ATTENTION - EEL LABORATORY

A photographic copy of a document in the possession of the subject of this case, this document being a certificate of satisfactory service made out to ENSIGN [REDACTED] and signed for the present by JAMES FORRESTAL, Secretary of the Navy.

It is believed possible that the signature of JAMES FORRESTAL has been forged to this instrument, and the Washington Field Office has been requested to furnish the laboratory with specimens of the handwriting of persons authorized to sign JAMES FORRESTAL's signature on these certificates of satisfactory service.

It is requested that the signatures of authorized signers of Mr. FORRESTAL's name be compared with the signature appearing on the above certificate of satisfactory service in an effort to establish the validity of this document.

EUL.43
43-1986
encl
Los Angeles
Letter February 20, 1943

Document
Examination requested by:

Specimen

RESULTS OF EXAMINATION:

As soon as the known handwriting specimens are received from the Washington Division the requested examination will be made and you will be advised. Inasmuch as there is a possible recovery involved it would be better if the original or a photocopy was available, and there is a possibility the original may be necessary for a positive conclusion to be reached.

Specimen No. 1 is retained in the files of the laboratory.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON D.C.

March 5, 1943

SECRET

Los Angeles

To follow: the report of the FBI Laboratory on the examination requested in your letter dated February 10, 1943.

Edgar Hoover
43-12-47
Director

Los Angeles

Letter February 10, 1943

Sincerely,

Examination conducted by...

Request that the [signature] appearing on [redacted] be compared with specimens of the handwriting of persons authorized to sign James Forrestal's signature on the Certificate of Satisfactory Service.

Results of Examination:

Various signatures of James Forrestal appearing as known handwriting and also as writing prepared by a mechanical signature writer have been compared with the questioned James Forrestal signature on [redacted]. A definite conclusion could not be reached inasmuch as the photostatic copy of the original evidence is not sufficiently clear for an examination and comparison with known specimens with the thought of reaching a definite conclusion. However there were noted characteristics appearing in the Forrestal signature on [redacted] that were similar to characteristics appearing in a signature which had been made by a mechanical signature writer of the United States Navy Department.

For your information...
SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

by JAMES F. DEAN, assistant for the President,

by the Secretary of the Navy.

- RUG -

REFERENCE:
Report of SA MAYNE L. ESHERICK, Los Angeles,
a/24/43

DETAILS:
SAC, Washington, D. C.

April 29, 1947

Director, FM

The C. E. Hanson Company, a corporation, vs.
James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy
and also as Acting Secretary of the Navy;
Navy Price Adjustment Board; and W. John Kennedy,
Chairman, Navy Price Adjustment Board;
Tax Court Docket No. 98-R,
RENEGOTIATION ACT.

Attached are two copies of a memorandum dated April 23, 1947 from
Mr. John F. Emmett, Assistant Attorney General, and the enclosures indicated
therein. You are requested to perform the investigation outlined, as the
availability of personnel will permit, and to return the enclosures personally
to Room 3616 Department of Justice, upon the completion of the preliminary audit.

A copy of the Claims Division memorandum is designated for the attention
of the Chicago Office, it being noted that the address of the C. E. Hanson
Company is 303-305 West Erie Street, Chicago, Illinois. No investigation will
be conducted by the Chicago Office until a report is submitted by the Washington
Field office and a subsequent memorandum is received from the Claims Division.

Enclosure

cc - Chicago (with enclosure).
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

   James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy,
   and also as Acting Secretary of the Navy,
   Navy Price Adjustment Board, and W. John
   Kennedy, Chairman, Navy Price Adjustment
   Board; Tax Court Docket No. 93-R.

In the above-entitled case the petitioner seeks a redetermination
of its excessive profits for its fiscal year ended December 31, 1942. Its
position is that the determination of the Navy Price Adjustment Board was
too high. The Government's position, on the other hand, is that the peti-
tioner's excessive profits were not less than has been found by the Board.
If the facts warrant it we shall urge the Tax Court to find that petitioner's
excessive profits were greater in amount than is shown by the present deter-
mination.

We have obtained from the Navy Price Adjustment Board its files
relative to the proceeding had before it with respect to the petitioner's
fiscal year ended December 31, 1942. These files are being transmitted
herewith. We are also transmitting copies of the petition, amendment to
petition and answer filed in this case.

There are also transmitted herewith certified photostatic copies of
 corporation income and excess profits tax returns, with attached schedules,
for the years 1936 to 1943, inclusive.

In our opinion it is important that we have this material analyzed
by an accountant before any examination is made of the petitioner's books
and records. Accordingly it is requested that you have an accountant of
your local Washington field office examine and analyze the data transmitted
herewith and submit his report, including therein the following:

1. A summary of petitioner's income, costs, profits and net worth
   for its fiscal year ended December 31, 1942, divided between renegotiable
   business and nonrenegotiable business as claimed by the petitioner.

2. An analysis of the theories put forward by the petitioner, in allocating
   costs between renegotiable and nonrenegotiable business, including its
total business between that which is renegotiable and that which is not, in
    amortizing equipment, in setting up reserves, etc.
3. The applicability of alternative accounting theories to the petitioner's business. We of course are particularly interested in those theories the application of which shows smaller total expenses and greater net income for renegotiable business.

4. An analysis of petitioner's income, costs, profits and net worth for its fiscal year 1942, divided between renegotiable and nonrenegotiable business as worked out by the Navy Price Adjustment Board.

5. An analysis of the theories used by the Navy Price Adjustment Board in arriving at the petitioner's income, costs, profits and net worth for its fiscal year 1942 and dividing each between renegotiable and nonrenegotiable business.

6. A discussion of apparent discrepancies, if any, between the data submitted by petitioner and the pertinent income tax returns filed by it.

7. A summary of the petitioner's profit and loss for each of its fiscal years prior to the one involved in this suit, beginning with 1936. The petitioner's average profit and loss for these years should be worked out with a subtotal for the years 1936 to 1939, inclusive.

8. Suggestions as to what information might be available in petitioner's books and records which could be obtained by an accounting examination of them which would possibly have a bearing on the question of the amount of petitioner's excessive profits for its fiscal year 1942 under the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as amended.

__________________________
(Room 3616, Department of Justice) is in charge of this case for the Government. He will be available for any conferences desired by your accountant to the end that the requested report, when submitted, will enable us intelligently to outline the nature and scope of the examination we expect to have made in due course of the petitioner's books and records.

John F. Sonnett
Assistant Attorney General.

Attachments.
SAM, Washington Field

Director, FBI

The O. H. Hanson Company, a corporation, vs.
James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy
and also as Acting Secretary of the Navy,
Navy Price Adjustment Board, and W. John Kennedy,
Chairman, Navy Price Adjustment Board;
Tax Court Docket No. 32-R.
RENEGOTIATION ACT.

Rebuttal 4/29/47.

