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## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To Members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:
The steel industry is basic to the American economy. Decisions made by steel executives on production, on expansion of facilities, and on prices have a profound effect on the entire Nation. Indeed, the strategic importance of steel makes it essential that steel management exercise a high degree of statesmanship in its policy judgments. The decision of the United States Steel Corp. to raise domestic prices and to reduce certain export prices as of December 16, 1949, has many consequences of importance to the American people, particularly since the decision was generally followed by a similar action of the other major domestic steel producers. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report is studying the factors involved in this action and its effect on the economy.

To assist this committee in its consideration of steel prices, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has, at my request, prepared the following collection of pertinent basic factual material on steel prices and the steel industry. The committee acknowledges its appreciation to Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, for making available the services of Julius $W$. Allen to prepare the materials for this report. It also thanks the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor for their assistance in supplying information.

The materials presented here do not necessarily represent the views of the committee, of its individual members, or of its staff.

> Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Chairman, Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

## I. The Importance of the Steel Industry in the American Economy

## CURRENT SIZE OF THE INDUSTRY

The steel industry of the United States is the largest producer of steel in the world. In 1949 the United States produced 77.6 million net tons of steel ingots and castings, or over 46 percent of the world total. The second largest producer, the U. S. S. R., is estimated to have produced about $20,000,000$ net tons, or under 12 percent of the world total. Complete data on world production of steel ingots and castings are shown in table 1.

Table 1.-World production, steel ingot and castings output
[By countries, net tons]

|  | 1949 1 | 1948 | 1947 | 1946 | 1945 | 1944 | 1943 | 1942 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| World total | 167,431,000 | 167,356,400 | 147,200,111 | 120,881,060 | 120,583,828 | 163,586,576 | 174,888,688 | 167,849,275 |
| United Stat | 77, 600, 000 | 88, 640, 470 | 84, 894, 071 | 66, 602, 724 | 79, 701, 648 | 89, 641, 600 | 88, 836, 512 | 86, 031, 931 |
| Canada | 3, 350, 000 | 3, 198, 720 | 2,945, 936 | 2, 334, 640 | 2, 87i, 952 | 3, 016, 160 | 3, 004, 176 | 3, 109, 904 |
| Great Brit | 17, 360, 000 | 16, 662, 240 | 14, 250, 880 | 14, 218, 736 | 13, 244, 000 | 13, 599, 264 | 14, 594, 720 | 14, 494, 704 |
| France 2 | 9,900, 000 | 7, 972,970 | 6,317, 766 | 4, 858, 000 | 1, 831, 200 | $3,407,600$ | 5, 650, 400 | 4, 944, 800 |
| Saar | 1, 935, 000 | 1, 346, 644 | 780, 216 |  | ${ }^{\text {(3) }}$ | (3) | ${ }^{(3)}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (3) |
| Belgiam | 4,300, 000 | 4, 316, 534 | 3, 179, 270 | 2, 517, 200 | 812, 000 | 685,440 | 1, 841, 280 | 1, 518, 720 |
| Luxembu | 2, 615, 000 | 2, 704, 308 | 1,887, 726 | 1,426, 096 | 291, 200 | 1, 398, 544 | 2, 379, 440 | 1, 729,168 |
| Italy | 2, 235,000 | 2, 341, 750 | 1, 874, 502 | 1, 270, 640 | 436,800 | 1, 130, 752 | 1, 903,328 | 2, 131, 360 |
| Spain | 710,000 | 625,936 | 596, 182 | 660,800 | 616,000 | 700, 000 | 728,000 | 660, 800 |
| Sweden | 1,495, 000 | 1,384, 320 | 1,312, 482 | 1,324, 624 | 1, 316, 000 | 1, 316, 000 | 1,344, 000 | 1,355, 200 |
| Germany | 10, 450, 000 | 6, 323,276 | 3, 490, 034 | 3, 318, 448 | 1, 705, 984 | 20, 187, 888 | 22, 877, 008 | 22, 570, 576 |
| Austria | 880,000 | 714, 096 | 394, 516 | 206, 080 | 189,504 | 1, 116, 416 | 1, 160, 992 | 988, 736 |
| Czechoslo | 3, 200,000 | 2, 920, 300 | 2, 519, 172 | 1,842, 624 | 1, 047, 200 | 2, 802, 576 | 2, 770, 656 | 2, 570, 064 |
| Poland | 2,250, 000 | 2, 071,760 | 1, 740,058 | 1,344, 000 | 545, 552 | 2, 149, 056 | 2, 689, 120 | 2, 304, 736 |
| Hungar | 800, 000 | 771, 400 | 662,302 | 392,090 | 141, 904 | 573, 888 | 855,680 | 864,528 |
| Russia | 20,000,000 | 18, 183, 000 | 14, 300, 000 | 13, 440,000 | 10, 080, 000 | 8, 960,000 | 8, 960,000 | 8, 960, 000 |
| Japan | 3, 000, 000 | 1, 895, 040 | 1, 070, 042 | 700,000 | 1, 173, 700 | 8, 099,168 | 10, 06I, 968 | 8, 704, 192 |
| India | 1, 500,000 | 1,350, 000 | 1, 389,732 | 1, 457, 120 | 1, 515, 136 | 1, 533, 168 | 1, 570, 464 | 1,504, 496 |
| Australia | 1, 100, 000 | 1, 424, 640 | 1, 511, 328 | 1, 124, 144 | 1, 573, 600 | 1,784, 048 | 1,912, 064 | 1,903, 776 |
| South A | 715, 000 | 658, 986 | 658, 896 | 555, 184 | 588, 448 | 533, 008 | 460, 880 | 381, 584 |
| Brazi | 578, 000 | 508, 000 | 426, 900 | 378, 015 | 226, 530 | 241, 235 | 202, 758 | 175, 576 |
| Mexico | 395.000 | 295, 000 | 353, 100 | 276, 100 | 211, 200 | 199, 320 | 194, 040 | 104, 280 |
| Miscellaneous | 1, 063, 000 | 1, 047, 000 | 645, 000 | 633, 885 | 458, 270 | 511, 445 | 891, 202 | 840, 144 |

1 Estimated.
2 Without Alsace Lorraine until 1945.
${ }^{3}$ Included in Germany.
4 All occupied zones of Germany proper since September 1945, but without Saar from 1947.

* Including Korea and Manchuria until July 1945.

Source: Steel (magazine), Jan. 2, 1950.
The steel industry is also the largest manufacturing industry in this country. In 1948 the steel industry broke all records for peacetime production, with a total production of steel ingots and steel for castings of 88.6 million tons, or 94.1 percent of total capacity of 94.2 million tons. In 1949 production dropped to 77.6 million tons or 80.7 percent of an increased capacity, totaling 96.1 million tons. The steel strike in the last quarter of 1949 of course was a major factor in preventing 1949 production from more nearly approaching that of 1948. Nevertheless, 1949 steel production was the third

## (anat) Production and Capacity

Steel Ingots and Steel for Castings-Net Tons

highest of any peacetime year. Production as a percent of capacity has fluctuated violently in the past. In 1932 production was less than 20 percent of steel capacity of that date. The trend in capacity and production from 1930 to date is shown in table 2.

Table 2.-Annual steel capacity and production by processes

|  | Open-hearth |  | Bessemer |  | Crucible |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Capacity | Production | Capacity | Production | Capacity | Production |
| 1949 | 84, 817,040 |  | 5,191, 000 |  | 20 | (1) |
| 1948. | 83, 610,690 | 79, 340,157 | 5, 226, 000 | 4, 243,172 | 20 | (1) |
| 1947. | 81, 010, 990 | 76, 873, 793 | 5, 154, 000 | 4, 232, 543 | 20 | (1) |
| 1945. | $81,236,250$ $84,171,590$ | 60, 711,963 $71,939,602$ | $5,154,000$ $5,874,000$ | 3, 327,737 $4,305,318$ | 20 3,800 |  |
| 1944 | 82, 223, 610 | 80, 363, 953 | 6, 074,000 | 5, ${ }^{4}, 3039,923$ | 3,800 3,800 | ${ }_{25}^{24}$ |
| 1943 | 79, 180, 880 | 78, 621,804 | 6,553,000 | 5, 625, 492 | 3,800 | 146 |
| 1942 | 78, 107, 260 | 76, 501, 957 | 6,721,400 | 5, 553, 424 | 3,800 | 2, 010 |
| 1941. | 74, 565, 510 | 74, 389,619 | 6, 996,520 | 5, 578,071 | 3,942 | 2, 313 |
| 1940 | 73, 721, 592 | 61, 573, 083 | 6, 009, 920 | 3, 708, 573 | 5,354 | 1,024 |
| 1939 |  | 48, 409, 800 | 7,138,880 | 3, 358, 916 | $5,354$. | 931 |
| 1937 | 69, 725,736 | 29,080, 016 $51 ; 824,979$ | $7,212,800$ $7,084,000$ | $2,106,340$ <br> $3,863,918$ | $\begin{array}{r}9,610 \\ 11,850 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 1,046 |
| 1936. | 68, 946, 829 | 48,760, 463 | 8,058, 400 | 3, 873, 472 | 11,850 | 1,0414 |
| 1935. | 68, 544, 310 | 34, 401, 280 | 8, 842, 400 | 3, 175, 235 | 11,850 | 719 |
|  | 68, 222,445 | 26, 354,838 | 8, 842,400 | 2, 421, 840 | 18,704 | 595 |
| 1933 | 68, 241, 286 | 22, 827, 473 | 8, 872, 668 | 2,720, 246 | 23,684 | 763 |
| 1932 | 68, 176, 102 | 13, 336, 210 | 9, 072,420 | 1,715, 925 | 24,725 | 722 |
| 1931 | 66, 642, 430 | 25, 210, 714 | $9,080,820$ | 3, 386, 259 | 30,891 | 1,733 |
| 1930 | 61, 884, 894 | 39,255, 073 | 9,608,407 | 5, 639, 714 | 33,523 | 2,523 |


${ }^{1}$ Included with electric steel.
2 Estimated.by Steel.
Source: American Iron and Steel Institute, in Steel, Jan. 2, 1950.
In 1948 the steel industry employed directly 635,600 persons on the average, and an all-time high was reached in February 1949 when average employment was 652,800 . Pay rolls totaled $\$ 2,234,461,000$ in 1948 and were running at slightly higher rates during the first 9 months of 1949. Pay rolls were 2.6 percent higher in the first 9 months of 1949 than they were for the first 9 months of 1948 . Sales also reached a record high of $\$ 24,134,000,000$ in 1948 and were only slightly less, totaling an estimated $\$ 22,157,000,000$, in 1949 . In 1947
there were 755 plants in the iron and steel industry. ${ }^{1}$ Steel-finishing plants alone are located in 29 States, centered principally in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana.

## DIRECT USERS OF STEEL

The steel industry is the foundation upon which virtually the entire industrial economy is based. There appear to be at least 30,000 direct customers of steel from steel mills. An estimated 25,400 makers of machinery and other industrial and business equipment are customers of the steel companies, with 12,900 manufacturers of other articles made from iron and steel products. This total of 38,300 establishments served by the steel industry is reported by the United States Department of Commerce. The number of establishments processing iron and steel was 33,600 in 1946, or 13,200 larger than in 1939, according to the Department of Commerce. This number includes customers of warehouses as well as direct mill customers, and is only slightly larger than the above estimate of direct mill customers, owing to the fact that some mill customers and many warehouse customers are not processors. Indirect customers, buying from warehouses or distributors, are many times as numerous as direct customers. They are estimated at several hundred thousand, consisting mainly of small manufacturers and builders. One large steel warehouse firm alone estimates that it serves 50,000 customers.

## INVESTMENT IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY

The ownership of the total investment in the steel industry, amounting to about $\$ 4,500,000,000$ can be described, as of 1946 , as follows:

Sixty percent of the common and preferred stock of companies in the steel industry were owned by 468,200 individuals ( 235,700 men and 232,500 women). The remaining 40 percent was held by 47,900 institutions, businesses and other groups. Of this, 40 percent, 31 percent was owned by partnerships, corporations, investment trusts and other businesses, and 9 percent was held by institutions, including insurance companies, hospitals, colleges, churches, foundations, and estates.

USE OF STEEL IN THE UNITED STATES.
The amounts of steel produced and in use in this country are practically beyond comprehension. More than 2 billion tons of steel have been made in this country in the last 75 years. The total amount of steel currently in use is estimated at more than $1 \frac{1}{2}$ billion tons, or about 23,400 pounds in use for every man, woman, and child in the country. This amount has been growing steadily. In 1900 the per capita use was estimated at 2,600 pounds; by 1930 it had increased to 15,940 pounds; now the amount js nearly 10 times the amount per capita that it was in 1900. In fact, during the first half of this century, the amount of steel in use has increased more than 400 pounds per person, on the average. New uses are constantly being developed.

In the borough of Manhattan in New York City, alone, it is estimated that the buildings contain $23,000,000$ tons of steel, while 1.2

[^0]million more tons are in bridges, tunnels, subways and elevated structures.

Farmers purchase about $1,000,000$ tons annually for barbed wire and fencing, farm implements, tractors, tools, and construction of farm buildings. This does not include the amount used in automobiles, household goods, and other articles purchased by farmers for personal use.

It is estimated that there are about $20,000,000$ tons of steel rails in use in the United States at present. It may also be noted that it is

Chart 2

estimated that one-sixth of all railroad freight consists of materials shipped to steel plants or steel products shipped from them.

It has been estimated that in 1949 about 19 percent of the steel produced went into automobiles, while the construction industry was the second largest steel buyer, taking about 13 percent of total output. Railroads, which formerly were the No. 1 users of steel, took about 7 percent. Manufacturers of containers, principally tin-can manufacturers, took almost 8 percent, while the farm market used more than 2 percent of all the steel produced. Machinery makers took about 5 percent and another 5 percent went to manufacturers of appliances, utensils, cutlery, and other equipment. About $6 \frac{1}{2}$ percent was exported. The rest of the steel sold, about a third of the
total, goes into such a wide variety of products that it is difficult to determine just how much goes to each user. The following table shows how finished steel was distributed in 1946 through 1949:

Table 3.-Finished steel distribution, by market classifications
[All grades, net tons]

${ }^{1}$ Estimated by Steel on'basis of actual shipments in first 8 months.
Source: American Iron \& Steel Institute, in Steel, Jan. 2, 1950.
It is of interest to nate the amount of steel which various commonplace objects contain:
Pounds
Refrigerator ..... 172
Farm tractor
Farm tractor ..... 1, 543
Typical passenger automobile ..... 3, 544
Turret lathe ..... 8, 056
Modern 6-room house ..... 8, 482
Railroad freight car (average) ..... 46, 000Diesel electric locomotive_${ }^{1} 200,700$
${ }^{1}$ Iron and steel account for about 80 percent of the weight of materials purchased to make a 1,500 -horsepower Diesel electric freight locomotive.

The kinds of steel products needed by all the various steel users seem limitless. To satisfy all demands, the steel industry is prepared to offer its : 500 major products in as many as 100,000 different sizes, shapes, finishes, and compositions. The most important types of steel shipments are shown in chart 3 and table 4.

