from one to two dollars above prices during the 5-year period."

In view of the extremely low hog prices of last year, Mr. Hutson warned producers of the dangers in excessive stimulation of production that might result in bringing in producers in areas not adapted to commercial production, until supplies would be excessive in later years when demand conditions may be less favorable. He advocated meeting the larger demand in 1941 with larger marketings in order to avoid if possible excessive production and low prices in later years.

Mr. Hutson pointed out that the loss of export markets was the problem of all the Nation's producers since those farmers who normally produce for a large export market will be forced into competition with producers who now serve the domestic market exclusively, unless there is substantial industrial development in the export areas or the export markets are regained.

Methods of aid

He recommended immediate action to aid those farmers in the export area, first, by helping them turn to other undertakings through the location of some of the defense industries in these areas, and secondly, by helping the people in these areas to have a better diet.

As aids in solving the dietary problems and helping move agricultural services, Mr. Hutson mentioned the Food Stamp Plan and other devices to increase the food consumption of low-income and relief groups.

Inventory of the food resources of the United States; experts from 10 Government agencies

An inventory of United States food resources is being made by the Food Supply Section of the Agricultural Division, National Defense Advisory Commission, in cooperation with other governmental agencies, Chester C. Davis, Commissioner in charge of the Agricultural Division, announces.

More than 100 Government experts are serving on the planning and procedure committee and on the 14 subcommittees working under the direction of George Livingston, chief of the Food Supply Section. These members represent 10 Government Departments and Government agencies.

Balance sheet

A "balance sheet" of complete information on each food, and facilities for its processing, warehousing, and distribution, will be set up from information submitted by the subcommittees. Staff specialists will keep these balance sheets current for use in defense planning.

Food requirements for the armed forces, the civilian population, exports, supplies for England, and for European relief will be given detailed study in the survey of the over-all food situation in its relation to national defense.

Preliminary reports

First steps in this study have been completed with the preliminary reports of the committees on hand.

In order to simplify and expedite the gathering of all pertinent data relating to the Nation's food supply, George Livingston, chairman of the planning and procedure committee, has set up 14 subcommittees dealing with every phase of the food situation. These committees, and their chairmen, are:

Grains, cereals, and forage, Joseph A. Becker, Agricultural Marketing Service; *livestock and meats*, C. L. Harlan, Agricultural Marketing Service; *dairy*, Edmond E. Vial, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; *poultry*, W. D. Termohlen, Surplus Marketing Administration; *fish*, R. H. Fiedler, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; *jats and oils*, Charles E. Lund, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; *fruit, vegetables, and nuts*, Reginald Royston, Agricultural Marketing Service; *canned, dehydrated, and frozen foods*, C. E. Birgfeld, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; *sugar, molasses, sirups, and honey*, Warren C. Funk, Tariff Commission; *tropical food products*, Mary L. Bynum, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; *seeds*, George C. Edler, Agricultural Marketing Service; *tobacco*, Charles E. Gage, Agricultural Marketing Service; *food requirements*, O. C. Stine, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; *food distribution*, Frederick V. Waugh, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.