Please expedite the submission of a report.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

ACCOUNTING REPORT

The C. H. HANSON COMPANY, a Corporation, vs.
JAMES V. FORMESTAL, Secretary of the Navy and
also as Acting Secretary of the Navy, NAVY
PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD, & W. JOHN KENNEDY,
Chairmen, Navy Price Adjustment Board;
Tax Court Docket No. 98-R

ACCIDENT REPORT

The C. H. HANSON COMPANY derived $260,000 excessive profits for 1942 arising
out of sales directly and indirectly to the government for
war end use. This amount less applicable federal income
and tax credit of $208,000 leaves $52,000 net refund due. Renegotiable profit of $298,751.79 was
49.42% of renegotiable sales. Elimination of excessive profit reduced this to
113.25% of adjusted renegotiable sales as compared with .83%
or less than 1% for "base period." Company's earned surplus
increased $65,400.60 from 1936 to 1940 and during 1941 and
1942 increased $129,934.58. Aggregate cash dividends of
$32,000 paid in later two years and officers' salaries
were substantially increased. Company paid refund of
$52,000 but disagreed with the determination and filed
petition in Tax Court of United States, dated October 31,
1944, Docket No. 98-R. The petition alleges general
points of error and raises no specific contentions as to
renegotiable data used in the determination. Files of
FBA reviewed and pertinent schedules set out.

REF: Bureau letter dated April 29, 1947
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION
II. HISTORY OF COMPANY
III. HISTORY OF RENEGOTIATION
IV. PETITION FILED BEFORE UNITED STATES TAX COURT
V. SUMMARY AND COMMENTS ON RENEGOTIABLE AND NON-RENEGOTIABLE SALES, COSTS AND PROFITS OF COMPANY
VI. SUMMARY AND COMMENTS ON COMPANY'S PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENTS FOR YEARS 1936 THROUGH 1941
VII. SUMMARY OF BALANCE SHEETS OF COMPANY FOR YEARS 1936 THROUGH 1942
VIII. CONCLUSION
IX. ENCLOSURES
Investigation in this case was commenced as a result of the Bureau letter to this office, dated April 29, 1947, which enclosed copies of a memorandum from JOHN P. SOLLER, Assistant Attorney General, dated April 23, 1947. There were forwarded with this memorandum a copy of a petition filed by the C. H. HANSON COMPANY with the Tax Court of the United States on October 31, 1944, the renegotiation file of the Price Adjustment Board of the Navy Department and certified photostatic copies of income tax returns of the petitioner for the years 1936 through 1942, inclusive. The memorandum requested the data submitted pertaining to the year ending December 31, 1942, be analyzed to facilitate an examination of the petitioner's books and records. The memorandum outlined the type of investigation required; however, will not be set forth in this report as a copy of the memorandum has been forwarded to the Chicago Division of this Bureau where the HANSON COMPANY is located. This report will cover the investigation as outlined.

II. HISTORY OF COMPANY

This company was established in 1866 as a sole proprietorship and was incorporated in the State of Illinois in July 1913. The company's regular business consists of the manufacture of a wide range of marking devices, such as stencils, steel stamps and dies, instruction and identification plates and tags, store and badge, rubber stamps, stencil ink and paste, trade marks, license plates and similar products. The management of the company is in the hands of HENRY J. & CHARLES H. HANSON, sons of the founder. These two persons occupy the positions of president and treasurer respectively and each holds 127-3/5 shares of stock. The total stock issue is 2000 shares. HENRY J. HANSON and EDWARD C. HANSON are sons of the founder and occupy the position of secretary and assistant secretary respectively. The company owns 225 shares of stock and the other 347-3/5 shares of stock respectively.

The company's principal contribution to the war effort was the successful development of a machine process for the engraving of nickel silver drums for Navy gun mounts manufactured by Nisle Printing Press and Manufacturing Company. The company also did steel lettering and furnished stencil sets for the Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot in Indiana. The service as a subcontractor to Nisle and to the depot consisted of a majority of renegotiable sales performed by the company for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1942.

The company employs approximately 150 skilled technicians, such as engravers, artists and designers. It occupies approximately 7000 square feet of factory space which is located at 309 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
III. HISTORY OF RENEGOTIATION

On July 31, 1943, the C. H. HANSON COMPANY submitted Standard Form of Contractors Report to Major [ ], Department of the United States Departmental Price Adjustment Board, P.O. Box 2707, Washington, D.C., in answer to a letter of preliminary inquiry dated July 2, 1943. This report, dated July 31, 1943, showed sales subject to renegotiation of $678,993.53, and sales not subject to renegotiation of $590,190.27, and total sales for the year ending December 31, 1942 as $1,269,183.90. The report was signed by C. H. HANSON as treasurer. It is to be noted that the allocation of sales as set forth in this report is only an estimate prepared by the company and at a later date a complete analysis was made by the company for sales both to renegotiable and non-renegotiable character, and an analysis of manufacturing costs and expenses was also submitted.

The company was advised by letter, dated August 10, 1943, from Departmental Price Adjustment Board, that based on information submitted further consideration as to the renegotiation of the company’s contracts was being referred to the Navy Department. On August 21, 1943, the Navy Department accepted assignments from the joint boards in accordance with assignment notice, dated August 9, 1943.

On September 15, 1943, by letter from Lieutenant, USNR, secretary, Price Adjustment Board, Washington, D.C., to regional Price Adjustment Board, Navy Department, 100 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois, the renegotiation of the company was forwarded to the regional office in view of the location of the petitioner’s place of business.

On September 30, 1943, the chairman of the Regional Price Adjustment Board, requested the HANSON COMPANY to furnish the Navy Department statements of actual costs of production under its contracts and subcontracts to which the provisions of Section 403 of the 6th Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act applied. On March 3, 1944, a meeting was held by the Regional Price Adjustment Board and the company. Present at this meeting for the Price Adjustment Board was [ ] and [ ] of the board, and Lieutenants (j.n.t.) [ ] and [ ] representing the company were [ ], [ ], and [ ].

Minutes of this meeting disclosed that there was discussed the type of work performed by the company toward war and use and particularly the work performed for the Miehle Printing Press and Manufacturing Company of Chicago, mentioning the latter company as holding a prime contract with the Navy. The meeting also discussed the savings to the
government in connection with this subcontract work, the history of the company in so far as earnings were concerned, the manner of segregation of negotiable and non-negotiable sales, and the allocation of costs in determining negotiable profit. It is to be noted that this meeting was held after the Regional Price Adjustment Board had been furnished with all financial data which was used both by the government and the petitioner for determining negotiable profits.

In a subsequent section in this report there will be discussed the manner of segregation of sales, as well as the allocation of costs, that was used. In support of this exhibits and schedules have been prepared.

The board recommended after reviewing the figures submitted and hearing the petitioner's explanations that an excessive profit of $260,000 was realized and recommended a refund of this amount after taking proper account of credit for federal income and excessive profit taxes.

A second meeting was held by the representatives of the company and representatives of the Regional Price Adjustment Board on March 16, 1944, whereby the company disagreed with the manner of computing excessive profits which will be subsequently explained. As a result of this meeting the board agreed that the excessive profit of $260,000 should be refunded after proper credits; however, the company was advised that a hearing should be arranged with the Washington, D.C., Price Adjustment Board to determine if their findings would be the same as the regional board findings.