Chart 3
SHIPMENTS OF STEEL PRODUGTS

*Estimated

Table 4.-Shipments of steel products, net tons

|  | 1949* |  | 1948 |  | 1947 |  | 1946 |  | 1939 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Shipments | Percent | Shipments | Percent | Shipments | Percent | Shipments | Percent | Shipments | Percent |
| Ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, tube rounds, sheet and tin bars, | 2, 131, 691 | 3.7 | 3, 150,754 | 4.8 | 2, 966, 748 | 4.7 | 1,949, 624 | 4.0 | 1, 305, 866 | 3.7 |
| Structural shapes (heavy | 3, 624,462 | 6.3 | 4, 255,355 | 6.5 | 4, 436, 129 | 7.0 | 3, 474, 284 | 7.1 | 2, 544, 515 | 7.3 |
| Steel piling--- | 320, 330 | 5 | 299, 537 | . 5 | 324, 224 | 5 | 200, 313 | 8.5 | 171,428 |  |
| Plates (sheared and universal) | 5,774,443 | 10.0 | 7,000, 199 | 10.6 | 6, 345,216 | 10.1 | 4, 1227, 033 | 8.5 | 2, 226, 508 | . 6 |
|  | 1, 1233,895 | 3. 3 | 1,976,520 | 3.0 | 2,207, 146 | 3.5 | 1,790, 311 | 3.7 | 1,161, 988 | 3.3 |
| Rails, standard (over 60 pounds) All other | 1, 121,602 | 3.3 .2 | 1,914, 880 | . 3 | 2, 211, 900 | 3. 1 | 144, 999 | .3 1.3 | 125, 109 | .4 1.3 |
| Joint bars and tie plates....-. | 513, 151 | .9 | 626,573 145,830 | 1.0 | 678,702 163,746 | 1. 1 | 624, 299 146,194 | 1.3 .3 | 466, 119,719 | 1.3 .3 |
| Track spikes...........-- | 94, 188 | . 2 | 145, 830 | . 2 | 163,746 | . 3 | 146, 194 | . 3 |  |  |
| Hot-rolled bars: |  |  | 6, 196, 444 | 9.4 | 6, 242, 416 | 9.9 | 5, 006, 859 | 10. 3 | 3, 292, 876 | 9.4 |
| Carbon. <br> Alloy |  |  | 1,927, 309 | 2.9 | 1, 741, 432 | 2.8 | 1,390, 278 | 2.8 | 702,322 | 2.0 |
| Total carbon and alloy | 6, 285, 358 | 10.9 | 8,123, 753 | 12.3 | 7, 983,848 | 12.7 | 6, 397, 137 | 13.1 | 3, 995, 198 | 11.4 |
| Reinforcing: New biliet |  |  | 1,329,945 | 2.0 | 1,277,075 | 2.0 | 1,048, 483 | 2.1 | 1,038,949 | 3.0 |
| New biliet. <br> Rerolled. |  |  | 1, 212, 021 | . 3 | 175, 833 | . 3 | 141, 346 | . 3 | 175,253 | . 5 |
| Total. | 1, 583, 650 | 2.7 | --------.- | ---.---- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cold-finished bars: |  |  | 1,349, 719 | 2.0 | 1, 426, 701 | 2. 3 | 1, 316,579 | 2.7 | 592, 514 | 1.7 |
| Carbon |  |  | 1,244, 248 | . 4 | 218, 802 | . 3 | 196, 237 | . 4 | 66, 384 | . 2 |
| Total carbon and alloy | 1, 205, 066 | 2.1 | 1,593,967 | 2.4 | 1,645, 503 | 2.6 | 1,512,816 | 3.1 | 658, 898 | 1.0 |
| steel b | 57,135 | . 1 | 88,376 | . 1 | 87, 279 | . 1 | 96,020 | . 2 | 45, 117 | . 1 |
| es and | 7,010,699 | 12.1 | 6,881, 549 | 10.4 | 6, 117, 884 | 9.7 | 4,655, 505 | 9.5 | 3, 505, 582 | 10.0 |
|  |  |  | 2,045,361 | 3.1 | 1,706, 415 | 2.7 | 1,276, 289 | 2.6 | 052, 974 | 2.7 |
| L apweld |  |  | 2, 339, 633 | . 5 | 1 389,762 | . 6 | 305,516 | . 6 | 358, 919 | 1.0 |
| Electricweld |  |  | 1, 572,139 | 2.4 4.4 | $1,122,350$ $2,082,686$ | 1.8 | 674,459 $1,871,540$ | 1.4 3.8 | 1,686, 665 | 4.8 |
| Seamless .....------.-.-.-- |  |  | 2, 224,416 | 4.4 | 2, 155, 335 | 1.3 .2 | 1, 98, 521 | . 2 | 78,850 | . 2 |
| Conduit and miscellaneous | 623, 478 | 1.1 |  |  | 661,336 | 1. 1 | 429, 180 | . 9 | 160,862 | . 5 |



Chapter sources: United States Census Bureau, American Iron and Steel Institute, Steel (magazine).

## II. Steel Price Trends

The steel-price increase of December 1949 was the fifth major price increase since the beginning of 1946 and the first since August 1948. As of December 1949, the index of the composite of finished steel prices issued by Steel (magazine) showed a 55.2 percent increase over 1939. The monthly trend of steel prices, including those of major semifinished steel products, for 1939 and monthly for 1947 through 1949 is shown by table 6 and chart 4. As footnote 1 to table 5 points out, these prices are only the base prices, f. o. b. producing plants, and do not include extras. Therefore the price increases to many users have often been considerably higher than these figures, particularly when, as in the latest price increase, substantial changes in the schedules of extras were made.

Table 5.-Changes in the price of finished steel and selected semifinished products 1939-49
Based on 1939 as 100, the composite price of finished steel ${ }^{1}$ and the prices of semifinished products ${ }^{2}$ were as follows in December 1949:

Skelp



${ }^{1}$ This index is the Steel Magazine Finished Steel Weighted Price Composite Index. It covers only base prices, $f$. o. b. producing plants and does not include extras. It contains 14 products covering about 80 percent of the total tonnage produced by the industry. Since the index aims to show the trend and at the same time provide a measure of price fluctuation, independent of other variable factors, the "weighting".given each product classification is held constant. Product weights are based on average tonnages produced for sale in the base period as reported by the American Iron and Steel Institute, New York. The base quantities (weights) converted to a percentage basis are: Hot-rolled carbon bars, 12.87519; plates, 11.88400; pipe, 11.33423 ; hot-rolled sheets, 9.93547 ; tin plate, 9.10459 ; structurals, 8.87895 ; cold-rolled sheets, 7.92402 ; hotrolled strip, 6.86266 ; galvanized sheets, 4.88860 ; wire, 4.80721 ; rails, 4.16611 ; cold-rolled strip, 2.71384 ; cold. finished bars, 2.24145; nails and staples, 2.28368 .
${ }^{2}$ Iron Age data.
${ }^{3}$ During the last week in December the index stood at 158.1.
Source: U. S. Department of Commerce.

## Table 6.-Changes inithe price of finished steel and selected semifinished products 1989 and 1947-49

[Dollars per short ton]

|  | Steel magazine finished steel composite | Rerolling billets and slabs | Forging billets | Skelp | Wire rods |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1939-A verage. | 53.78 | 30.36 | 35.71 | 38.00 |  |
| 1947-January. | 63.88 | 37.49 | 34.64 | 45.00 | 39.20 51.00 |
| February | 64. 30 | 37.49 | 44.64 | 47.00 47.00 | 51.00 51.00 |
| March.- | 64. 30 | 37. 49 | 44. 64 | 47.00 47.00 | 51.00 $51.00^{\prime}$ |
| April. | 64.30 | 37.49 | 44. 64 | 47.00 | 51.00 |
| May | 64. 30 | 37. 49 | 44. 64 | 47.00 | 51.00 |
| July.- | 64.30 65.22 | 37.49 | 44. 64 | 47.00 | 61. $00^{\circ}$ |
| August | 65.22 69.88 | 38.16 40.17 | 45. 74 | 47.00 | 52.00 |
| September | 69.88 69.8 | 40.17 40.17 | 49.10 | 52.00 | 56.00 |
| October-- | 69.88 69.88 | 40.17 | 49.10 | 52.00 | 56.00 |
| November | 70.04 | 40.17 | 49.10 | 52.00 | 66.00 |
| De48-Jecember | 70.04 | 40.17 | 49.10 | 62.00 | 56. 60 |
| 1948-January. | 72. 02 | 40.17 | 49.10 | 52.00 | 56.00 56.00 |
| February | 72. 90 | 45.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | 60.00 56.00 |
| March | 73.64 | 45.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | 56.00 |
| April | 73.64 | 45.00 | 54.00 | 55.00 | 59.40 |
| June- | 73.16 | 45.00 | 54.00 | 57.80 | 61. 60 |
| July.. | 72. 90 | 45. 00 | 54.00 | 57.80 | 61.60 |
| August | 82.52 | 46. 75 | 54.75 | 59.60 | 65.00 |
| September | 82. 28 | 52.00 52.00 | 61.00 61.00 | 65.00 65.00 | 65.00 |
| October--- | 82.28 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 65.00 | 65. 600 |
| November | 82. 28 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 |
| 1949-January | 82. 28 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 |
| February | 84.00 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 |
| March.-- | 84.00 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 65.00 |
| April. | 83. 814 | 52.00 52.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 71. 20 |
| May | 82. 84 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65. 00 | 68.00 |
| June | 82.84 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65. 00 | 68.00 |
| July | 82.78 | 52.00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 68.00 |
| August.... | 82.64 | 52. 00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 68.00 |
| Oepteber | 82.64 | 52.00 | 61. 00 | 65.00 | 68.00 |
| October--- | 82.64 | 52. 00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 68.00 |
| December ${ }^{1}$ | 82.64 | 52. 00 | 61.00 | 65.00 | 68.00 |
|  | 83.44 | 52. 50 | 62.00 | 64.00 | 72.60 |

## 1 Estimated.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce. Finished steel composite obtained from Steel magazine; other prices from the Iron Age.


The specific chronology of the latest price increase is shown as follows:

November 25: Sharon Steel Corp. advanced prices $\$ 5$ per ton on hot-rolled strip and semifinished steel.

November 28: Follansbee Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, raised prices of electrical silicon sheets by $\$ 35$ a ton.

December 4: Admiral Ben Moreell, chairman of the board and president of Jones \& Laughlin Steel Corp., announced that prices of steel products would be increased by his company, barring a sharp reversal of rising costs of production.
December 12: Mahoning Valley Steel Co. (which is supplied by Sharon Steel Corp.) increased prices on finished steel sheets by $\$ 10$ a ton.
December 16: Unıted States Steel Corp. subsidiaries raised prices "an average increase of approximately 4 percent in the present average selling price of our subsidiaries' steel products." Netional Supply Co. reported increases of its pipe products from $\$ 5$ to $\$ 8$ a ton. Youngstown Sheet \& Tube Co. and Wheeling Steel Corp. announced they would make adjustments in their price structure, following the lead set by the United States Steel Corp.

- December 19: Republic Steel Corp., Pittsburgh Steel Co., and Superior Steel Corp. anniounced an increase in steel prices.

December 20: Bethlehem Steel Corp., Jones \& Laughlin Steel Corp., Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Wheeling Steel Corp., and Armco Steel Corp. raised prices announced at an average of 4 percent.
Deeember 21: National Steel Co. subsidiaries, Babcock \& Wilcox Tube Co., and Timken Roller Bearing Co. revealed increases in line with those of the United States Steel Corp.
December 22: Youngstown Sheet \& Tube Co. and Lukens Steel Co. announced increases averaging 4 percent.

December 23: Latrobe Electric Steel Co. announced a 10-percent increase in base prices and extras on high-speed steel, tool, and die steels and carbon tool steels.
December 26: Inland Steel Co. announced increases in steel prices which "follow pretty much the leading steel producers' price changes."
December 27: Wisconsin Steel Co. increased prices amounting to an average of $\$ 6.46$ per.net ton. Granite City Steel Co. advanced prices about $\$ 4$ a ton.

1950
January 2: Laclede Steel Co. advanced pipe prices \$5-\$12 a ton.
January 3: Thomas Steel Co. announced a price advance of $\$ 3$ a ton on company's strip steel products, as of December 16, 1949. Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. raised prices of its tool steels 10 percent.

Sources for chronology: Journal of Commerce (New York), American Metal Markets, and Standard and Poor's Corporation Records.

## III. Steel Costs

As can be seen from table 7 and chart 5 , while postwar prices of steel have shown a series of increases, there has been a considerable fluctuation in the prices of major steel-making cost components. During the past year there has been a considerable downward trend in several of the more important items entering into steel costs. Using the data from table 7, the following changes from December 1948 to December 1949 may be noted:

| Item | Price, December 1948 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Price, Decem- } \\ & \text { ber } 1949 \\ & \text { (preliminary } \\ & \text { or estimate) } \end{aligned}$ | Percent change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steei-making scrap (aoiliars per long ton) | 43.25 | 28.50 |  |
| Coal (dollars per short ton) .-.-.......... | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 43. } \\ 8 . \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 28.50 18.30 | -34.1 |
| Iron ore (dollars per long ton) | 6. 20 | $\begin{array}{r}18.30 \\ 7.20 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | -1.6 -13.9 |
| Tin (cents per pound) ------ | 103.00 | 79.16 | -13.9 -23.2 |
| Zine (cents per pound) ....- | 17.50 | 9.75 | -44.3 |
| Fuel oil (dollars per barrel) | 2.74 | 12.05 | -25.2 |

[^1]Table 7.-Changes in prices of selected steel-making cost components, 1939 and 1947-49

|  | Steelmaking scrap ${ }^{1}$ | Coal ${ }^{4}$ | Labor ${ }^{3}$ | Ironore ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Tin ${ }^{5}$ | Zinc ${ }^{*}$ | Fuel oil ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Long ton | Short ton | Per hour | Long ton | Cents per pound | Cents per pound | Per barrel' |
| 1939-A verage | \$16.40 | \$4.31 | P \$0.845 | \$4.95 | 49.11 | pou. 5.12 | Per $\$ 1.04$ |
| 1947-January | 31.20 | 6.23 | 1. 329 | 5. 55 | 70.00 | 10. 50 | 1.92' |
| February | 33. 50 | 6.24 | 1. 317 | 5.55 | 70.00 | 10.50 | 2.00 |
| March.- | 37.25 | 6. 27 | 1. 329 | 5. 55 | 70.00 | 10.50* | 2. 10 |
| April. | 33.94 | 6.35 | 1:347 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10.50 | 2. 22: |
| May. | 29.75 | 6. 36 | 1.449 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10.50 | 2.22 |
| June. | 32.48 | 6.38 | 1.472 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10. 50 | 2.22 |
| July. | 37.23 | 7.13 | 1. 481 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10. 50 | 2.22 |
| August | 39.00 | 7.42 | 1. 486 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10. 50 | 2. 22 : |
| September | 37.83 | 7.45 | 1. 512 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10. 50 | 2.22 |
| October. | 39.85 | 7.53 | 1. 500 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10. 50 | 2. 22 |
| November. | 40.42 | 7.55 | 1. 508 | 5. 55 | 80.00 | 10. 50 | 2.46. |
| December. | 40.13 | 7.58 | 1. 517 | 5. 55 | 85.38 | 10.50 | 2. 63. |
| 1948-January | 40.75 | 7.70 | 1. 529 | 5. 55 | 94.00 | 11.08 | 3.00 |
| February | 40.48 | 7.71 | 1. 511 | 5. 55 | 94.00 | 12.00 | 3. $00{ }^{\circ}$ |
| March. | 40.21 | 7.71 | 1.508 | 5. 55 | 94.00 | 12.00 | 3.00' |
| April. | 40.41 | 7.75 | 1. 511 | 6.20 | 94.00 | 12.00 | 3. 00 |
| May. | 40.67 | 7.89 | 1. 514 | 6.20 | 94.00 | 12.00 | 3.001 |
| June. | 40.67 | 7.91 | 1.537 | 6. 20 | 103.00 | 12.00 | 3.00 |
| July. | 41.43 | 8.35 | 1.655 | 6.20 | 103.00 | 12.46 | 3.00 |
| August | 43.33 | 8.41 | 1.639 | 6. 20 | 103.00 | 15.00 | 3. 00 |
| September. | 43. 33 | 8.43 | 1.675 | 6. 20 | 103. 00 | 15. 00 | 3.00 |
| October..- | 43. 25 | 8.43 | 1.654 | 6. 20 | 103.00 | 15. 19 | $3.00{ }^{\circ}$ |
| November. | 43. 25 | 8.42 | 1.654 | 6.20 | 103.00 | 16.67 | 2. 92 |
| December | 43.25 | 8.43 | 1.655 | 6.20 | 103.00 | 17.50 | 2.74: |
| 1949-January | 41. 54 | 8.49 | 1.656 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 17.50 | 2.41 |
| February | 38.48 | 8.51 | 1. 3445 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 17. 50 | 2.01 |
| March | 34.60 | 8.46 | 1. 643 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 17.06 | 1.93 . |
| April. | 24.06 | 8.25 | 1. 642 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 14. 09 | 1.83 |
| May | 22.29 | 8.22 | 1. 634 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 11.88. | 1. 67 |
| June. | 20.85 | 8.20 | 1. 650 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 9.55 | 1.60 |
| July | 19.21 | 8.21 | 1. 645 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 9.35 | 1.60 |
| Auqust | 20.86 | 8.20 | 1.631 | 7.20 | 103.00 | 10.00 | 1.68. |
| September | 26.07 | 8.26 | 1.675 | 7.20 | 101. 65 | 10. 06 | 1.80 |
| October | 26.71 | 8. 28 | 1. 646 | 7.20 | 95.51 | 9.32 | 1.96 : |
| November | 28.96 | 8. 30 | 1. 644 | 7.20 | 89. 82 | 9.76 | ${ }_{\text {(9) }} 2.05$ - |
| December | 28.50 | (9) | ${ }^{(1)}$ | 7.20 | 79.16 | 9.75 | ${ }^{9}$ ) |

[^2]Chart 5


Table 8 shows, on a percentage and index basis, the extent of freight rate increases in 1948 and 1949:

Table 8.-Estimates of freight rate increase authorizations for selected commodities, 1939-49: ${ }^{1}$

| Commodities | Index ( $1939=100)^{2}$ |  | Percent increase, Sept. 1, 1949, over Aug. 21, 1948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Aug. 21, 1948 (ex parte No. 166) | Sept. 1, $1949^{3}$ (ex parte No. 168) |  |
| Coal and coke. | 130.5 | 143.2 | 9.7 |
| Iron ore.--.-. | 124.5 | 130.5 | 4.8 |
| Limestone. | 145.2 | 158.6 | 9.2 |
| Steel mill products, castings, forgings | '151.0 | 165.3 | 9.5 |

1 Carload shipments, via all rail.
2 There were no permanent general freight rate increases authorized between Dec. 31, 1939 and July 1, 1946.
${ }^{2}$ There were no general freight rate increases authorized between Sept. 1, 1949, and Dec. 31, 1949.
Source: Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, Monthly Comment on Transportation Statistics, October 1949 and October 1948, compiled by the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Note.-The cumulative increases shown above were published by the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, in its monthly comment, and computed in the usual way by ratioing. The Bureau stated that its estimate was based upon "the assumption that increases on intrastate traffic follow the same pattern of increase as the interstate, which is not true in some cases." Moreover, the estimates of percentage increases given are for the country as a whole. Actually increases authorized varied considerably between districts. This shows up in the increases on iron ore, especially. In ex parte No. 168 , no increase was allowed on movements of iron ore from the Minnesota and Wisconsin ranges to upper lake ports, 9 percent on all rail movements from the ranges to the East, and 10 percent on movements from lower lake ports to inland furnaces. The weighted average increase was only 4.8 percent, due to the preponderance of traffic taking no increase.

An interpretation of these cost data must account for the fact that major integrated companies own their principal sources of coal and iron ore and frequently their major transportation facilities. Market prices of such raw materials as coal and iron ore, as well as freight rates, do not have the same bearing on costs to these companies as they do to smaller companies which do not possess these raw materials and transportation facilities.

## IV. Profits of Steel Companies

The favorable profit situation within the steel industry at present is evident statistically as well as from statements of steel executives themselves. The following table, No. 9 , shows how net income after taxes of the 10 major steel companies compared for the first 9 months of 1949 and the first 9 months of 1948.

Table 9.-Profits after taxes of 10 major steel companies, first 9 months, 1948 and 1949

| Company | First 9 months 1948 | First 9 months 1949 | Percent change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States Steel Corp | \$88, 042, 000 | \$133, 223, 000 | +51.3 |
| Bethlehem Steel Corp. | 53, 184, 000 | 82, 898, 000 | +5.9.9 |
| Republic Steel Corp- | 29, 813, 000 | 35, 348, 000 | +18.6 |
| Jones \& Laughlin Steel Corp | 20.249, 000 | 20, 039,000 | -1.0 |
| National Steel Corp | 27, 201, 000 | 35, 917, 000 | $+32.0$ |
| Youngstown Sheet \& Tube Co | 23, 339, 000 | 28, 558,000 | +22.4 |
| Armeo Steel Corp. | 20,372, 000 | 22, 693, 000 | +11.4 |
| Inland Steel Corp. | 24, 820,000 | 23, 843,000 | -3.9 |
| Sharon Steel Corp. | 6, 514, 000 | 3, 543, 000 | -46.4 |
| Wheeling Steel Corp. | 9,692, 000 | 8, 278, 000 | -14.6 |

Source: Standard and Poor's Corporation Records.
Total net income of 50 companies within the steel industry has also increased substantially since the end of World War II. In 1946, these companies had a net income of $\$ 264,525,016$; in 1947, $\$ 411,932,947$; and in 1948, $\$ 542,085,610 .^{2}$ These figures are compiled by the American Iron and Steel Institute.

Detailed statistics on net income of the 10 largest steel companies as related to total investment and stockholders' investment have been compiled by the Federal Trade Commission. Table 10 shows the average total investment and stockholders' investment of the 10 leading companies from 1917 through 1948. This shows that the rate of return on total investment was higher in 1948 than in any year since 1917, and on stockholders' investment higher in 1948 than in any year since 1918.

Similarly, as table 12 shows, individual companies show the same increase. The rate of return on total investment was higher for each of the 10 major steel companies in 1948 than in any other year since the end of World War I, with only the following few exceptions: For the United States Steel Corp. the rate was higher in 1929, 11.39 percent compared to 10.20 percent in 1948; the rate of return for Jones \& Laughlin was higher in 1919 and in 1920 than in 1948; and the rate for the American Rolling Mill Co. and the Wheeling Steel Corp. was. higher in 1920.

Tables 11 and 12 show the rate of return on total investment for each of the principal steel companies from 1917 to 1948, before and after provision for Federal and other income taxes, respectively. Tables 13 and 14 give the same information for stockholders' investment. As shown in the explanatory notes of the FTC on these tables, adjustments have been made for accelerated depreciation, etc.

[^3]Table 10.-Summary of investments, profits, and rates of return on total investment (invested and borrowed capital) and stockholders' investment for the leading steel companies, for each of the years 1917-48, after provision for Federal and other income taxes

| Year | Number of companies | A verage investment ${ }^{1}$ |  | Net profit applicable |  | Rates of returnon |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total investment | Stockholders' investment | Total investment | Stockholders' investment | Total investment | Stockholders' investment |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Percent | Percent |
| 1917 | 9 | \$2, 042, 551, 602 | \$1, 265, 850, 481 | \$396, 116, 501 | \$356, 222,077 | 19.49 | 28.14 |
| 1918 | 9 | 2, 242, 760, 757 | 1, 440, 264, 130 | 243, 572, 102 | 202,063, 451 | 10.86 | 14. 03 |
| 1919. | 10 | 2, 312,348, 618 | 1,523, 231,794 | 179, 545, 014 | 138, 394, 983 | 7.76 | 9.09 |
| 1920 | 10 | 2, 412, 219,948 | 1, 642, 024, 293 | 238, 601, 116 | 198, 796, 689 | 9.89 | 12. 11 |
| 1921 | 10 | 2, 496, 924, 140 | 1,720,094,844 | 77, 860, 533 | 37, 239,686 | 3.12 | 2.16 |
| 1922 | 10 | 2, 519,932,575 | 1,733, 556, 105 | 106. 332, 651 | 65, 903, 951 | 4.22 | 3.80 |
| 1923 | 10 | 2, 741, 762, 013 | 1, 884, 815, 663 | 224, 946, 492 | 178,492, 080 | 8. 20 | 9.47 |
| 1924 | 10 | 2, 938, 272, 407 | 2, 015, 320, 313 | 180,989, 139 | 131,181, 782 | 6. 18 | 6. 51 |
| 1925 | 10 | 2,984, 256, 274 | 2, 059, 399, 971 | 206, 034, 003 | 156, 386, 415 | 6. 90 | 7. 59 |
| 1926 | 10 | 3, 100, 238, 026 | 2,196,255,696 | 252, 331, 826 | 203, 316, 932 | 8.14 | 9.26 |
| 1927 | 10 | 3, 193, 323, 052 | 2, 316, 395, 855 | 200, 713, 846 | 153, 669, 441 | 6. 29 | 6. 63 |
| 1928 | 10 | 3, 283, 061,412 | 2, 394, 884, 960 | 250, 399, 763 | 201, 795, 997 | 7.63 | 8. 43 |
| 1929 | 10 | 3, 446, 178, 873 | 2, 732, 668, 474 | 369, 574, 133 | 331, 437, 479 | 10.72 | 12.13 |
| 1930 | 11 | 3, 713, 236, 277 | 3, 169, 432, 222 | 188, 655, 305 | 160, 581, 647 | 5.08 | 5.07 |
| 1931 | 11 | 3, 764, 442,747 | 3, 209, 158, 505 | 21, 381, 238 | ${ }^{3} 9,492,148$ | . 57 | 3. 30 |
| 1932 | 11 | 3, 627, 597,981 | 3,050, 296, 801 | ${ }^{3} 107,795,706$ | 3137, 777, 981 | 32.97 | 3 4.52 |
| 1933 | 11 | 3, 465, 457, 893 | 2, 914, 733, 182 | ${ }^{3} 36,274,943$ | 3 64, 935, 051 | 31.05 | 82. 23 |
| 1934 | 11 | $3,393,171,634$ | 2, 854, 600, 658 | 8, 487, 239 | ${ }^{3} 19,639,252$ | . 25 | 3. 69 |
| 1935 | 11 | $3,300,519,165$ | 2, 733, 564, 210 | 69, 085, 520 | 40, 158, 557 | 2.09 | 1. 47 |
| 1936 | 11 | 3, 283, 372, 373 | 2, 658, 733, 919 | 156, 511, 449 | 127, 201, 440 | 4.77 | 4. 78 |
| 1937 | 11 | 3, 418, 807,906 | 2, 774,387,013 | 228, 502, 056 | 200,099, 661 | 6.68 | 7.21 |
| 1938 | 11 | 3, 548, 049, 985 | 2, 832,283, 648 | 24, 534,886 | ${ }^{3} 7$ 7,001, 449 | . 69 | ${ }^{3} .25$ |
| 1939. | 11 | 3, 625, 443, 598 | 2,838, 230, 305 | 152, 174, 130 | 118, 531, 820 | 4. 20 | 4.18 |
| 1940 | 11 | 3, 679, 186, 513 | 2,904, 190, 420 | 275, 054, 841 | 238, 251, 605 | 7.48 | 8. 20 |
| 1941 | 11 | 3, 765, 404, 934 | 3, 003, 318, 162 | 292, 309, 441 | 266, 294, 428 | 7.76 | 8.87 |
| 1942 | 10 | 3, 771, 502, 529 | 3, 068, 750, 763 | 206, 744, 775 | 180, 957,096 | 5. 48 | 5. 90 |
| 1943 | 10 | 3,757,062,350 | 3, 123, 045, 473 | 192,381, 021 | 168, 053, 090 | 5.12 | 5.38 |
| 1944 | 10 | 3, 741, 720, 423 | 3,163,069,540 | 186, 148, 736 | 162,058,770 | 4.97 | 5.12 |
| 1945 | 10 | 3, 690, 165, 133 | 3, 192, 973, 127 | 172, 551, 438 | 151, 734, 378 | 4.68 | 4.75 |
| 1946 | 10 | 3, 707, 660, 922 | 3, 240, 545, 867 | 246, 903, 424 | 231, 487, 448 | 6.66 | 7.14 |
| 1947. | 10 | 3, 906, 094, 272 | 3, 389, 104,658 | 402, 337, 994 | 385, 930,813 | 10.30 | 11.39 |
| 1948. | 10 | 4, 396, 056, 850 | 3, 833, 544, 355 | 553, 274, 625 | 536, 528, 543 | 12.59 | 14.00 |
| Averag |  | $3,369,125,563$ | 2,648, 099, 698 | 199, 161, 760 | 164, 562, 276 | 5.91 | 6.21 |

[^4]Table 11.-Rates of return on total investment (invested and borrowed capital) for each of the principal steel companies, 1917 to 1948, inclusive, before provision for $F$ ederal and other income taxes


[^5]Table 12.-Rates of return on total investment (invested and borrowed capital) for each of the principal steel companies, 1917 to 1948 , in-
[Percent]

| Year | United States Steel Corp. | Bethlehem Steel Corp. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Republic } \\ \text { Steel } \\ \text { Corp. } \end{gathered}$ | Jones \& Laughlin Steel Corp. | Youngstown Sheet \& Tube $\mathbf{C o}$. | National Steel Corp. | Inland Steel Co. | American Rolling Mill Co. | Wheeling Steel Corp. | Otis Steel Co. | Pittsburgh Steel Co. | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1917 | 17.86 | 16. 13 | 27.50 | 21. 23 | 37.53 | (1) | 34.11 | 28.65 | 36.02 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 29.92 | 19.49 |
| 1918. | 11. 32 | -8. 29 | 12. 42 | 5. 96 | 8.59 | (1) | 17.21 | 26.51 | 14.98 | (2) | 15.94 | 10.86 |
| 1919. | 7.24 | 8.11 | 4. 12 | 12.47 | 8.94 | (1) | 9.35 | 11.08 | 9.29 | 8.00 | 8.72 | 7.76 |
| 1920 | 9.08 | 7.27 | 11.67 | 14.53 | 9.06 | (1) | 10.71 | ${ }^{2} 17.36$ | 33. 60 | 7.06 | 6.20 | 9.89 |
| 1921. | 4.49 | 6.03 | 46.94 | 41.56 | 4.17 | (1) | -1.00 | 48.19 | 42.96 | 422.24 | 5.49 | 3.12 |
| 1922 | 4.72 | 3.71 | 1.97 | 3.84 | 4.63 | (1) | . 46 | 8.02 | 1.33 | 4.02 | 2.05 | - 4.22 |
| 1923 | 8.84 | 5. 51 | 10. 41 | 6.98 | 10.20 | (1) | 10.53 | 10.23 | 7.57 | 5. 91 | 6.89 | 8. 20 |
| 1924. | 7.26 | 3. 88 | 3.93 | 5.60 | 6. 50 | (1) | 8.99 | 8.07 | 2. 63 | 42.43 | 5. 26 | 6. 18 |
| 1925 | 7.46 | 4. 79 | 6. 48 | 6.17 | 9.39 | (1) | 7.73 | 8.13 | 6.05 | 7.36 | 3. 31 | 6.90 |
| 1926. | 8. 62 | 5.68 | 7.94 | 8. 76 | 10.02 | ${ }^{(1)}$ | 9.68 | 10.82 | 6.92 | 8. 56 | 7.45 | 8.14 |
| 1927. | 6.80 | 4.61 | 5. 29 | 6.39 | 5. 53 | $\left.{ }^{1}\right)$ | 9.21 | 9.07 | 5.81 | 6.59 | 5.06 | 6.29 |
| 1928. | 8.04 | 5.07 | 6.79 | 8.39 | 7.01 | (1) | 13.08 | 12.82 | 8.26 | 11.91 | 3.56 | 7.63 |
| 1929. | 11.39 | 8.18 | 10.58 | 10.60 | 11.97 | (1) | 15.84 | 9.76 | 8.98 | 11.97 | 9.82 | 10.72 |
| 1930 | 5. 67 | 4. 51 | 12. 24 | 4.64 | 4.93 | 8.86 | 8. 50 | 2.23 | 4.05 | 4.33 | 4. 49 | - 5.08 |
| 1931 | . 95 | 1. 10 | 42.21 | 4.87 | 41.22 | 5. 38 | 3.55 | 4.81 | 41.61 | 42.44 | 42.10 | . 57 |
| 1932 | 43.54 | 42.04 | 43.90 | 13.89 | 44.07 | 2.73 | 41.42 | . 23 | 42.80 | 46.77 | 4.3.89 | 4.97 |
| 1933. | 41.76 | 4.41 | 4.53 | 42.24 | 41.93 | 3.51 | 2.42 | 1.71 | . 77 | +2.79 | 43.92 | +1.05 |
| 1934. | 4. 96 | 1.14 | 4.08 | 41.36 | . 88 | 5.81 | 6.06 | 3.71 | 2.09 | 4.56 | 41.85 | . 25 |
| 1935. | . 39 | 1. 82 | 3.48 | 4.07 | 3.06 | 9.09 | 11. 19 | 7.31 | 5.03 | 10.00 | 4. 2.86 | 2.09 |
| 1936 | 3.82 | 3. 24 | 5.34 | 2. 78 | 7.25 | 9.35 | 12. 61 | 8.39 | 5.77 | 8.59 | . 50 | 4.77 |
| 1937. | 6. 78 | 6.01 | 4. 66 | 3.07 | 7.44 | 12.08 | 10.86 | 8.16 | 5.34 | 9.19 | 4.60 | 6.68 |
| 1938. | . 04 | 1.84 | 4.96 | -1.83 | 1.18 | 5.12 | 4.68 | 4.98 | 1.91 | 41.61 | . 57 | . 69 |
| 1939. | 3.21 | 4. 88 | 4. 73 | 2.58 | 3.87 | 8.08 | 8. 60 | 3.16 | 6.33 | 2.61 | 2.31 | 4.20 |
| 1940. | 7.34 | 8.50 | 7.61 | 5.69 | 6.29 | 8.80 | 10.68 | 5.81 | 6.23 | 4. 06 | 4. 66 | 7.48 |
| 1941 | 7.60 | 6.07 | 8. 18 | 8. 70 | 8.22 | 9.49 | 10. 35 | 8.49 | 8.25 | 8.24 | 7.75 | 7.76 |
| 1942 | 4.80 | 5.29 | 6.16 | 5.40 | 5.56 | 6.74 | 9.04 | 6.27 | 4.66 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 8.36 | 5.48 |
| 1943 | 4.32 | 6. 48 | 4.59 | 5.30 | 4.59 | 6.47 | 8.39 | 4.89 | 4.53 | (2) | 4.44 | 5. 12 |
| 1944: | 4.18 | 7.06 | 4.37 | 4.24 | 4.54 | 5.90 | 7.19 | 4.97 | 4.53 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 2.91 | 4.97 |
| 1945. | 3.98 | 6. 25 | 3. 50 | 3.83 | 4.87 | 6.09 | 7.22 | 5.97 | 4.11 | (2) | 4.33 | 4.68 |
| 1946 | 6.01 | 6. 78 | 5. 29 | 4.99 | 7.01 | 10.46 | 10. 12 | 10.90 | 5.24 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | . 96 | 6. 66 |
| 1947 | 9.68 | 8.08 | 10.51 | 8.18 | 13.02 | 14.01 | 15.82 | 13.62 | 9.52 |  | 9. 14 | 10.30 |
| 1948 | 10.20 | 12.92 | 13.96 | 11.06 | 15.82 | 20.26 | 17.75 | 14.89 | 10.52 |  | 11.67 | 12. 59 |
| A verage.. | 5.76 | 5.25 | 5.08 | 5.19 | 6.15 | 8.80 | 9. 78 | 7.25 | 5.72 | 3.85 | 4.42 | 5.91 |

${ }^{1}$ Data are not available prior to 1930
${ }^{2}$ Data are not available prior to 1919; absorbed by Jones \& Laughlin, June 30, 1942.
Rate of return for 18 months, due to change from fiscal year, June 30, to calendar year, Dec. 31.