By memorandum dated March 23, 1944, the chairman of the Chicago board forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy Price Adjustment Board the entire 1942 file of the company and on April 24, 1944, a meeting with the Price Adjustment Board of the Navy Department was held. Present at this meeting for the company were HENRY E. HANSON, President, and . This meeting in Washington constituted a new hearing on the entire matter and at this meeting the company stated the company was not raising any issue with respect to the figures upon which the regional board made its determination but the issue was only in respect to the determination itself. As a result of this meeting the board unanimously agreed that the company had realized $260,000 excessive profits and proposed a refund of that amount less credit for federal taxes paid.

The company by letter dated May 5, 1944, to the Navy Price Adjustment Board, 718 18th Street, NE, Washington, D.C., advised that it was declining to concede that the sum of $260,000 represented excessive profit.
On May 17, 1944, a letter was directed to the company from the Navy Price Adjustment Board, Washington, D.C., advising that it had been recommended that an issuance of a unilateral determination determining that excessive profits of $260,000 had been realized and offered the company opportunity to present any additional consideration that would assist their case.

A second meeting was held in Washington, D.C., on June 20, 1944, for further consideration of the matter. [Omitted: person present for the company. As a result of this meeting the company was advised that if the board recommendation for an adjustment of excessive profits was not made, the unilateral determination would be made.]

A unilateral determination showing $260,000 in excessive profit as realized by the C. H. HANSON COMPANY for the year ending December 31, 1942, was made, dated June 17, 1944. It was submitted to the Secretary of the Navy July 22, 1944, and was approved.

On August 4, 1944, a letter was directed to the company, signed by the Navy Price Adjustment Board, requesting that an amount equal to the difference between the excessive profit determined and the tax credit to which the company is entitled under Section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code be paid on or about August 14, 1944.

By letter dated August 21, 1944, to the Certification Disbursing Division, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Navy Department, the company refunded $22,000 which was the amount determined after a credit of $234,000 representing a tax credit under Section 3806 of the Internal Revenue Code. The company stated that this amount was paid in accordance with the request of the Price Adjustment Board. However, it was in no way expressly or impliedly admitting that any excessive profit was realized.

IV. PETITION FILED BEFORE UNITED STATES TAX COURT

A petition for determination under the Renegotiation Act was filed before the Tax Court of the United States through the petition was sworn to by HENRY J. HANSON on October 31, 1944. The petition generally set forth that the excessive profit figure of $260,000 in the unilateral determination is erroneous as no excessive profits were received, that the provisions of the Renegotiation Act and amendments do not pertain to the operations of the company for the year ending December 31, 1942, and that the act is unconstitutional. The petition further states that if the act is applicable, it should not apply to sales made for the year 1942 on purchase orders received prior to April 28, 1942, to the extent that payments made and paid for prior to this date are not subject to renegotiation.
V. SUBSIDIARY AND CORDENTS ON RENEGOTIABLE AND NON-RENEGOTIABLE SALES, COSTS AND PROFITS OF COMPANY

The following is an analysis of sales for the C. H. EASON COMPANY for the year ending December 31, 1942, divided as to renegotiable and non-renegotiable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renegotiable</th>
<th>Non-Renegotiable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct to U.S. Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jeffersonville Q.M. Depot</th>
<th>Renegotiable</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sub-Contracts

(a) Miehle Printing Press & Mfg. Company
(b) Jas. H. Matthews & Co.
(c) Ecm Electric Co.
(d) Other sub-contracts
Steel Stamps & Dies
Data & Instruction Plates
Stencils
Employee & Guard Badges
Tecl & Time Checks
Sundrys

$119,620.41 $254,822.45 $664,212.66 $2,289,115.00

In apportioning sales subject to renegotiation, the petitioner used the following basis on sales direct to the United States Government and on subcontracts. There were tabulated all invoices of sales issued after April 22, 1942, regardless of product sold. All unfinished current contracts as of that date were then examined and all payments for shipments made thereon prior to April 22, 1942, were added to the total. This procedure, according to the petitioner, gave the total government sales subject to renegotiation. In the allocation of sales of steel stamps and dies the petitioner advised that 77% of the sales made were to trade customers, hardware stores and supply houses and 23% directly to the consumer. It was then determined that 44% of the 77% of sales to trade customers, etc., would be subject to renegotiation. The 44% determination was arrived at by using statistics from the Department of Agriculture. In this connection figures disclose that 44% of the national expenditures were for war purposes indicating that 44% of the industry was converted for war purposes. Under the steel stamps and dies group of sales there was tabulated every invoice issued after April 15, 1942. April 15th was selected as a cut-off date for this item as a substantial number of the petitioner's customers were operating on a ten-day discount basis and it was the opinion of the petitioner that any invoice issued prior to that date and not paid prior to April 26th would be offset by those issued after April 15th and not discounted prior to April 26th.
The sales of data and instruction plates were allocated in the same manner as steel stamps and dies in so far as the cut-off date of April 15, 1942, is concerned. The petitioner concluded that these items do not directly enter into production of equipment and are further removed from war use than steel stamps and dies. Petitioner estimated 25% of sales of this character should be considered renegotiable.

The petitioner considered that sales of stencils, and employee and guard baiiges, tool and time checks, and sundries to the general trade were not considered subject to renegotiation.

The manner of segregation of sales as explained above is more fully set out in a letter to the Regional Price Adjustment Board in Chicago dated March 2, 1944, and this basis was accepted by the PAB for renegotiation purposes. It was on this basis that the unilateral determination was made.

The company also submitted detailed information as to the costs and expenses in connection with operations for the year ending December 31, 1942. There was prepared from the data submitted and made a part of this report Exhibit A which is an operating statement for the year ending December 31, 1942, divided as to renegotiable and non-renegotiable business showing the operating results before giving consideration to the determination of $260,000 excessive profit and showing results after deduction of $260,000 from renegotiable sales and profits.

Schedules 1, 2 and 3 were prepared which make reference to Exhibit A and are also made a part of this report, pertaining to manufacturing, administrative and selling and shipping expenses.
Figures contained in Exhibit A and in Schedules 1, 2 and 3 as submitted by the petitioner were used for the purpose of renegotiation and acceptable to the Price Adjustment Board. The special sales item of $284,822.45 is a subcontract to Miele Printing Press and Manufacturing Company. Sales subject to renegotiation were 47.63% of total sales. From examination of Exhibit A it is noted that the percentage of operating profit on sales renegotiable regular sales was 36.74% and 62.66% on renegotiable special sales. The total renegotiable profit to renegotiable sales was considered to be 49.42%. After giving affect to the excessive profits determined of $260,000, the percentage of operating profit to sales on renegotiable sales was computed to be 11.25% as compared to 49.42% before this application. The percentage of operating profit on non-renegotiable sales before and after giving effect to $260,000 remains the same.