- Denotes loss.


## [Percent]

| Year | United States Steel Corp. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bethlchem } \\ \text { Steel } \\ \text { Corp. } \end{gathered}$ | Republic Steel Corp. | Jones \& Laughlin Steel Corp. | Youngstown Sheet \& Tube Co. | National Steel Corp. | Inland Steel Co. | American Rolling Mill Co. | Wheeling Steel Corp. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Otis Steel } \\ & \text { Co. } \end{aligned}$ | Pittsburgh Steel Co. | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1917. | 47.58 | 30.85 | 52.58 | 39.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1918. | 34.68 | 12.27 | 22.11 | 14.83 | 18.13 | (1) | 60.05 28.40 | 32.05 | 60.03 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 38.67 | 46. 17 |
| 1919 | 11. 50 | 14.20 | 4.15 | 16.28 | 9.41 | (1) | 28.40 10.85 | 45.04 | 29.51 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 25.49 | 29. 51 |
| 1920. | 13.62 | 8.68 | 15. 79 | 20.08 | 10.27 | (1) | 12.48 | $\begin{array}{r}13.85 \\ \hline 19.99\end{array}$ | 9.69 | 8.63 | 10.00 | 11.74 |
| 1821. | 4. 13 | 5.95 | - 9.67 | 42.22 | 4.21 | (1) | 11.84 | $\begin{array}{r}18.99 \\ \hline 8.56\end{array}$ | 41.70 | $\begin{array}{r}7.47 \\ \hline 25\end{array}$ | 8.25 | 14.26 |
| 1923. | 4. 50 | 2. 24 | . 90 | 3.67 | 5. 13 | (1) | +.27 | -8. 807 | 4.11 .39 | $\bigcirc$ | 5. 96 | 2. 23 |
| 1924. | 11.41 | 5.13 | 12.47 | 8.12 | 13.04 | (1) | 11.18 | 12.29 | 8.02 | 6. 33 | 7.75 | 3.78 |
| 1925. | 8.70 9.03 | 2.62 | 3.91 | 6.31 | 7.07 | (1) | 9.62 | 9.19 | 1.38 | +6.87 | -6.10 | 10.09 |
| 1926. | 10.88 | 4.69 6.32 | 7.40 | 7.03 | 12. 30 | (1) | 9.07 | 9.23 | 6.73 | 6. 56 | 3.67 | 8.18 |
| 1927. | 8.04 | 6.32 4.57 | 9.75 | 10.17 | 13.27 | (1) | 11. 17 | 12.93 | 8.09 | 8.95 | 8.29 | 10. 10 |
| 1928. | 9.90 | 4.54 5.44 | 5.95 | 7.25 | 5.33 | (1) | 10.61 | 10.83 | 6.31 | 7.31 | 5. 55 | 7.22 |
| 1828 | 13. 57 | 10.25 | 13.68 | 11. 96 | 9.12 17.04 | (1) | 16.31 | $\checkmark 17.03$ | 9.47 | 15.90 | 3.68 | 0.20 |
| 1930 | 6.29 | 4.71 | 42.55 | 11.96 5.06 | 17.04 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.07$ | 21.95 | 13.20 | 11.27 | 15.46 | 12.11 | 13.17 |
| 1931. | . 71 | . 03 | -5.24 | 4. 1.15 | -5. 25 | 10.07 | 10. 55 | . 45 | 3.38 | 3.65 | 4.41 | 5. 50 |
| 1932 | 4.06 | 43.82 | -7. 50 | 14.35 | -10.77 | 5.02 | 2. 10 | 15.69 | 14.50 | - 0.41 | 14.08 | 4.27 |
| 1933. | +2.18 | +1.85 | 12.88 | 42.58 | 47.48 | 1.86 | - 5.86 | 44.07 | 46.11 | 413.52 | 16.35 | -4.50 |
| 1934 | 41.17 | . 20 | 12.27 | 41.61 | $\begin{array}{r}10.48 \\ +2.48 \\ \hline 1\end{array}$ | 1.40 7.31 | . 47 | -1.27 | -1.09 | 4.8.36 | 16.31 | - 2.21 |
| 1935 | . 34 | 1.11 | 3.14 | 4.11 | +2.48 | 7.31 12.53 | 7.78 16.76 | 2.63 | . 87 | 3.67 | -3.77 | 4.50 |
| 1936 | 4.57 | 3.55 | 6.88 | 2. 66 | 1.61 9.67 | 12.53 | 16.76 18.87 | 9.65 | 5. 64 | 13.61 | 14.97 | 1.86 |
| 1937. | 8.99 | 7.82 | 5. 93 | 3.33 | 10.92 | 14.94 21.35 | 18.87 | 11.98 | 6.57 | 12. 98 | 4.76 | 5. 72 |
| 1938. | 4.35 | 1.26 | -3.26 | -3.49 | 4.01 | 21.35 6.90 | 18.09 6.32 | 9.75 <br> +70 | 6. 55 | 12.55 | 4.78 | 9.02 |
| 1939. | 4.01 | 6. 42 | 5.61 | 2.71 | 4.09 | 11.40 | 6.32 13.55 | 3.70 | .79 8.17 | 15.75 | 4.58 | . 02 |
| 1940 | 9.25 | 14.58 | 11. 74 | 8.01 | 8. 56 | 16.76 | 19.27 | 3.78 | 8. 817 | 1.33 | 2.07 | 5. 17 |
| 1942. | 15.78 | 22.03 | 25.17 | 17.43 | 22.97 | 24.11 | 30.71 | 17.84 | 8.61 17.77 | 4.67 19.88 | 5. 70 | 10.78 |
| 943 | 14.17 | 27.82 | 26.88 | 16.96 | 9.17 | 24.55 | 26.34 | 15.09 | 11.75 | (9) 19.88 | 17.12 | 19.25 |
| 944 | 9.33 | 25.69 | 16.11 | 14.19 | 14.23 | 21.06 | 22.10 | 10.53 | 8.29 | (2) | 10.70 | 19. 12 |
| 945 | 8.84 5.8 | 23.67 | 13.68 | 7.89 | 10.49 | 15. 63 | 19.61 | 8.38 | 9.70 | (2) | 1.30 | 12. 30 |
| 946 | 8.01 | 10. 52 | 8.75 | 3.88 | 7.75 | 15. 32 | 13.02 | 12.41 | 7.67 | (2) | 41.75 | 7.54 |
| 947 | 15. 34 | 14.26 | 9.21 19.28 | 7.40 | 12.98 | 18. 69 | 17.62 | 18. 91 | 7.82 |  | . 37 | 10.12 |
| 1948. | 15.78 | 22.72 | 19.28 24.94 | 14.27 19.67 | 22.45 | 24.42 34.50 | 30.93 | 24.72 | 18. 98 |  | 16.72 | 17.58 |
| Average. |  |  |  |  | 27.55 | 34.50 | 33.58 | 27.02 | 21.50 |  | 19.97 | 21.16 |
|  |  | 9.8 | 10.57 | 8.12 | 10.65 | 17.38 | 17.81 | 12.08 | 8. 70 | 3.83 | 6.48 | 8.90 |
| Data are not available prior to 1930. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data are not available prior to 1919; absorbed by Jones \& Laughlin June 30, 1942. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Denotes loss. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 14.-Rates of return on stockholders' investment for each of the principal steel companies, 1917-48, inclusive, after provision for Federal
[Percent]

| Year | United States Steel Corp. | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Bethlehem } \\ \text { Steel } \\ \text { Corp. } \end{array}$ | Republic Steel Corp. | Jones \& Laughlin Steel Corp. | Youngs-townSheet \& Tube Co. | National Steel Corp. | Inland Steel Co. | American Rolling Mill Co. | Wheeling Steel Corp. | Otis Steel Co. | Pittsburgh Steel Co. | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1917 | 27.45 | 22.67 | 35.77 | 24.59 | 37.58 | (1) | 38.98 | 32.05 | 40.78 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 31.35 | 28. 14 |
| 1918. | 15.55 | 10.15 | 14.48 | 6.11 | 8.60 | (1) | 18.79 | 27.98 | 16.12 | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 15.94 | 14. 03 |
| 1919. | 8.66 | 9.25 | 3.85 | 13.61 | 8.95 | (1) | 10.90 | 11.23 | 9.74 | 7.95 | 9.19 | 9.09 |
| 1920 | 11.48 | 8.33 | 13.18 | 15.73 | 9.06 | (1) | 11.23 | 317.44 | 36.13 | 7.06 | 0. 31 | 12.11 |
| 1921 | 4.25 | 5.76 | +10.01 | 42.38 | *. 21 | (1) | 4.95 | +8.79 | 4.21 | 25.77 | 5. 50 | 2. 36 |
| 1922 | 4.59 | 2.22 | . 80 | 3.64 | 4.63 | (1) | 4.29 | 8.97 | . 39 | +2.21 | 6. 98 | 3.87 |
| 1823 | 10.85 | 4.83 | 11.55 | 7.22 | 11. 63 | (1) | 10.75 | 11.61 | 8.02 | -6.35 | 5. 27 | 9. 61 |
| 1924 | 8.36 | 2.59 | 3.45 | 5.64 | 6.54 | (1) | 8.93 | 8.34 8.40 | 5. 94 | 6.56 | 5.32 | 7.59 |
| 1925. | 8. 57 | 4.21 | 6.83 8.91 | 6.28 9.11 | 11.80 | - (i) | 10.34 | 11.58 | 7.14 | 8.77 | 7.11 | 9.26 |
| 1926. | 10.11 | 5.72 4.11 | 8. <br> 5 <br> 5 | 9. 6.48 | 1.80 5.39 | (1) | 19.76 | 9.77 | 5.62 | 6. 35 | 4.87 | 6.63 |
| 1927 | 7.44 | 4.11 4.82 | 6. 6.93 | 8.63 | 8.07 | (1) | 15.38 | 15. 40 | 8.77 | 14.17 | 3.31 | 8.43 |
| 1928 | 9.03 | 4.82 | 6. 93 | 8.63 10.95 | 15.64 | (1) | 21.13 | 12.16 | 10.41 | 13.97 | 10.75 | 12.13 |
| 1829. | 12.64 | 9.21 4.45 | 12.36 42.66 | 10.95 4.62 | 15.64 | -8.97 | 9.99 | . 20 | 3.39 | 3.26 | 3.90 | 5.07 |
| 1830 | 5.76 | 4.45 .02 | 12.66 <br> 4.24 <br> 15 | 4.62 11.18 | 4. 5.12 | 4.52 | 2. 19 | 45.70 | 14.50 | 46.42 | 44.11 | 4.30 |
| 1932 | 4.4 .08 | 4. 3.92 | 4. 7.50 | 44.34 | 410.77 | 1.71 | +6.08 | 44.07 | 46.11 | 413.52 | +6.39 | 44.52 |
| 1933. | 42.19 | 41.83 | 42.88 | 42.58 | - 7.48 | 2.92 | . 44 | 4.1.40 | 4.1.09 | +8.36 | +6.35 +3.77 | 4.23 4.69 |
| 1834 | 41.33 | . 11 | 42.27 | 41.63 | - 2.52 | 6.14 | 6. 66 | 2.02 | 5.81 | 11. 71 | 14.99 | 1.47 |
| 1935. | . 08 | . 92 | 2. 73 | 4.24 | 1.50 | 10.78 | 14.32 | -8.54 | 5.06 6.16 | 11.71 9.50 | . 4.77 | 4.78 |
| 1936 | 3.77 | 2.93 | 5.36 | 2.46 | 9.25 9.35 | 11.93 | 16.62 14.70 | 10.04 8.38 | 6.16 5.83 | 10.68 | 4.10 | 7.21 |
| 1937 | 6.99 | 6. 63 | 4.48 | 2.85 13.54 | 9.35 4.26 | 16.28 5.67 | 14.70 5.27 | 4.1.09 | . 67 | 45.83 | 4.58 | 4.25 |
| 1938 | 4.57 | 1.08 | 3.28 4.59 | 13.34 1.93 | 3. 51 | 5.67 10.25 | 11.19 | 3.17 | 6.99 | 1.06 | 1.63 | 4.18 |
| 1939. | 3.07 | 5.18 | 4.59 8.70 | 1.93 6.01 | 7.43 | 11. 59 | 13.96 | 5.94 | 6.80 | 3.47 | 4.38 | 8. 20 |
| 1940 | 7.47 | 10. 729 | 8.70 9.53 | 6.01 9.84 | 10.60 | 12.26 | 13. 57 | 9.18 | 9.91 | 10.17 | 8.42 | 8.87 |
| 1941 | 8.20 | 7.20 6.02 | 9.53 6.62 | 9.84 5.88 | 6. 46 | 8.12 | 11.02 | 6.72 | 5.09 |  | 8.97 | 5.90 |
| 1942 | 4.92 | 6.02 7.51 | 4.53 | 5.68 | 4.90 | 7.68 | 9.99 | 5.70 | 4.87 |  | 4.23 | 5.38 |
| 1943 | 4.30 | 8.51 | 3.78 | 4.35 | 4.69 | 6.85 | 8.33 | 5.07 | 4:83 |  | 1.23 | 5.12 |
| 1944. | 4.17 | 8.12 6.77 | 3.56 | 3.88 | 4.29 | 6.93 | 7.82 | 6.20 | 4.30 |  | 4.1.75 | 4.75 |
| 1945. | 3.98 6.01 | 7.87 | 5.90 | 5. 20 | 8.22 | 12. 13 | 11.90 | 12.25 | 5.80 |  | . 12 | 7.14 |
| 1947 | 10.02 | 9.25 | 12. 24 | 8.76 | 14. 75 | 16. 26 | 20.95 | 16. 26 | 11.97 |  | 9.71 | 11.39 14.00 |
| 1948. | 10.50 | 14.93 | 16. 50 | 13.07 | 17.78 | 23.33 | 23.65 | 18.35 | 13.99 |  | 12.06 | 14.00 |
| A verage | 5.95 | 5.39 | 5.08 | 5.30 | 6.74 | 10.52 | 11.84 | 7.85 | 6.03 | 2.63 | 4.14 | 6.21 |

[^6]Jandary 10, 1950.

## Explanatory Notes to Tables 10 to 14 on Rates of Return for Leading Steel Companies

The rates of return for the leading steel companies that are presented in the tables prepared by the Federal Trade Commission were computed from published sources. The returns for the years 1917-38 were computed from information obtained from the companies by the Commission in a study of long-term profits in the steel industry for the Temporary National Economic Committee. ${ }^{1}$ The returns for the subsequent years were computed from infermation in the companies' annual reports to stockholders.

These tables present rates of return on the stockholder's investment and the total investment (invested and borrowed capital), before and after provisions for the payment of Federal income and profits taxes.

The stockholders' investment includes the common and preferred stocks outstanding and the surplus and surplus reserves. The total investment includes in addition long-term debt of the companies under review.