By examination of Schedules 1, 2 and 3 there is an analysis as to the manner of allocating manufacturing, administrative and selling and shipping expenses which shows that the expenses were applied in instances on a sales basis on an arbitrary percentage basis, actual basis, direct labor basis or other basis which is explained. The company maintained at the various meetings with the Price Adjustment Boards in Chicago and Washington, D.C. that if the percentage of profit on renegotiable sales was computed on the sales figure of $604,462.86 after the elimination of the excessive profits of $260,000 rather than on $344,462.86 ($604,462.86 minus $250,000) the percentage of operating profit would be only 6.41% which would not be excessive. The petitioner further stated that if the prorata amount of federal income and excess profits taxes of approximately $229,000 had been deducted from the operating profit, the percentage would be only approximately 9.65%. Petitioner stated that after deducting the prorata federal income and excess profits taxes the net profit would be approximately $97,747 and then after deducting $52,000, the amount of the refund, the residual net profit would be approximately $45,747, or only 1.28% of renegotiable sales.

The net profit after federal income taxes and before the $52,000 reimbursement (refund on account of renegotiation) on the entire business for the year ended December 31, 1942, was $137,564.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net income before taxes</th>
<th>$492,098.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income taxes per 1942 tax return</td>
<td>$392,825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Postwar refund of excessive profits</td>
<td>$38,291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$354,534.00</td>
<td>$137,564.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depreciation was computed on a straight line method, varying from 2% to 20% and the amount recorded in the books is the same as that shown for federal tax purposes. No accelerated depreciation was taken for the year under review and the company has no equipment covered by certificate of
necessity. There was no depreciation claimed on assets previously depreciated and the total depreciation claimed as shown in Schedules 1, 2 and 3 does not appear to be excessive.

The negotiator for the Regional Price Adjustment Board pointed out in his report, dated February 16, 1944, that from his work papers the 25% basis used by the petitioner in estimating sales of data and instruction plates subject to renegotiation was probably low in view of the contractor’s statement that these items do not directly enter into production in the same sense as do steel stamp. The negotiator stated that to the extent that they are a part of machinery and equipment used in producing war material they are renegotiable. Similarly stencils used for marking shipments should probably be considered renegotiable to the extent that they are used on war material. In this respect the negotiator stated the possible increases in renegotiable sales would be approximately $28,000. He mentioned this to be offset through the petitioner’s method of allocating costs and expenses. It is to be noted from Schedules 1, 2 and 3 that expenses such as commissions, advertising, bad debts, dues and subscriptions and some other expense items were charged directly to non-renegotiable business. Of clerical, selling and shipping salaries 70% was charged to non-renegotiable business. The negotiator pointed out that according to the computation if all expenses except those allocated on an actual basis were allocated on a sales basis then renegotiable profit would be lowered by $3,868; further that from his review of the petitioner’s books many items of cost were charged to non-renegotiable sales that might properly have been prorated. The negotiator concluded that the petitioner did a reasonably acceptable job of a difficult segregation and that any understatement of renegotiable sales could be considered offset by a liberal allocation of costs to non-renegotiable business and suggested no changes.

There are set forth below the names of officers receiving salaries in excess of $10,000 for the year ending December 31, 1942 and are compared with years 1940 and 1941.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Title</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HENRY J. HANSON, president</td>
<td>$4,940.00</td>
<td>$5,120.00</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES K. HANSEN, treasurer</td>
<td>3,380.00</td>
<td>10,440.00</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWIN C. BAND, secretary</td>
<td>3,380.00</td>
<td>10,440.00</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD C. BAND, assistant secretary</td>
<td>3,120.00</td>
<td>2,810.00</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,920.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,810.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The negotiator pointed out in his report that the Bureau of Internal Revenue had apparently questioned the salaries paid to officers for the year 1942. In justification of the increase the company submitted a report prepared by pointing out that officers’ salaries had previously been held down with agreement with bankers during the years the company was borrowing money and that 1941
salaries were but 7.3% of sales as compared with an average ratio of 8.79% of such salaries to sales for 14 companies in the industry surveyed by the Department of Commerce. The allocation of officer's salaries for the year 1942 is reflected in Schedules 1, 2 and 3 of this report.

Attention is called to the item of royalties paid of $13,670.44, which is set forth under renegotiable sales special in Schedule 2 of this report. The petitioner explained that these royalties were paid to a man

This individual is[ ] and presently[ ]

The petitioner through[ ] stated that the rate was $2.00 per drum and was paid in accordance with an agreement dated October 1, 1941.

The negotiator pointed out that only a portion of the amount of $13,670.44 to the extent of approximately $9700 should be properly charged to renegotiable business. A portion of the Hialeh contract was performed in 1941 and therefore not subject to renegotiation.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONTENTS OF COMPANY'S PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENTS FOR YEARS 1936 THROUGH 1941

There was prepared summary profit and loss statements of the petitioner for the years 1936 through 1941 as taken from federal income tax returns supplied to this office by the Department. These summaries are set forth on Exhibit B which has been made a part of this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attention is called to the percentage of net profit on net sales for these years which are shown on Exhibit C. The percentage of profit on sales for the base period of the years 1926 through 1929 was 10% and it was determined to be 13% or less than 14%. Attention is called to the operating results for the year 1929 shown on this exhibit wherein the percentage increased to 18.4% over 13% for the prior year. The petitioners during the various hearings held stated that the base period for determining a fair operating profit on sales should be taken from the results of operations for the years 1920 through 1929 as this was a normal production period of operation for the company, mentioning that it was during these years the company made and sold license plates to states and cities which constituted a large segment of the company's business. After 1929 the plates were sold free of charge and therefore profits of the company were abnormally low and should not be considered a normal period of operation for the company. This condition continued to exist through the base period.

From a schedule of operations submitted by the petitioner setting forth sales, cost of sales, expenses and profit for the years 1920 through 1942 supporting its position, the negotiator prepared the following summary of operations and percentages. It is being set out at this time for comparison with the percentages computed for the year under investigation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Average Profit Before Jaxes</th>
<th>Average Net Profit Before Jaxes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>694,302</td>
<td>52,924</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-32</td>
<td>301,255</td>
<td>(64,052)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-36</td>
<td>265,901</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-40</td>
<td>322,271</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. SUMMARY OF BALANCE SHEETS OF COMPANY
FOR YEARS 1926 THROUGH 1942

From the information supplied to the Price Adjustment Board by the petitioners there was prepared for the purpose of this report Exhibit D which is a comparative balance sheet of the company for the years 1926 through 1942 and also Exhibit D which is an analysis of earned surplus for the years 1940, 1941 and 1942.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSET</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Assets:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIABILITY</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Liabilities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUITY</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Equity:**

**Note:** The table appears to be a comparative balance sheet for the C.R. Hanoly Co., with years 1940, 1941, and 1942.
Examining the earned surplus account for the years 1940, 1941, and 1942 which is shown on Exhibits C and D, it will be noted that the balance in this account improved from a balance of $73,750.50 to $197,038.58 for the period from January 1, 1940, to December 31, 1942, after dividends of $7,000 in 1941 and $25,000 in 1942 were paid. In addition to this improvement of the surplus account, attention again is called to the fact that officers' salaries in 1940 were $14,820, in 1941 were $45,810 and in 1942 were $76,000. It is noted that net profits before renegotiation and after federal taxes were deducted amounted to $137,564, which is 34.65% of net worth of $397,038.58 as of December 31, 1942.