In computing the rates of return on each basis of investment, all known amounts of appreciation or other intangibles were deducted from investments. The maximum of appreciation for which deductions were made was $\$ 580,098.176$ in 1917. Of this amount, $\$ 522,609,129$ applied to United States Steel Corp., $\$ 32,996,728$ to Republic Steel Corp., $\$ 14,083,793$ to Bethlehem Steel Corp., and $\$ 10,408,526$ to other companies. Practically all of these amounts, however, were written off the books of the companies in succeeding years. The amounts applicable to Bethlehem and Republic were written off by those companies by 1936 and 1937, respectively. The amount applicable to United States Steel was reduced each year from $\$ 522,069,129$ in 1917, to $\$ 249,583,149$ in 1937 . In the following year the company wrote off all but $\$ 1$ of the latter amount.

According to the Report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Steel Industry, ${ }^{2}$ the amount of appreciation originally included in the assets of United States Steel Corp. at its formation in 1901 was $\$ 720,846,817$, or slightly more than one-half of the initial capitalization of $\$ 1,400,000,000$. Recognition was given to the accuracy of this estimate of intangibles as evidenced by the following statement appearing in the annual report of the United States Steel Corp. to its stockholders for the year 1938:
"As far back as 1917 when the wartime excess-profits tax laws were in force, the Internal Revenue Department in its calculations to determine and verify invested capital for intangibles accepted a plan designed to fix such investment values at the date of the formation of the corporations on April 1, 1901. This plan was based upon values appraised some years prior to 1917 by the United States Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Corporations. With the enactment of the Federal Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the regulations promulgated thereunder, the necessity developed for a segregation in the accounts of the intangible values. Accordingly, the plan accepted by the Internal Revenue Department, as above outlined, was utilized as the initial basis from which to obtain this separation of intangible values."

By the end of 1938, the United States Steel Corp. had written down to a nominal value of $\$ 1$, all of the $\$ 720,846,817$ of intangible values included in its assets at time of organization in 1901, together with $\$ 47,824,205$ of additional appreciation resulting from subsequent acquisitions.

Profits were also adjusted in computing rates of return for the various companies in order to reflect properly the results of their operations during the years under review. Income and expenses of significant amount that were applicable to prior years' operations, gains and losses on sale of capital assets, special reserves of a contingent nature, and provisions for higher replacement values of fixed assets were treated as surplus additions or doductions, and the reported net incume of the companies was increased or decreased accordingly. In addition, the net income of three of the companies was adjusted to exclude provisions for accelerated depreciation on facilities constructed since the war. These companies were United States Steel Corp., Republic Steel Corp., and National Steel Corp.

In 1948, these companies adopted a policy, retroactive to January 1, 1947, of computing depreciation on postwar facilities at an accelerated rate. This accelerated depreciation is in addition to normal depreciation on all depreciable property and is not deductible for tax purposes. The amount charged to net

[^7]income in 1948 for accelerated depreciation amounted to $\$ 55,335,444$ for United States Steel Corp., $\$ 7,000,000$ for Republic Steel Corp., and $\$ 10,500,000$ for National Steel Corp. The amounts stated to be applicable to 1947 operations were $\$ 28,975,094$ for United States Steel Corp., $\$ 4,000,000$ for Republic Steel Corp., and $\$ 3,500,000$ for National Steel Corp.

These latter amounts are substantially equal to the amounts charged against net income by these companies in 1947 to provide for higher property-replacement costs and were excluded by the Commission in computing rates of return for these companies in that year. The accounting profession, supported by the Securities and Exchange Commission, regards as unsound accounting the practice of including for depreciation amounts based on estimates of present or future replacement costs instead of orignal costs.

In its Accounting Research Bulletin No. 33, issued by its committee on accounting procedure in December 1947, the American institute took the position that, "It believes that accounting and financial reporting for general use will best serve their purposes by adbering to the generally accepted concept of depreciation on cost, at least until the dollar is stabilized at some level. An attempt to recognize current prices in providing depreciation, to be consistent, would require the serious step of formally recording appraised current values for all properties, and continuous and consistent depreciation charges based on the new values. Without such formal steps, there would be no objective standard by which to judge the propriety of the amounts of depreciation charges against current income, and the significance of recorded amounts of profit might be seriously impaired."

In view of this position, the three companies sought to justify even larger deductions from earnings by adopting a method of accelerated depreciation on original cost instead of one based on estimated higher replacement cost. For this reason the propriety of the amounts charged to income as accelerated depreciation is open to question. Such accelerated depreciation is not allowable for Federal income-tax purposes, and is contrary to sound accounting practice if it includes a factor of amortization which is not susceptible of objective measurement and is therefore arbitrarily apportioned over the useful life of the property.

Under these circumstances, the reported net income of United States Steel Corp., Republic Steel Corp., and National Steel Corp. was adjusted by the elimination of accelerated depreciation in order to provide a satisfactory basis of comparing their earnings with those of the other companies which, though similarly situated, did not adopt the "accelerated depreciation policy." The effect on the rates of return of the three companies by the inclusion or exclusion of amounts for accelerated depreciation is as follows:

|  | Rates of return |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Including deduction for accelerated depreciation |  | Excluding deduction for accelerated depreciation |  |
|  | Before Federal income taxes | After Federal income taxes | Before Federal income taxes | After Federal income taxes |
| United States Steel Corp.: | Percent 13.20 | Percent | Percent ${ }^{15} \mathbf{7}$ | Percent 10. 50 |
| On total investment.---...... | 12.80 | 7.41 | 15.30 | 10. 20 |
| Republic Steel Corp; |  |  |  |  |
| On stockholders' investment.- | 23.43 | 14. 64 | 24. 94 | 16. ${ }^{13.90}$ |
| On total in vestment---------- |  |  |  |  |
| On stockholders' investment | 31.31 | 19. 27 | 34. 50 | 23.33 |
| On total investment... | 27.29 | 16. 73 | 30.17 | 20.26 |

Table 15 gives the data on stockholders' investment for the first 9 months of 1949, compared to the first 9 months of 1948. Return on stockholders' investment after taxes was higher in 1949 for four of the five largest companies, but lower for four out of the next five largest companies. In contrast to Tables 10-14, figures are not adjusted, but are based entirely on the companies' quarterly reports of earnings. No adjustments have been made for accelerated depreciation, etc.
'Table 15.—Stockholders' investment, profits, and rates of return for the principal steel companies
(A) FOR THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD QUARTERS OF 1949

|  | United States Steel | Bethiehem Steel | Republic Steel | Jones \& Laughlin Steel | Youngstown Sheet \& Tube | National Steel | Inland Stecl | Armeo ${ }^{1}$ | Wheeling Steel | Fittsburgh Steel | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stockholders' investment '.-..----....- | \$1, 870, 517, 099 | \$645, 171, 287 | \$328, 163,691 | \$251, 167, 816 | \$214, 562, 729 | \$222, 731, 829 | \$175, 197, 444 | \$186, 518, 366 | \$113, 443, 764 | \$47, 820, 389 | \$4, 055, 294, 414 |
| Income applicable to stockholde rs investment (before provision for Federal income taxes): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 91, 928,670 | 56,929, 574 | 27,698, 628 | 16, 252, 895 | 19, 955, 660 | 25, 603, 775 | 15, 104, 385 | 14, 407, 499 | 6, 965, 137 | 3,775,508 | 278, 621, 731 |
| Second quarter | 81, 123, 595 | 45, 949, 029 | 18, 228, 544 | 8,335, 004 | 14, 918,705 | 20, 535, 132 | 11, 472, 949 | 13, 117, 513 | 3, 901,432 | 457.934 | 218, 039,837 |
| Third quarter. | 70, 171, 144 | 39, 819, 798 | 18, 170, 703 | 7,862, 019 | 12,028, 626 | 18, 982, 905 | 12, 498; 803 | 10,615,433 | 3, 850, 664 | 3 4 818, 157 | 193, 181, 939 |
| Total, 3 quarters. | 243, 223, 409 | 142, 698, 402 | 64, 097, 875 | 32, 449, 918 | 46, 002, 991 | 65, 121, 812 | 39, 076, 137 | 38, 140, 445 | 14, 717, 233 | 3, 415, 285 | 689, 843, 507 |
| Income applicable to stockholders' investment (after provision for Federal income taxes): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First quarter- | 49, 928, 670 | 33, 129, 574 | 15, 298, 628 | 9, 868, 895 | 12, 022,660 | 14, 753, 775 | 9, 254, 230 | 8, 404, 861 | 4, 010, 137 |  |  |
| Second quarter | 44, 123,595 | 26, 749, 229 | 10, 178, 544 | $5,300,004$ | 9,020,705 | 11, 115, 132 | 7, 033, 304 | 7,703, 772 | 2, 128, 432 | 252, 834 | $123,605,451$ |
| Third quarter. | 39, 171, 144 | 23, 019, 799 | 9,870, 70:3 | 4, 870, 018 | 7, 514, 626 | 10,047, 905 | 7, 555, 103 | 6, 584, 411 | 2, 139, 664 |  | $110,307,217$ |
| Total, 3 quarters | 133, 223, 409 | 82, 898, 402 | 35, 347, 875 | 20, 038, $91 \varepsilon$ | 28, 557, 991 | 35, 916, 812 | 23, 842, 637 | 22, 683, 044 | 8,278, 233 | 1,972, 285 | 392, 760, 600 |
| Rate of return on stockholders' investment (before provision ior Federal hincome taxes): | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| First quarter-.. | 4. 91 | 8. 82 | 8. 44. | 6. 47 | 9.30 | 11. 50 | 8. 62 | 7.72 | 6. 14 | 7.88 | 6.87 |
| Third quarter | 4. <br> 3 <br> 3.75 | 6.17 | 5. 5.54 5. | 3. <br> 3.13 <br> 13 | 6. 5.61 | 9. 22 8.52 | 6.55 7.13 | 7.03 5.69 | 3.44 3.39 | 1.96 <br> 4 | 5. 38 4.76 |
| Total, 3 quarters. | 13.00 | 22.11 | 19.53 | 12.92 | $\therefore$ - 21.86 | 29.24 | 22.30 | 20.44 | 12.97 | 7.14 | 17.01 |
| Rate of return on stockholders' investment (after provision for Federal income taxes): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First quarter | 2.67 | 5.13 | 4.66 | 3. 93 | 5.61 | 6. 62 | 5. 29 | 4. 51 | 3. 53 | 4. 57 | 3.02 |
| Sceond quarter | 2.36 | 4.15 | 3.10 | 2.11 | 4. 20 | 4.99 | 4.01 | 4.13 | 1.88 | . 53 | 3.05 |
| Third quarter | 2.09 | 3.57 | 3.01 | 1. 94 | 3,50 | 4.51 | 4.31 | 3. 53 | 1.89 | 4.97 | 2.72 |
| Total, 3 quarters.. | 7.12 | 12.85 | 10.77 | 7.98 | 13.31 | 16.12 | 13.61 | 12.17 | 7.30 | 4.13 | 9.68 |

Soe footnotes at end of table, p. 26.

Table 15.-Stockholders' investment, profts, and rates of return for the principal steel companies-Continued
(B) FOR FIRST 3 QUARTERS OF 1948

|  | United States Steel | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bethlehem } \\ & \text { Steel } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Republic } \\ & \text { Steel } \end{aligned}$ |  <br> Laughlin Steel | $\begin{gathered} \text { Youngs- } \\ \text { town Sheet } \\ \& \text { Tube } \end{gathered}$ | National Steel | $\underset{\substack{\text { Inland } \\ \text { Steel }}}{ }$ | Armeo : | Wheeling Steel | $\begin{array}{\|} \text { Pittsburgh } \\ \text { Stceel } \end{array}$ | Combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stockholders' investment s---.-.--, | \$1,546, 287, 718 | \$565, 422, 892 | \$293, 114, 789 | \$226, 737, 684 | \$187, 226, 037 | \$193, 764, 363 | \$151, 298, 872 | \$162, 570, 603 | \$101, 775, 836 | \$43, 160, 059 | \$3, 471, 358, 853 |
| investment for 3 quarters to Sept. 30, 1948 (before provision for Federal income taxes) | 164, 242, 150 | 90, 113, 858 | 51, 812, 788 | 32, 285, 317 | 38, 029, 330 | 48, 866, 435 | 40, 439, 691 | 33, 142, 892 | 16, 737, 645 | 6, 743, 030 | 622, 413, 136 |
| Income applicable to stockholders' investment for 3 quarters to Sept. 30, 1948 (after provision for Fed. cral income taxes) | 88,042, 150 | 53, 183, 858 | 29, 812, 788 | 20, 249,317 | 23, 339, 330 | 27, 201, 435 | 24, 819, 526 | 20, 372, 369 | 9,691, 645 | 3, 892, 780 | 300, 605, 188 |
| Rate of return on stockholders' investment for 3 quarters to Sept. 30, 1948 (before provision for Federal income taxes) | Percent $10.62$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 15.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 17.68 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 14.24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 20.31 \end{aligned}$ | Percent $25.22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 26.73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ 20.39 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 16.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & 15.62 \end{aligned}$ | Percent <br> 15. 05 |
| Rate of return on stockholders' investment for 3 quarters to Sept. 30, 1948 (after provision for Federal income taxes) $\qquad$ | 5. 69 | 9.41 | 10.17 | 8.93 | 12. 47 | 14.04 | 16.40 | 12. 53 | 9.52 | 9.02 | 8.66 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes United States and Canadian subsidiaries only, 1949.
Difference of $\$ 352,000$ in losses before and after Federal income taxes reflects adjustment of taxes reserved in previous quarters, before losses were sustained.
4 Denotes loss.
${ }^{8}$ As of Dec. 31, 1947.
Source: Moody's Industrials Cumulative 1949.

## V. Productivity Within the Iron and Steel Industry

There has been much discussion as to the changes in productivity within the steel industry and within industry generally and the effects that increases in productivity would have in reducing production costs, and therefore how these productivity increases could benefit labor, consumers, or stockholders. No definitive data, however, are available.
A rough measure of productivity within the steel industry can be computed by calculating the total output of hot-rolled iron and steel products produced in relation to the man-hours worked in blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills. Table 16, prepared by the United States Department of Commerce, shows this relationship during the past decade.

Table 16.-Productivity of labor in iron and steel industry, 1939-48 1
[Index $(1939=100)]$
Year:

${ }^{1}$ The above table reflects the total output of hot-rolled iron and steel products produced per man-hour worked in blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills. Because no recognition whatever is given to product mix, the index presented makes no pretense to show accurately changes in productivity.
Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, based on production data of the American Iron and Steel Institute and man-hour data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

As the footnote in this table points out, the index presented "makes no pretense to show accurately changes in productivity." The subject of productivity within the steel industry was considered in some detail in the course of hearings before the President's Steel Industry Board in August 1949. As the Steel Industry Board report of September 10, 1949, states:

The union (United Steelworkers of America, CIO) asserted that from 1939 to 1948 labor productivity in the steel industry had risen 44 percent and, by the first quarter of 1949 , almost 50 percent, while over the same periods the real average hourly earnings of steel workers had increased, respectively, only 9 percent and 14 percent. The union concluded that, since the prices of steel products had not been reduced but had risen during the period, most of the gains of productivity went to the owners of the industry through higher profits. ${ }^{3}$

The position of the steel companies is summarized as follows:
The union's estimates of the increases in average man-hour productivity since 1939 were said to be much too high * * *. A properly weighted index of finished steel output would have shown, it was asserted, an increase of less than 20 percent from 1939 to 1949 . In respect to the interpretation of the laborproductivity data, the companies took the position that, whatever series of index uumbers is used, it is improper to compare the 1948 aud 1949 figures with the oue for 1939. This is because, it was asserted, one of the most important determinants of output per man-hour in any given period is the volume of production, i. e., the extent to which productive capacity is utilized in the period. Much of the labor in steel plants was said to be almost fixed in amount, no matter what the rate of operations. Therefore, when output is high, these man-hours are spread much more thinly than when it is low. Man-hour output can thus rise considerably from a low-output to a high-output period without a single technological improvement being made. Consequently it was said to be inequitable to compare labor

[^8]productivity in 1939 , a year of low capacity utilization, with that for a highutilization year like 1948 or early 1949. A much more valid comparison, it was said, would be one based on 1941, a peacetime year, when the defense program had started the steel industry toward a high rate of operation. In this case, even the union's own index numbers would show a rise of only 20 percent by 1949 . And a properly constructed series would show a labor-productivity increase of less than 10 percent. ${ }^{4}$

The Steel Industry Board itself reached the following conclusion:
The union's estimates of the trend in man-hour productivity seem to be overstated. The companies' attack on the union's method of calculating the rise in productivity succeeded in raising considerable doubt in our minds in respect to the accuracy of the union's estimates.

- The companies' estimates, on the other hand, were also far from being definitive.

There are no accurate estimates. * * * It does appear, however, that there has been some rise in productivity per labor-hour.

The evidence before us suggested that in the whole economy man-hour output rose from 1899 to 1939 at an annual rate of about 2 percent, but in the following decade the increase was at a lower rate, perhaps 1.5 percent. On this basis the apparent growth in labor productivity for the 8 years 1941-48 would have been about 12 percent, or about the same as the 11-percent rise in steel workers' real average hourly earnings.

If the productivity gains in a particular industry are higher than for the economy as a whole, the board believes that, with reasonable allowance for the needs of the industry for modernization and expansion in the public interest, the consumers at large should be the chief beneficiaries through lower prices for the industry's products. ${ }^{5}$
Although it is apparent that no accurate productivity data in the steel industry are available, it may be reasonably concluded that productivity will continue to rise with technological improvements and better production methods, so long as production remains high: Consumers should share in the form of lower prices the benefits of any productivity increases.

## VI. Concentration Within the Steel Industry

In its study on the concentration of productive facilities, the Federal Trade Commission pointed out that the primary steel industry "ranks among the Nation's more concentrated fields." The section of this report on primary steel follows:

## Primary Steel

Because of the magnitude of the steel industry, the leading corporations, while of giant size, do not account for as large a proportion of the industry's facilities as is true, of many other industries. Nonetheless, the industry ranks among the Nation's more concentrated fields.

The leading company, United States Steel Corp., owns 29 percent of the industry's net capital assets, with the second firm, Bethlehem Steel Corp., holding 13 percent, or a total for the two companies of 42 percent. Thereafter, the concentration curve, as shown in the bottom of the chart, rises less rapidly as the so-called Little Steel corporations are added, which are indeed little only in comparison with United States Steel. Republic Steel Corp., one-fourth the size of United States Steel, but still among the Nation's largest 25 industrial corporations, owns 7 percent of the industry's facilities; and the next five companies, led by Jones \& Laughlin Steel Corp., have an average of 5 percent each. The eight leading corporations thus account for some 70 percent of the industry's total net capital assets.

[^9]It should again be emphasized that these figures represent the concentration of the total net capital assets of all corporations whose principal line of activity is the production of steel. This means, of course, that those productive facilities of the steel corporations which are actually engaged in other fields are included here in the steel industry. Nonetheless, as was pointed out above, it is not believed that this factor results in any serious overstatement of concentration for the industries included in this report.

The steel industry presents an opportunity to test that supposition, since it is one of the few fields, if not the only one, for which recent data are available showing the degree of concentration on the basis of actual physical capacity. The product generally used to measure concentration on this basis is steel ingots, which reflects what is generally referred to as "basic steel" operations. The following table shows the degree of concentration in the steel industry, as measured, first, by net capital assets and, second, by steel ingot capacity.


1 Year 1947.
${ }^{2}$ Year 1945.

- Most of the discrepancy between the two sets of figures is accounted for by United States Steel Corp. and Republic Steel Corp., each of which shows a higher percentage for ingot capacity than for net capital assets. This is to be expected, since both of these companies are known to be somewhat more important factors as basic steel producers than as producers of some of the industry's more highly finished products. ${ }^{6}$
Similar conclusions may be seen from the release of the Secretary of Commerce of December 5, 1949, based on data of the Census of Manufactures of 1947, from which the following table is compiled:

Table 17.-Concentration of output in the largest steel-producing companies

| - Industry (census classification) | Number of companies | Value of shipments (thousands of dollars) | 1947 concentration ratios |  |  |  | 1935 concentration ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | First 4 companies | First 8 companies | First 20 companies | First 50 companies | First 4 companies | First 8 companies |
| Steel works and rolling mills Blast furnaces | 111 | $\begin{gathered} (1) \\ 1,713,945 \end{gathered}$ | 44.7 67.3 | 62.8 82.1 | 81.1 95.5 | 94.2 | ${ }^{(1)} 66$ | ${ }^{(1)} 82.8$ |

[^10]
## VII. Effects of the December 1949 Steel Price Increase on the Direct Consumers

The effects of the December 1949 steel price increase on the rest of the economy have not yet crystallized despite considerable discussion. While according to some observers the 4-percent increase did not immediately appear to add significantly to the costs of steel users, many have since found out that the cost increase in their particular case was substantial. Major changes took place in the schedules of extras, so much so that many companies are making considerable changes in their purchasing plans. As pointed out in the December 29, 1949, issue of Iron Age:

The December 16 price change by United States Steel is drastic. The base price increase is nominal, but the changes in extras were substantial, both waysup and down. Raises and reductions in extras run as high as $\$ 14$ a ton on some items, with a few changing as much as $\$ 35$. * * * Sheet prices have been revised to the extent that buyers must completely change their thinking as to what types and sizes of steel are the most economical to use. ${ }^{1}$

The steel committee of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, in a report released on December 28, 1949, analyzed the reaction to the steel price increase as follows:

Substantially higher material costs face fabricators and consumers of steel as a result of the price increases announced December 16 by United States Steel Corp. subsidiaries and followed by other steel producers last week. First announcements of increases averaging $\$ 4$ per ton were accepted as the inevitable result of higher freight and labor costs and of very strong demand for most steelmill products. Most manufacturers using steel to make standard products and whose selling prices are established by competitive forces were prepared for moderately higher steel prices and were reconciled to the necessity of absorbing them. But they were not prepared for the cumulative increases in extras received several days after the effective date. Now comes the question, Will manufacturers' prices be forced up and, if so, will the higher prices speed the coming of receding business in general? In any event, many buyers look for downward pressure against the new steel prices to develop in the second quarter.

One of the first of the larger firms which announced that steel-price increases might cause increases in the prices of the products they manufacture was the Oliver Corp., manufacturer of farm equipment. Alva W. Phelps, president of the company, announced to the dealers and distributors of Oliver farm and industrial equipment:

By December 20, 1949, the company had been advised by important steel suppliers of price increases ranging from 5.6 percent to more than 19 percent on certain products. The management anticipates that the average of such increase on all steel and steel products purchased will approximate 8 percent. * * * It is difficult for me to see, at this time, how a general increase in the price of Oliver farm and industrial equipment can be avoided.

Manufacturers of bolts and screws appear to be severely affected. Mr. George P. Byrne, managing director of the United States Cap Screw Service Bureau, stated that the "widely publicized average price advance of $\$ 4$ per ton, or 4 percent, does not nearly represent the true picture." Increases applying to materials used by this industry range from 8.4 to 26 percent, Mr. Byrne stated. A similar viewpoint was expressed by Lamson \& Sessions, manufacturers of bolts, nuts, cotters, cap screws, and screw-machine products in Cleveland, Ohio, in a letter to customers, as follows:

[^11]With great regret we feel an obligation to advise you that severe advances on the steel used in our production have just been made on current shipments rather than the modest figures which have been mentioned up to date (December 21, 1949) in the newspapers. The price increases on rods and wire such as used in our production range upward to $\$ 22$ per ton, amounting to 27 percent in some instances, and we understand there are additional increases on extras for size.

Obviously, on low-priced products such as ours, where steel involves both a high percentage of the cost and selling price of the finished products, the steel price advances will require of necessity substantial price increases on our products.

What the effect of the price increase will be on the automobile industry, the largest user of steel, is not yet clear. The trade journal, Steel, has considered the problem in an article, How Much Will Auto-Making Costs Go Up? from which the following information is quoted:

As a starter for determining the result of higher steel prices, weights of various types of steel used in making the average automobile may be related to the increase in base price and extras in this way:

|  | Product | Weight required (in pounds) | Increased cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hot-rolled bars |  |  |  |
| Cold-rolled bars |  | 535 80 | \$1.47 |
| Hot-rolled sheets |  | 1,650 | 5. 97 |
| Wire products |  | 960 | 2.88 |
| Terne plate..-- |  | $\cdot 185$ | . 69 |
| Other plate.-- |  | 45 45 | . 32 |
| Pipe and tubing |  | 10 | . 09 |
| Structurals. |  | 30 | .07 |
| All steel_ |  | 3, 540 | 11.79 |

The weights on the different products are estimates developed by the American Iron and Steel Institute. They represent "purchased"'weights, including material that is machined off or otherwise removed in making the finished component.

Much of the steel represented comes from parts sources, and in some cases the tier of sources for a single part may be two or three deep. Take the case of a cold-headed part that starts at the steel mill in, say, the form of wire rods, then goes to a cold-drawing plant, then to the cold-heading source, and finally gets in the hands of the automotive buyer. By that time wire rods have been kicked up a minimum of $\$ 16$ per ton, base and extras.
B. E. Hutchinson, chairman of Chrysler's finance committee, has said that his people figure a $\$ 3$-per-ton increase in raw steel would mean a $\$ 50$ to $\$ 75$ increase in the retail price of the average car by the time all the inflationary factors along the devious supply road are taken into account. And that includes not only steel, but glass, rubber, textiles, etc.

Mr. Hutchinson admittedly is not one to wax too enthusiastic over the economic outlook; few financial experts are. But even if you discount his figures by 25 percent, auto buyers seem to be faced with prospects of paying $\$ 40$ to $\$ 60$ more for the cars being built today. Such a development might throw the market into a stall. Then everyone concerned would be in the soup. ${ }^{1}$

While other sources suggest that competitive pressures may be strong enough to prevent automobile price increases to the extent suggested above, there is more agreement that at least any downward trend in automobile prices would be halted.

At the Merchandise Mart in Chicago in mid-January 1950, the effect of the steel price increase was extensively considered. Mr. W. A. Blees, vice president and general manager of the Crosley division, Avco Manufacturing Co., declared that in many instances the cost

[^12]of specially fabricated steel used in refrigerators and other major products has far exceeded the $\$ 4$-a-ton advance generally associated with the recent steel price increase. He stated:
There is a universal misconception on the increase of steel costs to users. The average increase is $\$ 4$ a ton, but extras have gone up much more than that in many cases. ${ }^{2}$

Within the steel industry itself, it appears that the extras schedule may create hardships for independent converters. As Iron Age points out, while there were many changes in the extras on hot-rolled strip, principally increases apparently, cold-rolled strip extras were not changed and probably won't be in the immediate future.

Therefore the converters who buy hot-rolled strip and make and sell cold-rolled strip are squeezed. The base price on hot-rolled was not raised but the $\$ 3$ base differential between hot- and cold-rolled strip is not much of a margin in view of the higher extras on hot-rolled. ${ }^{3}$

## VIII. Selected Data on Foreign Trade in Steel

Table 18 shows the monthly exports and imports of steel during 1948 and the first 9 months of 1949. Exports have long been far more significant than imports of steel and have tended to show less fluctuation.

Table 18.-United States exports and imports of steel products excluding advanced manufactures, 1948-49

|  | Exports (net tons) | Imports (net tons) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exports } \\ \text { (net tons) } \end{gathered}$ | Imports (net tons) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1948-January | 542,751 | 21,323 | 1949-January | 436, 255 | 284, 142 |
| February | 486, 956 | 15, 234 | February | 386, 039 | 293, 209 |
| March. | 494, 766 | 45, 621 | March | 455, 940 | 298, 844 |
| April | 438, 560 | 48,798 | April | 565,140 | 184, 289 |
| May | 381, 707 | 27,982 | May | 553,950 | 161, 729 |
| June | 380, 391 | 55, 263 | June | 599,093 | 109, 133 |
| July. | 366, 149 | 50, 754 | July . | 668, 053 | 56, 133 |
| August | 343, 673 | 67, 741 | August | 509, 644 | 50,667 |
| September | 326, 221 | 129, 400 | September- | 521, 553 | 19,327 |
| October- | 377,496 | 162, 035 |  |  |  |
| November | 281, 097 | 119, 611 |  |  |  |
| December | 463,376 | 181,716 |  |  |  |

Source: Steel (magazine), Jan. 2, 1950, from U. S. Office of Business Economics.
Table 19 indicates the extent of the exports of steel to Europe under the European recovery program.
Table 19.-Paid shipments of steel from the United States under the European recovery plan, Apr. 3, 1948, through Nov. 30, 1949

PAID SHIPMENTS OF IRON AND STEEL MILL MATERIALS AND PRODUCTS, INCLUDING FERROALLOYS

Country of destination:

| Netherlands | \$2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| United King | 27, 092, 000 |
| France | 22, 668, 000 |
| Norway | 13, 782, 000 |
| Belgium-Luxemburg- | 8, 425, 000 |
| Denmark_ | 6, 110, 000 |
| Italy | 4, 987,000 |
| Gree | 3, 138, 000 |
| Austria | 2, 268, 000 |

Country of destination-Continued

| Sweden. | \$2, 172, 000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Germany | 1, 521, 000 |
| Ireland. | 875, 000 |
| Turkey | 297, 000 |
| Trieste | 264, 000 |
| Iceland | 72, 000 |
| Total | 123, 250, 000 |

Source: Economic Cooperation Administration. Division of Statistics and Reports, paid shipments, Nov. 30, 1949.

2 New York Times, January 13, 1950, p. 30.
${ }_{3}$ Iron Age, December 29, 1949, p. 62.

Table 20, taken from a recent study of the Steel Division of the Economic Commission of Europe and published by the United Nations gives the comparative domestic and export prices of selected steel products in the United States Great Britain, and Belgium, as of January 1949.
Table 20.-Home market and expnrt prices in the United Kingdom, Belgium, and the United States, January 1949
[United States dollars per metric ton]

| Product | United Kingdorn |  | Belgium |  |  | United States |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Homemarket prices ${ }^{1}$ | Export prices ${ }^{2}$ | Homemarket prices ${ }^{3}$ | Organized market export prices 3 | Freemarket export prices ${ }^{3}$ | Homemarket prices ${ }^{4}$ | Export <br> prices ${ }^{5}$ |
| Heavy steel: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Joists -- | 71 | 91 | 67 | 98 | 127 | 72 | 90 |
| Plates ( 10 mm . and over) | 74 | 94 | 76 | 109 | 148 | 75 | 93 |
| Light steel: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rounds and squares (under 76 mm.) | 80 | ${ }^{\circ} 104$ | 69 | 100 | 119 | 74 | 93 |
|  | 77 |  | 72 | 107 | 131 | 80 | 92 |
| Sheets (1 mm.) | ${ }^{7} 99$ | ${ }^{5} 110$ | 105 | 136 | 191 | 895 | ${ }^{8} 112$ |

1 Delivered to consumer.
${ }_{2}$ Delivered to port nearest works.
${ }^{3}$ F. o. b. Antwerp.
4 A cerage domestic price, f. o. r. for 5 main producing points.
${ }^{5}$ Delivered New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore.
${ }^{6}$ Minimum export price.
${ }^{7}$ Cold-rolled
${ }^{8}$ Quoted by the Metal Bulletin.
Source: Economic Commission for Elurope. Steel Division. European Steel Trends in the Setting of the World Market. Geneva, United Nations Department of Economic Affairs, 1949, p. 46.

## IX. United States Steel Corp.: Selected Information

The United States Steel Corp., through its subsidiaries, is the world's largest producer of iron and steel, having an annual rated capacity for raw steel and castings on January 1, 1949, of 31,300,000 net tons, or about a third of our domestic steel-making capacity. One of the company's subsidiaries, the Universal Atlas Cement Co., is also the largest domestic producer of cement, with an annual producing capacity of $33,590,000$ barrels as of December 31, 1940.

## OPERATIONS OF THE COMPANY

Its principal products include numerous items within the following general commodity classifications: Rolled and forged steel, flatrolled products, welded and seamless steel tubular products, oil-field oquipmont, wire and wire products, high-tensile and stainless steel, transportation equipment (railroad cars, rails, barges, lighters, etc.), steel drums and containers, cement, raw and semifinished materials, merchant pig iron and slag, and coke-plant chemicals. The company has become an increasingly important factor in the fabricating field. It has engaged extensively in fabrication and erection of steel structures such as bridges and buildings. It produces substantially all of the iron ore and linestone, most of the coal and some of the other raw materials used in its operations. It operates steamships, barges and docks on the Great Lakes, common carrier railroad lines trans-
porting shipments between the properties of the mining and manufacturing subsidiaries, and steamships in intercoastal and foreign service which carry products of outside shippers as well as its own. Its total sales and revenues for 1948 amounted to $\$ 2,473,000,000$, the highest sales figure in its history.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE COMPANY

United States Steel Corp., a holding company, was incorporated in New Jersey on February 25, 1901, under a charter of perpetual duration and immediately acquired practically the entire capital stock of the Carnegie Co., the Federal Steel Co., the National Tube Co., the American Steel \& Wire Co. (New Jersey), the National Steel Co., the American Steel Hoop Co., the American Sheet Steel Co., the American Tin Plate Co., the American Bridge Co., the Lake Superior Consolidated Iron Mines, the Shelby Steel Tube Co., and also the entire issue of bonds of the Carnegie Co. and a one-sixth interest in the capital stock of the Oliver Iron Mining Co. and of the Pittsburgh Steamship Co. The other five-sixths interest in the stocks of the lastnamed two companies was owned by the Carnegie Co., thus giving the United States Steel Corp. 100 percent control.