VIII. CONCLUSION

There appears to be no dispute as to segregation of sales for the purposes of renegotiation and the allocation of costs. The figures submitted by the petitioner were used without adjustment. The chief disagreement as has heretofore been set out is that excessive profits should be determined only after federal income taxes have been deducted. Had this procedure been adopted, there would have been no excessive profits for renegotiation. Further, in arriving at a percentage to indicate a fair rate of return, the adjusted sales figure ($260,000 deducted from net sales) should not be used. It appears that a complete analysis of costs and explanation as to the segregation of sales was submitted by the petitioner and it is not believed that an accounting investigation of the petitioner's books and records would materially improve the government's position. In view of the petitioner's remarks that the base period of operation was an abnormal period the government attorney may consider it important to study a number of representative companies in the same type of business as that of petitioner to ascertain a normal margin of profit for these years. This is particularly true since the petitioner's margin of profit for the base period was less than 1%.

IX. ENCLOSURES TO THE BUREAU

Files of the Navy Price Adjustment Board pertaining to Petitioner's operations for the year 1942.
Certified photostatic copies of federal income and excess profits tax returns for the years 1936 through 1942.

These files are being transmitted to the Bureau in accordance with Bureau instructions in order that they may be forwarded to the Department.

Copies of this report have been designated for the Chicago Division inasmuch as investigation may be desired at this company at the direction of the Department.
Docket of U. S. Tax Court reflects that on October 5, 1949, the court dismissed this case on account of non-appearance. As a result of this dismissal, the determination made by the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board that petitioner earned excessive profits of $2,000,000 for the calendar year 1942 remains in full force and effect.

A check of the docket, U. S. Tax Court, reflects that on October 5, 1949, the court dismissed plaintiff's petition on account of non-appearance of plaintiff. As a result of this dismissal, the determination made by the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board that petitioner earned excessive profits of $2,000,000 for the calendar year 1942 remains in full force and effect.
A copy of this report is being designated for the Chicago Division to complete its files. It will be noted that no field examination was conducted by the Chicago Division inasmuch as no request for an accounting examination in the field was received from the Department.

CLOSED
Department of the Navy
Building T-3
Washington 25, D. C.

Attn: Room 1629 - Renegotiation Div.

Re: G. H. Hanson Company v. Secretary of the Navy, Tax Ct. 499-R.

Gentlemen:

Please be advised that on October 5, 1949, the Tax Court of the United States entered an order dismissing the petition in the above-entitled proceeding.

This dismissal leaves in full force and effect the determination made by the respondent that the petitioner for its fiscal year ended December 31, 1942, had excessive profits in the principal amount of $260,000.

Sincerely yours,
For the Attorney General,

R. G. Kinsman,
Assistant Attorney General.

cc: Federal Bureau of Investigation

Internal Revenue Service

6-11 Nov. 7, 1949
War Contracts Price Adjustment Board  
Room 325, The Pentagon  
Washington 25, D.C.

De: William A. Leiser, et al.  
d/b/a K. A. Leiser & Company  
v. James Forrestal; Tax Court  
Docket No. 100-R.

Sir:

Respectfully,  
For the Attorney General,

HERBERT A. BERGEN  
Acting Assistant Attorney General.

cc: Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Bureau of Internal Revenue  
(Mary Dept)  
Chief  
District Court Section

RECORDED  
46-13 650-5  
26 JUL 15 1947
SIAO, Washington Field

July 9, 1947

Director, FBI

RECORD:
WILLIAM A. LEISER, ET AL.
VS. JAMES FORRESTAL, SECRETARY
OF NAVY, ET AL. TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 359-R

RESENTATION ACT

46-13650

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
MAILED 9
JUL 9-1947 P.M.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
June 27, 1947

Mr. Francis Heggie, Counsel
Navy Price Adjustment Board
Room 338
Navy Department
Washington, D.C.

Re: William A. Leizer, et al.
Vs. James Forrestal, Secretary of Navy, et al., Tax
Court Docket No. 352-Y.

Sir:

[Blank]

Respectfully,
For the Attorney General,

PETTY FORD,
Assistant Attorney General.

cc: Federal Bureau of Investigation
    Bureau of Internal Revenue
    (War Dept.)
    Chief
    Finance Loan Section

[Handwritten note: 7/16/47]
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EX-58

December 31, 1947

SAC, Washington Field

Director, FBI

The Austin Company v. Secretary of
the Navy, Tax Docket No. 104-R
Renegotiation Act

There are attached for your attention two copies of a self-explanatory memorandum from the Claims Division, dated December 26, 1947 together with the enclosures indicated therein. Upon completion of the investigation, the enclosures should be returned by your office to the Bureau.

A copy of the Claims Division memorandum is being forwarded to the Cleveland Office inasmuch as the address of the petitioner is 16112 Euclid Avenue, East Cleveland, Ohio. No investigation will be conducted by the Cleveland Office until a report has been submitted by the Washington Field Office and a subsequent memorandum received from the Claims Division.

Enclosures

cc - Cleveland (with enclosure)
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

December 26, 1947

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

Re: The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy, Tax Docket No. 104-R

In the above-entitled case, the petitioner seeks a re-determination of its excessive profits for its fiscal year ending December 31, 1941 and 1942. Its position is that the determination of the respondent was too high; the Government's position, on the other hand, is that the petitioner's excessive profits were not less than has been found by the respondent. If the facts warrant it, we will urge the Tax Court to find that the petitioner's excessive profits were greater in amount than is shown by the present determination.

The petitioner plans to rely in the Tax Court on the financial data submitted by it to the delegate which renegotiated the petitioner for and on behalf of the respondent.

The following information and material is herewith forwarded:

1. Copies of the petition and answer filed in this case.

2. All available tax returns for this petitioner for the period beginning 1936.

3. The renegotiation file obtained from the renegotiating agency for the fiscal year involved.

The Austin Company is an Ohio corporation with its principal offices located at 16112 Euclid Avenue, East Cleveland, Ohio. Its counsel is the firm of McKeehan, Herrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

Department of Justice (Room 3348, Extension 1126) is in charge of this case on behalf of the Government. He will be available for any conferences desired by your accountants to the end that the requested report, when submitted, will enable us to intelligently outline the nature and scope of an audit we plan to have made of the petitioner's books and records.

[Signature]

15 JAN 9 1948
In our opinion, it is important that we have this material analyzed before any examination is made of petitioner's books and records. Accordingly, it is requested that you have an accountant of your local Washington Field Office examine and analyze the data transmitted herewith or referred to above and submit his report, including therein the following:

1. A summary of petitioner's income, costs, profits and net worth for its fiscal year involved herein, divided between renegotiable business and non-renegotiable business as claimed by the petitioner.