From time to time the United States Steel Corp. or its subsidiaries acquired other independent enterprises until on December 31, 1944, it controlled about 132 subsidiary companies. As of December 31, 1948, United States Steel Corp. listed with the Securities and Exchange Commission a total of 92 subsidiaries, listed as table 22 on page 35 .

## ACQUISITIONS BY THE COMPANY

From January 1, 1915, through 1947 the United States Steel Corp. acquired control of about 25 independent enterprises. The Federal Trade Commission estimates, on the basis of information on 12 of these enterprises, that about 6.9 percent of the growth of the corporation during this period was derived from external expansion through the acquisition of other concerns.

A chronology of some of the more important acquisitions follows. Chart 6 shows the acquisitions of United States Steel Corp. since 1939 including war plants bought from the War Assets Administration. 1901:

Bessemer Steamship Co.
Aragon Iron Mines.
1902. Union Steel Co. This company was the result of a merger between the

Union Steel Co. and the Sharon Steel Co. only a few months before it was
acquired by United States Steel.
Troy Steel Products Co.
Trenton Iron Co.
1904. Clairton Steel Co. 1907:

Great Northern Iron Ore properties (lease).
Tennessee Coal, Iron \& Railroad Co.
1908. Schoen Steel Wheel Co.
1920. Michigan Limestone \& Chemical Co.
1924. Cyclone Fence Co.
1926. Compania de Maestranzas y Galvanizacion (Chile).
1928. Northwest Fence \& Wire Works.

# ACQUISITIONS OF UNITED STATES STEEL CORP. SINCE 1939 



Atlas Portland Cement Co.
Washington Coal \& Coke Co.
Columbia Steel Co.
Oil Well Supply Co.
1934. Jackson Fence Co.
1935. Virginia Bridge \& Iron Co.
1936. Gerrard Co., Inc.
1937. Potter Ore Co.
1939. Boyle Manufacturing Co., Inc., California.
1940. Savannah Wire Cloth Mills, Savannah, Ga. 1943:

Moise Steel Co., Milwaukee, Wis.
Petroleum Iron Works, New York, N. Y. 1944:

Gunnison Housing Corp., New Albany, Ind.
Witte Engine Works, Kansas City, Mo.
Bennett Manufacturing Co. 1945:

Neilson Pump Co., Long Beach, Calif.
Wabash Portland Cement Co., Osborn, Ohio.
1946. Geneva Steel Works (Utah), purchased from the United States Government.
1947. Consolidated Steel Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.

The following table shows the basic information on the war plants bought by United States Steel from the United States Government:

Table 21.-Purchases of war plants from the War Assets Administration

| Place and description | Date | Cost (in millions) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sale price } \\ \text { (in mil- } \\ \text { lions) } \end{gathered}$ | Sale price as percent of cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geneva, Utah: Fully integrated, iron ore, coal, limestone; blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills. | May 1946..- | \$200.6 | \$47.5 | 23.7 |
| Homestead, Pa.: Steel works, rolling mills (plate):-......... | June 1946...- | 86.5 | 44.1 | 51.0 |
| Braddock, Pa.: Blast furnaces. | ._do_.-.-- | 22.8 | 14. 4 | 63.2 |
| Duquesne, Pa.: Electric steel: heat treating | - -do-.------ | 10.8 | 6.5 | 60.2 |
| Duluth, Minn.: Blast furnace. | -do------- | 7.6 | 1.8 | 23.7 |
| Dragerton, Utah: Townsite at coal mines | March 1947. | 4.2 | 1.6 | 38. 1 |
| Torrance, Calif.: Aluminum reduction plant | January 1948. | 12.9 | 4.2 | -32.6 |
| Total |  | 345.4 | 120.1 | 34.8 |

Table 22.-Subsidiaries of United States Steel Corp., as of Dec. 31, 1948

|  | Percentage of voting power including directors where applicable |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agawam Iron Mining Co | .-- 100 |
| American Bridge Co | 100 |
| The American Steel \& Wire Co. of New Jersey | 100 |
| Standard Fence Co | 100 |
| Washburn \& Moen Manufacturing Co | ${ }^{2} 100$ |
| Angus Land Co.----------.-.-.-. | 3100 |
| Apollo Gas Co | 100 |
| Bessemer \& Lake Erie R. R. Co_ | 100 |
| Bessemer-Union Improvement Co. (balan Union R. R. Co.) | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { d by } \\ \hline-150 \end{array}$ |
| The Meadville, Conneaut Lake \& Linesvill | 100 |
| Birmingham Southern R. R. Co_ | 100 |
| Bradley Transportation Co | 100 |
| Central Radio Telegraph Co | 100 |
| Carbon County Ry. $\mathrm{Co}_{\text {- }}$ | 100 |
| See footnotes at end of table, p. 37. |  |

# Table 22.-Subsidiaries of United States Steel Corp., as of Dec. 31, 1948-Con. 

Perecntage of coting power including direetors
Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp ..... 100
Bessemer Electric Power Co ..... 4 100
Carnegie Natural Gas Co ..... 100
Chapin Mining Co ..... + 100
Columbia Iron Mining Co ..... 100
Columbia Steel Co ..... 100
Companhia Meridional de Mineração (United States Steel Corp. owns 99.83 percent of the voting power and 0.04 percent is owned by each of the following wholly owned subsidiary companies: The American Steel \& Wire Co. of New Jersey, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp., and Tennessee Coal, Iron \& R. R. Co.) ..... ${ }^{5} 99.95$
Connellsville \& Monongahela Ry. Co ..... - 100 ..... - 100
Consolidated Western Steel Corp ..... 100
Consolidated Steel Corp. of Texas ..... 100
Consolidated Western Constructors, Ine ..... 100
Consolidated Western Steel Corp., Philippines ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
Cyclone Fence Co ..... 100
Donora Southern R. R. Co ..... 100
Duluth, Missabe \& Iron Range Ry. Co ..... 100 ..... 100
Elgin, Joliet \& Eastern Ry. Co ..... 100
Essex Iron Co ..... ${ }^{3} 100$
Etna \& Montrose R. R. Co ..... 100
Federal Shipbuilding \& Dry Dock Co ..... 100
H. C. Frick Coke Co ..... 100
Gary Land Co ..... 100
Geneva Steel Co ..... 100
Gerrard Steel Strapping Co ..... 100
The Gerrard Co., Inc ..... 100
Gerrard Pan-American, Ltd ..... 100
Gunnison Homes, Inc ..... ${ }^{5} 70$
Hannibal Connecting R. R. Co ..... 100
Hemlock Land Co ..... ${ }^{3} 100$
Illinois Steel Co ..... 100
Isthmian Steamship Co ..... 100
Johnstown \& Stony Creek R. R. Co ..... 100 ..... 100
The Lake Terminal R. R. Co ..... 100
McKeesport Connecting R. R. Co ..... 100
Michigan Limestone \& Chemical Co ..... 100
National Tube Co ..... 100
The Newburgh \& South Shore Ry. Co ..... 100
Northampton \& Bath R. R. Co ..... 100
Ohio Barge Line, Inc ..... 100 ..... 100
Oil Well Supply Co ..... 100
Oil Well Supply Co., Ltd ..... 100
Oliver Iron Mining Co ..... 100 ..... 100
The Cartier Mining Co., Ltd ..... 100

Pennsylvania \& Lake Erie Dock Co ..... | 388. |
| :--- |
| 385 |
| $\quad 3$ |

Piloto Mining Co ..... 482.64
The Pittsburg, Bessemer \& Lake Erie R. R. Co
The Pittsburg, Bessemer \& Lake Erie R. R. Co .....
100 .....
100
The Pittsburgh \& Conneaut Dock Co
The Pittsburgh \& Conneaut Dock Co
100
100
Pittsburgh Steamship Co ..... 100
Scully Steel Products Co ..... 100
Seventy-one Broadway Corp ..... 100
Tennessee Coal, Iron \& R. R. Co ..... 100
Trotter Water Co ..... 100
Union Railroad Co ..... 100
Bessemer-Union Improvement Co. (balance of shares owned by Bessemer \& Lake Erie R. R. Co.) ..... ${ }^{1} 50$
Union Supply Co ..... 100
See footnotes at end of table, p. 37.

Table 22.-Subsidiaries of United States Steel Corp., as of Dec. 31, 1948-Con.
Percentage of
voting pover
including directors'
qualifying shares
where applicable
United States Coal \& Coke Co ..... 100
United States Steel Corp. of Delaware ..... 100
United States Steel Export Co ..... 100
Brazaço S. A ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
Compania de Acero:
United States Steel Export Co. (Chile), S. A ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
United States Steel Export Co. (Peru), S. A ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
Compania de Representaciones Mercantiles, Cubaçero S. A ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
Isthmian Steamship Co., Ltd ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
Metalurgica Exportadora Estadounidense de la Argentina, S. A.-- ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
United States Steel Export Co. de Mexico, S. A ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
United States Steel Export Co. of China, Inc ..... 1
United States Steel Export Co. (Puerto Rico), Inc ..... ${ }^{5} 100$
United States Steel Products Co ..... 100
Bennett Manufacturing Co., Inc ..... ${ }^{1} 100$
Boyle Manufacturing Co ..... 100
The Petroleum Iron Works Co. (Ohio) ..... ${ }^{1} 100$
The Petroleum Iron Works Co. (Texas) ..... 100
United States Steel Supply Co ..... 100
Universal Atlas Cement Co ..... 100
Universal Exploration Co. ..... 100
Virginia Bridge Co ..... 100
Warrier \& Gulf Navigation Co ..... 100
The Youngstown \& Northern R. R. Co ..... 100
${ }^{1}$ Conducts no business; owns assets of no material significance.

2 Conducts no business; owns no property.
${ }^{3}$ Conducts no business; owns property not presently operated.
4 Conducts no business other than the ownership of property leased to, or subject to operation under agreement by, subsidiaries of the Corporation.
s Not consolidated in the corporation's consolidated statement of financial position and no separate financial statements are filed or to be filed as the aggregate investments in these companies are not significant in respect of (1) the assets they represent, and (2) the sales or operating revenues of such companies. With these exceptions, all companies in foregoing schedule are included in the consolidated financial statements.

- Conducts no business other than the ownership of property leased to a nonatiliated company

The corporation or some one of its subsidiaries also owns a substantial percentage, but not exceeding 50 percent in any case, of the voting stock of cach of 8 other corporations, 4 of which own or operate iron ore properties. The corporation does not possess, directly or indirectly, the power to direct or cause the direction of the management or policies of any one of such 8 other corporations, whether through the ownership of voting securities, by contract or otherwise; and the corporation therefore disclaims any admission of the actual existence of effective control by it, directly or indirectly, of any one of such 8 other corporations and, when the term "subsidiaries" is used in thic annngl report it shail not be deemed to include any one of such 8 other corporations.

## X. Bethlbhem Steel Corp. Press Release on Amendments to Its Pension Plan, December 21, 1949

Bethlehem Steel Corp. has called a special meeting of its stockholders at noon on February 7, 1950, at Wilmington, Del., to vote on certain amendments to the long-established Bethlehem pension plan which was called for by the strike-settlement agreement dated October 31, 1949, between Bethlehem and the steelworkers' union.

Reasons favoring the settlement; statements concerning the estimated cost to the corporation, and a description of the changes proposed in the pension plan, are set forth in a covering letter by $\mathrm{E} . \mathrm{G}$. Grace, chairman of Bethlehem Steel, and in further detail in a proxy statement, both of which are currently being mailed to stockholders.

The agreement with the union, Mr. Grace's letter points out, settles the pension question until the end of 1951 and further until October 31, 1954, if Bethlehem continues the agreement in effect.

Under the agreement old-age benefits under the Federal Social Security Act are deductible from Bethlehem's pension obligations, and any increases in such benefits will also be deductible.

The pension plan is a noncontributory plan and Mr. Grace states in his letter that Bethlehem has always believed in a noncontributory pension plan. The strike-settlement agreement requires a contributory social-insurance plan which covers insurance against sickness and hospitalization.

## ESTIMATED COSTS

Mr. Grace's letter estimates that the proposed increases in the Bethlehem pension plan will cost the corporation between $\$ 2,000,000$ and $\$ 2,500,000$ per year for the next 5 years. He estimates that "if the above-described amendments were not made," the cost would be between $\$ 5,500,000$ and $\$ 7,500,000$ per year. But assuming that the proposed amendments are approved by the stockholders the estimated average annual cost for the next 5 years "will be between $\$ 7,500,000$ and $\$ 10,000,000$."

In pointing to the reasonableness of the amounts of pensions as proposed, Mr. Grace said: "It should be noted that they are small when compared with the total pay roll of Bethlehem-approximately $\$ 490,000,000$ in 1948."

It is expected that in 1950 there will be a nonrecurring cost resulting from the transfer to the pension plan of a number of men now receiving benefits under the Bethlehem relief plan. That cost "may be as much as $\$ 10,000,000$, most or all of which may be provided in $1950 . "$

It is Bethlehem's practice-
when an employee becomes entitled to a pension, to charge to current earnings and to pay into the pension trust fund which has been established pursuant to the plan an amount, determined on an actuarial basis, which is estimated to be sufficient to provide for the payment to him of the amounts that he will become entitled to receive as a pension during the remainder of his life. As shown in the proxy statement, the amount charged in 1948 to current earnings of the corporation and its subsidiaries in accordance with that practice to provide for the payment of pensions that were granted under the plan in that year is $\$ 3,544,738$ and the amount that would have been so charged in that year, if the abovedescribed amendments had then been in effect and had been applicable to the persons who became pensioners in that year, is $\$ 4,507,163$, and the corresponding figures for the first 10 months of 1949 are $\$ 4,468,402$ and $\$ 5,585,125$.

## BENEFITS UNDER THE PLAN

The principal amendment to the pension plan, which is subject to stockholders' approval, will provide that the present minimum pension of $\$ 50$ per month will be increased to $\$ 100$ per month for pensions to be granted to employees with 25 or more years of service at age 65 or over. Pensions payable under the plan are reduced by amounts payable under the Federal Social Security Act. Other amendments provide for retirement after 15 years of service under certain circumstances, and for increases in certain pensions granted under the present plan if old-age insurance benefits shall be increased under the Federal Social Security Act.

Mr. Grace's letter and the proxy statement also refer to a resolution by three stockholders proposing a maximum limit on annual pensions which is substantially the same as one disapproved by a large majority of the stockholders at each of the last two annual meetings.

## XI. Information Concerning Remuneration and Pensions of Executives in the United States Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp.