2. An analysis of the theories used by the petitioner in allocating costs between renegotiable and non-renegotiable business, in allocating its total business between that which is renegotiable and that which is not, in amortizing equipment, in setting up reserves, etc.

3. The applicability of alternative accounting theories to the petitioner's business. We, of course, are particularly interested in those theories the application of which would show smaller total expenses and greater net income from renegotiable business.

4. An analysis of petitioner's income, costs, profits and net worth for its fiscal year involved herein, divided between renegotiable and non-renegotiable business, as worked out by the renegotiating agency.

5. An analysis of the theories used by the renegotiating agency in arriving at the petitioner's income, costs, profits and net worth for its fiscal year involved herein, and dividing each between renegotiable and non-renegotiable business.

6. A discussion of apparent discrepancies, if any, between the data submitted by petitioner and the pertinent income tax returns filed by it.

7. A summary of the petitioner's profit and loss for each of its fiscal years prior to the one involved in this suit, beginning with the year 1936, if the petitioner was in business during that period. The petitioner's average profit and loss for the years 1936-1939 should be worked out.

8. A summary of the balance sheets covering the years 1936 to and including the year involved.

9. Suggestions as to what information might be available in petitioner's books and records which could be obtained by an accounting examination of them, and which possibly would have a bearing on the question of the amount of petitioner's excessive profits for its fiscal year involved herein, under the provisions of the Renegotiation Act, as amended.
10. In analyzing the data submitted in this case, it is requested that your accountant classify petitioner's business under the various headings set forth in the petition (pages 8-13, inclusive). For example, construction sales should show sales, costs and profits for (i) cost plus fixed fee contracts, (ii) negotiated fixed amount contracts, (iii) DFC business, (iv) transactions with Dow Chemical Company, and (v) sales prior to April 28, 1942. Possibly some of these subheadings will have to be further broken down, i. e., DFC business may have been both before and after April 28, 1942, or it may be under a negotiated fixed amount contract. There may be several subheadings under some of the other general classifications. It is believed that such a breakdown is advisable in order that we can stipulate as to the mathematical accuracy of the various contentions raised by the petitioner.

HERBERT A. BERGSON
Acting Assistant Attorney General

Attachments
# ACCOUNTING REPORT

The Navy PAB determined that petitioner derived excessive profits of $400,000 from its renegotiable contracts for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941, and $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942. Total sales in 1941 amounted to $87,481,222 of which $49,989,929 were not subject to renegotiation. Profits on renegotiable sales in 1941 before renegotiation amounted to $1,238,112 and $838,147 after renegotiation. Total sales in 1942 amounted to $258,329,483 of which $20,745,139 were not subject to renegotiation. Profits on renegotiable sales in 1942 before renegotiation amounted to $5,555,677 and to $5,555,677 after renegotiation. Contracts include both fixed price and cost plus fixed price. Schedules A and B prepared from the NPAB files reveal details of gross receipts and adjusted profits. Contractor denies excessive profits and filed petition in Tax Court on November 10, 1944 seeking a redetermination. No examination made of petitioner’s books and records by 20th. Copies of this report being designated for the Cleveland Division for information purposes.

---

**REFERENCE:** Bureau letter dated December 31, 1947.
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work is carried on in each of the seven such areas under the district managers who are generally vice-presidents. Each district office is patterned after an independent operating company, securing its own business and becoming a part of the local community. Each district maintains its own staff, storeyards and stock of construction equipment. The general office provides supervision and financial direction, determines policies, directs development and research activity and supervises the operations of the steel fabricating mill.

HISTORY OF RENEGOTIATION

The Austin Company was assigned to the Navy Department for renegotiation on August 6, 1942. On September 10, 1942, the Board requested the contractor to submit preliminary data for renegotiation purposes. On September 14, 1942, the company replied to the communication and advised that the information would be forthcoming.

On November 23, 1942, the contractor submitted the first information for renegotiation purposes in connection with the Board's request.

On February 20, 1943, the Austin Company wrote to the Navy enclosing various schedules and other information which had been requested theretofore by the Board. On March 26, 1943, the Company again wrote the Navy enclosing additional information such as financial statements and answers to specific questions which it stated constituted all of the specific schedules and information requested.

On April 19, 1943 the Company sent to the Navy schedules of contract data for the year ended December 31, 1942 showing construction sales, engineering sales and other financial data for that particular year.

Again on June 17, 1943, the Austin Company sent to the Board a number of additional schedules containing financial information consisting of balance sheets, surplus profit and loss statements, all pertaining to the fiscal year 1942. On July 8, 1943 the Board requested additional schedules from the company pertaining to its construction costs. The company replied on July 14, 1943 that ERNST and ERNST, Certified Public Accountants, would prepare the desired information.

On July 21, 1943 the Company submitted to the Board various exhibits and schedules for the purpose of placing on record the pertinent facts concerning the history, work and performance of the Austin Company, as a background for the analysis of the data previously submitted.
On September 23, 1943, the company again sent to the Board additional schedules pertaining to its financial transaction. Under date of December 3, 1943 the Board mailed to the Austin Company notice that an initial conference was set for December 17, 1943, in Washington, which notice the company acknowledged by its letter of December 7, 1943.

On December 17, 1943 a conference was held by the company and members of the Navy Price Adjustment Board in Washington, D. C. No final determination was made at this meeting with respect to excess profits.

Under date of February 19, 1944, the company sent to the Board additional information which had been requested by analysts of the Board. Again on April 3, 1944, the Board requested certain specific information from the company concerning details of information which it had previously submitted. The company replied to this request under date of April 19, 1944. On May 9, 1944, the company wrote to the Board enclosing various schedules and information submitted or to be submitted to the Bureau of Internal Revenue in connection with the reasonableness of salaries for the years 1940 and 1941 which were involved in the disallowance for income tax purposes. Under date of May 16, 1944, the Austin Company sent to the Board in response to telephonic requests, additional information concerning financial transactions of the Company for the years 1936 to 1942 inclusive.

Under date of May 24, 1944, a letter was sent to the Austin Company by the Board notifying the company of a renegotiation meeting to be held on June 5, 1944, in Washington, D. C., which the company acknowledged by letter of May 29, 1944.

On June 5th and 6th, renegotiation conferences were held in Washington, D. C., by the Board and the company. No definite agreement was reached as to the excessive profits at this meeting.

Under date of June 17, 1944, the Austin Company wrote to the Board referring to the preliminary findings made at this meeting of June 6th and advising that the company had not thought that the profits under cost plus a fixed fee contracts should be considered subject to reduction upon renegotiation. The company also offered various reasons as to why it considered the tentative determination of excessive profits by the Board to be unreasonably high.
On July 10, 1944, the Chairman of the Board wrote to the Austin Company advising it that the Board had carefully considered the information submitted theretofore and had found nothing which would justify a change in its findings made at a meeting with the company. Under date of July 17, 1944, the company wrote the Board advising it that in order to protect its position in regard to certain legal questions, it might be necessary for it to appeal to the Tax Court and that, therefore, the Board should make a unilateral determination.