## A. UNITED STATES STEEL CORP.

The following table contains information with respect to remuneration paid during the last fiscal year of the United States Steel Corp. to each of its directors who received in excess of $\$ 25,000$, to each of its three highest-paid officers, to its directors and officers as a group and to "associates" of directors who received in excess of $\$ 25,000$ :

| Name of person or identity of group | Capacity in which remuneration was received | Remuneration paid by corporation and subsidiaries, 1948 (acerual basis) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Benefits under pension } \\ & \text { plan (3) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1948 contributions |  |  |
|  |  |  | By corporation and subsidi- aries | By the indi- <br> vidual |  |
| Irving S. Olds (1) ............ | Director, member of finance committee, and chairmmn of board. Net after taxes | 1 \$161, 300 (2) 69,449 | \$7,350 | \$4,410 | \$13,815 |
| Enders M. Voorhees (1). | Director, chairman of finance committee, and comptroller. | ${ }_{2} 160,700$ | 7,350 | 4,410 | 20, $32 \overline{3}$ |
| Benjamin F. Fairless (1)...-- | Net after taxes. <br> Director, member of finance committee, and president. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { (2) } \\ \stackrel{3}{3} \\ \mathbf{2 0 7}, \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 9,850 | 5,910 | 26,537 |
| Nathan L. Miller. | Director, member of finance com- | $\begin{array}{r} \text { (2) } 84,075 \\ 109,300 \end{array}$ | None | None | None |
| Myron C. Taylor | Director, member of finance committee, and advisory counsel. | 54, 900 | None | None | None |
|  |  |  | Paymen corpor aries d | s for pen ation and aring 194 | sions by subsidi- |
| All directors and officers White \& Case ${ }^{3}$. | As directors and officers. Legal services. | 1883,533 <br> 77,750 |  | \$54,769 |  |

' Exceeded remuneration for 1947 by $\$ 22,367$.
? Exceeded remuneration for 1947 by $\$ 21,567$.
${ }^{3}$ Exceeded remuneration for 1947 by $\$ 20,167$.
${ }^{4}$ Exceeded remuneration for 1947 by $\$ 103,717$
'Mr. Irving S. Olds, a member of the firm of White \& Case, does not participate in this remuneration.
(1) About May 6, 1941, the Corporation entered into a contract with this individual, which provides in substance that in the event of his continued service on behalf of the corporation for a continuous period of at least 5 years after May 6 , 1941, and his attaining the age of 60 years (unless this age requirement is subsequently reduced by the board of directors), he shall be entitled upon retirement to receive annually from the corporation during his life a sum equal to $\$ 5,000$ for each year of such continuous service after May 6, 1941, with a proportionate part thereof for any fraction of a year of such service, but not more than $\$ 50,000$ annually; the full annual sum thus computed to be paid in the year of his death to him or his estate.
(2) These amounts are the estimated net remuneration of the three highest-paid officers after paying income taxes. The estimates are based on the assumption that each individual's remuneration from the corporation is his only income, and that he is entitled to no deduction therefrom other than as a married person and, in computing Federal income tax, a deduction of New York State income tax.
(3) The estimated annual pensions set forth in the foregoing table will become payable only upon certain conditions being fulfilled. For the purpose of estimating these annual pensions, it is assumed that (a) the named individuals will continue in the employ of the corporation or its subsidiaries until they respectively reach 65 years of age, will retire at that age, and during the period up to the date
of their retirement will continue to make their contributions under the contributory part of the plan; (b) the combined contributions of participating emplovees and employing companies under the contributory part of the plan will be sufficient to permit payment of the "normal retirement pensions" therein specified; (c) the remuneration of the individuals will continue at the 1948 rates until they respectively reach 65 years of age; and $(d)$ the present rules under the plan will continue in force during the lives of the respective individuals. Their ages on December 31, 1948, were as follows: Irving S. Olds, 61; Enders M. Voorhees, 57, Benjamin F: Fairless, 58.

## GENERAL INFORMATION CONCERNING PENSION PLAN

Officers and employees of the corporation's subsidiaries are entitled to benefits under the corporation's pension plan on the same basis as officers and employees of the corporation. During the year 1948, pensions were granted under the plan to 1,371 retiring employees and 1,677 pensions were terminated by the death of pensioned employees, or for other reasons; at the end of the year pensions were in force with respect to 15,422 retired employees.

Employees do not contribute to the noncontributory part of the corporation's pension plan. They are eligible for pensions thereunder with respect to service prior to January 1, 1940, subject to adjustment for public pensions. This part of the plan also permits pensions under special retirement conditions, including total and permanent incapacity. This part states that it is voluntary and constitutes no contract and confers no legal rights upon any active or retired employees or any pensioner thereunder.

During the year 1948, the corporation and subsidaries made payments of $\$ 5,900,698$ under the noncontributory part of the pension plan.

The contributory part of the corporation's pension plan provides for contributory pensions with respect to employees' earnings in excess of the maximum amounts specified in the Federal old-age benefit laws as the basis for taxes payable by employer and employee. Employees who elect to participate contribute 3 percent of their compensation in excess of these specified amounts, and the employing companies contribute such additional amount as may be sufficient, according to the determination of an actuary, to cover present and prospective benefits and expenses under this part of the plan. Contributions of the employing companies are restricted, however, to 5 percent of the compensation, in excess of these specified amounts, paid to all employees eligible to participate. Participation by employees is voluntary. No contributions are made by the corporation or subsidiaries for the benefit of employees who do not themselves contribute. This part of the plan provides that it may be terminated on certain conditions and that all payments by the corporation and subsidiaries are voluntary.

During the year 1948, the corporation and subsidiaries paid a total of $\$ 4,291,150$ to a trustee for the benefit of all employees participating in the contributory part of the pension plan. The total of the payments by participating employees was \$2,574,755.

Source: United States Steel Corp., proxy statement, May 2, 1949.

## B. BETHLEHEM STEEL CORP.

In the following table are set forth with respect to each person who was a director of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. at any time during the year 1948 (including each person who was one of the three highest paid officers of the corporation during that year) and whose aggregate remuneration from the corporation and its subsidiaries during that year exceeded $\$ 25,000$ (a) the aggregate remuneration (fixed salary and incentive compensation) directly or indirectly paid to him by the corporation and its subsidiaries during that year for services in all capacities and (b) the estimated amount of the annual pension that would be payable to him under the pension plan, as at present in effect, upon retirement under the conditions stated in footnote (3) below:

| Name of person | Capacities in which remuneration was received | Fixed salary 1 | Incentive compensation ${ }^{12}$ | Estimated amount of annual pension payable under the pension plan on retirement ${ }^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Donald T. Aikenhead. | Director, treasurer and assistant secretary of the corporation and director and officer or employee of 1 or more subsidiaries. | \$27, 500 | \$42, 984 | \$9, 122 |
| James P. Bender.. | Director and assistant treasurer of the corporation and officer or employee of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 27,500 | 42, 984 | 23, 427 |
| Norborne Berkeley. | Director of the corporation and director and officer of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 60,000 | 114, 624 | 48, 400 |
| Stewart J. Cort |  | 90,000 | 114, 624 | 29,298 |
| Harry C. Crawford |  | 45, 000 | 57, 312 | 18.487 |
| Eugene G. Grace.-. | Director and chairman of the corporation and director and officer of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 150,000 | 171,932 | None |
| Charles R. Holton *- | Director of the corporation and director and officer or employee of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 60,000 | 114, 624 | None |
| Arthur B. Homer | Director and president of the corporation and director and officer of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 120,000 | 143,280 | 67, 087 |
| Myrl L. Jacobs ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | Director of the corporation and director and officer of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 52,275 | 85,968 | None |
| Joseph M. Larkin |  | 60.000 | 114, 624 | 58,944 |
| Paul Mackall. | do | 90, 000 | 114, 624 | 76, 802 |
| Robert E. McMath | Director, vice president and secretary of the corporation and director and officer of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 75, 000 | 114, 624 | 60, 592 |
| Arthur F. Peterson ${ }^{5}$ | Director of the corporation and director and officer or employee of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 27,601 | 43, 111 | 10,827 |
| Frederick A. Shick.- | Director and comptroller of the corporation and director and officer of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 75,000 | 114, 624 | 61, 731 |
| Daniel D. Strohmeier. | Director of the corporation and director and officer or employee of 1 or more subsidiaries. | 50,000 | 64,476 | 9,391 |

1 The amounts by which the aggregate remuneration that was paid by the corporation and its subsidiaries to the following named officers and directors during the year 1948 exceeded the aggregate remuneration that was so paid to them, respectively, during the year 1947 are as follows: Mr. Aikenhead, $\$ 47,304 ; \mathrm{Mr}$. Bender $\$ 7,164$; Mr. Berkeley, $\$ 31,044$; Mr. Cort, $\$ 109,924$; Mr. Crawford, $\$ 19,552$; Mr. Holton, $\$ 31,044 ;$ Mr. Larkin, $\$ 31,044 ;$ Mr. Mackall, $\$ 19,104$; Mr. McMath, $\$ 19,104$; Mr. Peterson, $\$ 24,718$; Mr. Shick, $\$ 19,104 ;$ and Mr. Strohmeier, $\$ 04,994$.
${ }^{2}$ All the amounts shown in this column (except $\$ 21,619$ of the amount shown opposite the name of Mr. Peterson) are amounts that were paid out of the special incentive compensation fund of the corporation. Such amounts (except such $\$ 21,619$ ) aggregate $\$ 1,432,796$, the total amount that was paid out of said fund in 1948.

3 The amount set forth in this column opposite the name of each person is the amount of the pension to which he would be entitled under such plan (before deducting any amount the deduction of which is required by such plan), if (a) he shall continue to be an employee under such plan until he shall attain the age of 65 years or, in the case of a person who will have attained that age prior to Jan. 1, 1950, until that date, (b) he shall retire on the date when he shall attain the age of 65 years or, in the case of a person who will have attained that age prior to Jan. 1, 1950, on that date (which the provisions of such plan do not require him to do in either case), (c) such plan in its present form shall continue in effect until he shall so retire and (d) he shall receive compensation for the period from Jan. 1, 1949, to the date when he shall so retire at an average rate equal to the average rate of his compensation for the years 1939 to 1948 , inclusive
: Mr. Holton died on July 16, 1949.
5 Mr. Jacobs died on Nov. 13, 1948, and on Nov. 26, 1948, Mr. Peterson was elected a director of the corporation to fill the vacancy thereby caused.

The aggregate remuneration $(\$ 2,517,011)$ directly or indirectly paid by the corporation and its subsidiaries during the year 1948 to all persons, as a group who were directors and/or officers of the corporation at any time during that year for services in all capacities consisted of fixed salaries in the aggregate amount of $\$ 1,047,092$ and incentive compensation in the aggregate amount of $\$ 1,469,919$. The amount by which sucb aggregate remuneration exceeded the aggregate remuneration that was so paid to the corresponding group during the year $104^{4}$ is $9016,8 \%$.
Source: Bethlehem Steel Corp., proxy statement, Dec. 19, 1949.

## XII. Statements by the President's Steel Industry Board and the Council of Economic Advisers on Steel Prices

## A. By the President's Steel Industry Board:

The plant modernization and expansion program should result in efficiencies which, other things being equal, will better enable the companies to meet the cost of the insurance and pension plans recommended, and also to look toward a lower level of prices for their products.

With increased efficiency and lowered costs resulting from the plant-modernization program, and with no great decrease in the demand for steel, there should be continued and higher profits. If these profits do not result in benefit to the consumer in the form of lower prices, there would be justification for the union to renew its demand for increase of wage rates in order better to participate in the industry's prosperity. ${ }^{1}$
The Board has found that the use of a substantial portion of recent profits for plant modernization and expansion was of benefit to the economy and the Nation. The only question in our minds is whether a larger fraction of the expansion should not have been financed by long-term borrowing, thus enabling the payment of higher dividends to stockholders and the creation of reserves for the payment of retirement benefits to the industry's workers. The steelworkers were found to have suffered no inequity from these uses. But it is to be expected that the modernization and expansion of steel-making capacity will substantially lower costs and thereby increase profits considerably, given no decrease in the demand for steel. If and when this development occurs, the consumers of the country will receive measurable benefit, the Board believes, in the form of lower prices for steel products. And if this does not happen, and if business conditions continue to be generally favorable, there would appear to be justification for the union to renew its demand for larger participation in the industry's income.

The words "present conditions" above, however, do not have the same force when applied to the subjects of social insurance and pensions.
As to these there are two main items to be considered. The first is the employers' ability to pay; the second involves certain definite social obligations which are owed to workers in all industries. By a collective bargaining which recognizes both of these considerations, we think that fair and equitable conclusions can be reached.
As to the first consideration, we believe that the steelworkers are in an inequitable position now vis-à-vis workers in other industries who have systems of social insurance and pensions. They are also in an inequitable position vis-à-vis managerial employees in many of the steel companies which have provided substantial pensions for their officers and top executives. And we believe that the steel companies do now have the ability to provide a system of social insurance and pensions. Although their extraordinary reported profits of recent years have to be materially discounted for all the reasons mentioned above, they are still substantial. Measured by any standard they appear able to bear the comparatively slight increase of labor costs involved in the program we recommend.

What do those costs come to? On the basis of a 2,000-hour work year, which is a high employment year, the gross cost of the program, * * * would come to an additional 4 cents per hour per worker for social insurance and an additional 6 cents per hour per worker for pensions-a total of 10 cents per hour for the program. However, some of the companies now have some kind of social-insurance plans, and a few have some kind of retirement pians. The present cost to the companies of these existing plans should be deducted from the 10 cents. Our very rough estimate is that the net result would be about 8 cents per hour. Since the steelworkers' present average earnings come conservatively to $\$ 1.60$ per hour, this cost of 8 cents will cause about a 5 -percent increase in direct labor cost.
On the liberal assumption that labor costs average 50 percent of total cost (they more likely come closer to 40 percent) this increase in total cost would be only about $21 / 2$ percent at an operation rate of 2,000 work hours per year.

Ťhe steel companies, under present conditions and under presently foreseeable conditions (which include cost reductions because of plant improvements), appear able to afford this and still put into effect the price reductions mentioned above. ${ }^{2}$

[^13]
## B. By the Council of Economic Advisers:

The fact that we are not now threatened with general inflation does not justify price increases at any vital points in the industrial structure. Such price increases, instead of being called inflationary, should be regarded as fundamentally retarding in that they will reduce our likelihood of gaining maximum production and employment by imposing further restrictions upon a level of demand which is not yet sufficiently high. If there is any room for price change in some vital industrial areas; it is in a downward and not in an upward direction. Earnings are generally rewarding, though not so high as a year ago, and they can best be protected and advanced by those policies which will maintain and expand volume.

Steel prices are a case in point. Steel affects the whole economy, and some reduction in steel prices would favorably influence the whole economic situation. A stable and expanding economy requires a growing volume of steel output and of those other basic products which use steel. Some of these other products, whose prices are affected by steel prices, are also priced at a level where sustained and growing output seems uncertain at current prices. The statements of the steel industry accompanying the recent price increases did not in our judgment impair the shortly prior findings of the Steel Industry Board. These findings were to the effect that the price-profit-cost situation in the steel industry, allowing for pensions, did not justify price increases and in fact left room for price decreases in view of no wage-rate increases. ${ }^{3}$

[^14]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Census Bureau classification of blast furnaces, steel works and rolling mills, steel foundries, and iron and steel forgings.

[^1]:    1 November 1949.

[^2]:    ${ }_{1}$ Steel magazine composite.
    2 Runof-mine bituminous (f. o. b. mine price plus freight); from BLS except beginning with March 1048 , which are not quoted prices but are calculated from indexes by Iron and Steel Division, ODC. Quoted prices are affected by coverage or reporting sources.
    ${ }_{3}$ BLS average hourly earnings in blast furnaces, steel works, and rolling mills.
    4 Mesabi non-Bessemer.
    : Straits, tin, delivered at New York.

    - Prime Western, delivered at St. Louis.
    ${ }^{3}$ Bunker C fuel, excluding anl fees and taxes f. o. b. refineries or terminals, ship's bunkers, New York Harbor.
    ${ }^{8}$ Preliminary or estimate.
    - Not available.

    Source: U. S. Department of Commerce.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Some of the reporting companies are engaged in activities which are not limited to the steel industry. Hence net income as reported by such companies reflects the operation of activities other than those of the steel industry; for 1946, 52 companies are included.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ A verage of investments at beginning and end of year for each company.
    a Net profit (or loss) after provisions for Federal and other income taxes.
    ${ }^{2}$ Denotes loss.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data are not available prior to 1930
    Data are not available prior to 1919; absorbed by Jones \& Lauphlin June 30, 1942
    Data are not available prior to 1919; absorbed by Jones \& Laughlin June 30, 1942 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Rate of roturi

[^6]:    Data not available prior to 1930.
    Data not available prior to 1919; absorbed by Jones \& Laughlin June 30, 1942.
    Rate of return for 18 months, due to change from fiscal year, June 30, to calendar year December 31.
    Denotes loss.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Federal Trade Commission's report to the Temporary National Economic Committee, pt. 31. Investments, Profits and Rates of Return for Selected Industries.
    ${ }^{2}$ Pt. 1, 1911.

[^8]:    ${ }^{2}$ U. S. Steel Industry Board. Report to the President of the United States on the Labor Dispute in the Basic Steel Industry, p. 27.

[^9]:    4 Ibid., pp. 32-34, passim.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ibid., pp. 44, 45 .

[^10]:    Not available.
    Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, release of Secretary of Commerce, Dec. 5, 1949, based on data of the Census of Manufactures of 1947.
    ${ }^{5}$ U.S. Federal Trade Commission, Report * * on the Concentration of Productive Facilities, 1947; Washington, 1949; pp. 23-24.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Brown, D. C., Study Shows Strip and Bar Extra Changes, Iron Age, December 29, 1949, p. 61.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ "How Much Will Automaking Costs Go Up?" Steel, December 26, 1949, p. 19.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ United States Steel Industry Board, Report to the President of the United States on the Labor Dispute in the Basic Steel Industry, September 10,1949, p. 6.

    2 Ibid., pp. 53-55.

[^14]:    ${ }^{3}$ The-Economic, Report of the President, January 1950. pp. 72-73.