Under date of August 14, 1944, a unilateral order was signed by the Board and mailed to the company with a letter noting that the company merely desired to protect its legal position and not to have the Chairman give further consideration to the matter. The determination of the Board was to the effect that the excessive profits for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941, amounted to $400,000 and the excessive profits for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942, amounted to $2,000,000 making a total of $2,400,000 excessive profits for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

On September 5, 1944, the Paymaster General of the Navy advised the company that the net balance of the excessive profits which have been determined would be $2,400,000 would be equal to $503,113.60 after the application of the tax credits to which the company would be entitled.

**DETERMINATION OF EXCESSIVE PROFITS**

The Navy Price Adjustment Board determined that the petitioner derived excess profits of $400,000 in the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941, which were applicable to cost plus fixed fee contracts.

The Board also determined that petitioner derived excess profits in the amount of $2,000,000 in the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942. Of this amount $200,000 was determined to be applicable to fixed price contracts and $1,800,000 was applicable to cost plus a fixed fee contracts.

The total amount of excessive profits amounts to $2,400,000 which is subject to a tax credit of $1,896,886.40 leaving a net refund due the Government of $503,113.60.

On March 15, 1945, the reporting agent joined in a conference with
This conference was held at the counsel's office of McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

At this conference, discussed with the petitioner as to what their decision would be as to the break-off date of April 28, 1942 in regard to their war business. pointed out that although in the petition filed with the Tax Court by The Austin Company they referred to the April 28th break-off date, they do not show any break-up of their total contracts as set forth in their sales figures on page 8 of this petition. and asked to think this over a while and stated that they would notify the reporting agent at a later date.

raised the question of the Defense Plant Corporation business and the tabulation of the contracts executed prior to July 1, 1943 as to their renegotiability. at this time acquainted and with the recent court opinion concerning the July 1, 1943 effective date of the amendment to the Renegotiation Act. Counsel and again stated that they wished to think this over and would notify the reporting agent at a later date.

During this conference, stated that he did not think the Price Adjustment Board gave adequate consideration to the fact that the Austin Company was performing four separate and distinct jobs; namely, (1) design and engineering of a project; (2) construction of a project; (3) the furnishing of construction equipment needed for the performance of the construction work; and (4) the fabrication of structural steel. further stated that the Austin Company had performed engineering services for the Government, at a cost to the Government which is much less than it would have paid had it entered into separate engineering contracts for the same work. stated he brought these points out because the Board had renegotiated them on a yearly basis instead of on a completed contract basis and pointed out the fact that in the year 1943 the petitioner realized a profit on cost plus a fixed fee contracts of 86 per cent before taxes and before renegotiation. replied that at the time renegotiation was first instituted, they, The Austin Company, could have made an agreement with the Price Adjustment Board as to how they wished their renegotiations to be handled and at this late date nothing further could be done about this matter.

replied that he was of the opinion that the court should take into consideration their profits for the year 1943, in which
year they were completing some of the continuing contracts and upon which they received no additional fee. Stated that the FBI would check the firm's 1943 records and submit them.

was contacted at The Austin Company's offices on March 23, 1949. At this time stated that The Austin Company had reached the following decision; namely, that the April 28, 1942 break-down would be waived and that all contracts, both Army and Navy, cost plus a fixed fee and lump sum would be considered on a yearly basis. Secondly, that in regard to the July 1, 1943 break-down for the Defense Plant Corporation, The Austin Company would stand upon the validity of the court decision in the Warner & Swasey case.

METHOD OF ACCOUNTING

The accounts are audited by ERNST and ERNST. The books are kept on an accrual basis, separate accounts being established for each construction project. Income on long term contracts is taken up on basis of estimates of completion. Fees on Cost Plus a Fixed Fee contracts are generally taken up in income as approved and passed for payment by the contracting officer or owners representatives.

Separate records are maintained for the principal departments of the company; namely, Construction, Engineering and Bliss Mill. In addition, costs of the individual contracts are charged with second party equipment rentals or rentals for the use of the company's own equipment. The method of booking the intra-company operations and equipment rental may be summarized as follows:

1. Construction costs include, at billing price, all intra-company operations and second party equipment rentals;

2. Such billing price for Engineering is generally cost plus 50% on lump sum work; for Bliss Mill is based on competitive prices, and for second party Equipment Rentals is in accordance with a company manual (small tools are generally charged at 2% of contract price) which rate appears to be below OPA and AGC rates;
Attached hereeto are two copies of the self-explanatory memorandum from H. C. Morison, Assistant Attorney General, dated January 31, 1949, together with the enclosures referred to therein. A copy of this memorandum is being furnished the Washington Field Office since they will ultimately report the results of the Tax Court. It is suggested that two copies of your report be furnished the Washington Field Office. You will note on page two of the attached memorandum that [signature] suggests that your office contact [name] or L. P. O'Brien, Vice President of the Austin Company, who will make the necessary records available for audit.

It is suggested, upon completion of the investigation of this case that you return the attached enclosures to the Bureau.

Attachment
cc: Washington Field (Dole)
AIM: MVP

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
MAILED 17
FEB 8 1949 P.M.

[Signature]
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Tax Court No. 104-R

January 31, 1949

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Re: The Austin Company v. James V. Forrestal,
Secretary of the Navy of the United States,
Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

Reference is made to my memorandum relative to the above-entitled case wherein
it was requested that the Washington field office of the Federal Bureau of Investi-
gation examine and analyze the data submitted by the petitioner and used in the
renegotiation of the excessive profits of the petitioner. Pursuant thereto, the
report of Edward J. Armbrester (A) has been received.

It is now requested that you assign an accountant to examine the petitioner's
books and records with a view to ascertaining, among other things, the following:

1. The accuracy of the figures set forth in the schedules and exhibits contained
in Agent Armbrester's report. Possibly with respect to certain of these items spot
checks will suffice. However, it is requested that the examination of your accountant
be sufficient to satisfy him as to the accuracy of such figures. It will be noted
that auditors for the Navy Department have made certain rather comprehensive examinations
with respect to certain of the items set forth in the schedules and exhibits. Wherever it is possible, it is suggested that the work of these men be utilized.

2. The amount of renegotiable sales for 1941 and 1942. It will be noted that
the determination includes excessive profits for both 1941 and 1942.

3. Income, costs and profits of the Austin Company for the years 1936 to 1942,
inclusive, with subtotals for the period 1936 to 1939, inclusive.

4. The renegotiable sales, costs and profits for the years 1941 and 1942.

5. An examination and analysis of the controllable items of expense in view
of the fact that certain of said items were disallowed as being excessive and others
because they were not allocable to the contracts renegotiated in these cases. This
latter item is due to the fact that the larger portion of the excessive profits for
1942 was applicable to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

6. In analyzing the data submitted in this case, it is requested that your
accountant classify petitioner's business under the various headings set forth in
the petition, pages 8 to 13, inclusive. For example, construction sales should
show sales, costs and profits for (i) cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, (ii) negotiated
fixed amount contracts, (iii) DPC business, (iv) transactions with Dow Chemical
Company, and (v) sales prior to April 28, 1942. Possibly some of these subheadings
will have to be further broken down, i.e., DPC business may have been both before
and after April 28, 1942, or it may be under a negotiated fixed amount contract.
There may be several subheadings under some of the other general classifications.
It is believed that such a breakdown is advisable in order that we can stipulate as to the mathematical accuracy of the various contentions raised by the petitioner.

7. Any other facts which might develop during the examination which your accountant thinks might be material to the question of renegotiable profits realized by the petitioner during 1941 and 1942 and which might have some bearing on the amount of petitioner's excessive profits for the period involved.

Petitioner's counsel is the firm of McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower Building, Cleveland, Ohio. [Insert name] is the first counsel listed on the petition. It is suggested that your office contact him or Mr. L. P. Gilmore, Vice President, the Austin Company, who by letter dated December 10, 1947, requested this office to make an audit of the data with respect to this proceeding.

There are transmitted herewith the administrative files of the Navy Department Price Adjustment Board which conducted the renegotiation with respect to this petitioner. In addition thereto, there are transmitted herewith the petition, answer, and copies of pertinent income tax returns.

[Insert name] Room 3738, Department of Justice (Extension 72) is in charge of this case for the Government.

We would appreciate your handling this matter as soon as possible.

H. G. MORISON
Assistant Attorney General

Attachments
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. JAMES V. FORRESTAL
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

TEN-DAY REPORT

Reference:
Bureau letter to Cleveland dated February 8, 1949.
Report of Special Agent EDWARD J. ARMERUSTER (A) dated June 4, 1948 at Washington, D. C.

Details:
This investigation was instituted upon the basis of a request contained in a memorandum of Assistant Attorney General H. G. MORISON dated January 31, 1949 which was transmitted to the Cleveland Division by the Bureau letter dated February 8, 1949.

Pursuant to instructions contained in referenced Bureau letter, Mr. L. P. GILMORE, Vice President of The Austin Company, was telephonically contacted on March 11, 1949 and arrangements made to begin this investigation on March 23, 1949.

COPY DESTROYED
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On March 15, 1949, the reporting agent joined in a conference with Mr. GILMORE and

RECORDED - 50

C.I. APR 13 1949

EX-137

Bureau
Washington
Cleveland

FILE NO. 46-783
for petitioner. This conference was held at the counsel's office of McKeehan, Merrick, Artz & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

At this conference, discussed with the petitioner as to what their decision would be as to the break-off date of April 28, 1942 in regard to their war business. Pointed out that although in the petition filed with the Tax Court by The Austin Company they referred to the April 28th break-off date, but do not show any break-up of their total contracts as set forth in their sales figures on Page 8 of this petition. and asked to think this over a while and stated that they would notify the reporting agent when he contacted them on March 23, 1949 to begin the audit.

raised the question of the Defense Plant Corporation business and the tabulation of the contracts executed prior to July 1, 1943 as to their renegotiability. At this time acquainted Mr. and with the recent court opinion concerning the July 1, 1943 effective date of the amendment to the Renegotiation Act. Counsel and again stated that they wished to think this over and would notify the reporting agent as to their decision.

stated that he did not think the Price Adjustment Board gave adequate consideration to the fact that The Austin Company was performing four separate and distinct jobs; namely, (1) design and engineering of a project; (2) construction of a project; (3) the furnishing of construction equipment needed for the performance of the construction work; and (4) the fabrication of structural steel. Mr. further stated that The Austin Company had performed engineering services for the Government, at a cost to the Government which is much less than it would have paid had it entered into separate engineering contracts for the same work. Mr. stated he brought these points out because the Board had renegotiated them on a yearly basis instead of on a completed contract basis and pointed out the fact that in the year 1943 the petitioner realized a profit on a cost plus fixed fee contracts of .36 per cent before taxes and before renegotiation.

replied that at the time renegotiation was first instituted, they, The Austin Company, could have made an agreement with the Price Adjustment Board as to how they wished their renegotiations to be handled and at this late date nothing further could be done about this matter.
replied that he was of the opinion that the court should take into consideration their profits for the year 1943, in which year they were completing some of the continuing contracts and upon which they received no additional fee. stated that the FET would check the firm's 1943 records and submit them. However, stated he did not think that the year 1943 would be taken into consideration.

On March 23, 1949 Special Agent (A) and the writer contacted at The Austin Company, located at 16112 Euclid Avenue, East Cleveland, Ohio. At this time stated that The Austin Company had reached the following decision: namely, that the April 28, 1942 break-down would be waived and that all contracts, both Army and Navy, cost plus fixed fee and lump sum, would be considered on a yearly basis. Secondly, that in regard to the July 1, 1943 break-down for the Defense Plant Corporation, The Austin Company would stand and rise or fall upon the validity of a recent court decision, then made available to agents various work sheets, certified statements and Austin Company statements of The Austin Company. No books of original entry were available at the Cleveland headquarters for the sales of the various divisions located throughout the country of The Austin Company. stated that the divisions sent in a balance sheet and profit and loss statement monthly and yearly. This information was transposed into work sheets and then into the General Office's books and records. These General Office's books and records are control accounts only.

INVESTIGATIVE OUTLINE

The investigative program in progress and contemplated is as follows:

A. General - Fiscal years 1936 through 1943, inclusive:

1. Prepare trial balance for the books;
2. Reconcile profit or loss per books and Federal income tax returns;
3. Prepare consolidated balance sheets and profit and loss statements.
B. Year end of December, 1941:

1. Sales:

(a) Segregate sales between DPC, Army and Navy, Dow Chemical Company, cost plus a fixed fee and lump sum contracts and non-renegotiable sales;

2. Cost of sales:

(a) Allocate expenses between DPC, Army and Navy, cost plus a fixed fee, lump sum contracts and non-renegotiable sales;

(b) Test check repair and maintenance charges;

(c) Analyze depreciation and amortization.

3. General administrative expenses:

(a) Prepare comparative schedules for the years 1941, 1942 and 1943;

(b) Analyze any expenses which appear excessive on a comparative basis.

Examination for the years 1942 and 1943 will follow the same outline as set forth above.

WORK PERFORMED

Sales have been analyzed between the DPC, cost plus a fixed fee and lump sum for the years 1941 and 1942. Sales have also been analyzed for the Army and Navy contracts, cost plus a fixed fee and a lump sum. Other portions of the work outlined above are in progress at the time of this report.

The following Special Agents (A) are engaged in this investigation:

JOHN K. BUSTER
CV F. O.
46-783

It is estimated that it will require approximately thirty days to complete this investigation.

- PENDING -
Report of Special Agent (A) JOHN K. EUSTER, Cleveland, Ohio dated April 5, 1949.

During the period covered by this report the following work has been completed:

Sales have been analyzed on the Dow Chemical Company contract for the years 1941 and 1942.

Trial balance sheets and profit and loss statements have been prepared for the years 1941 and 1942.

Allocation and analysis of expenses for the year 1941 have been made on all contracts.

Other phases of the work outlined in referenced report for the years 1941, 1942 and 1943 are in progress at the date of this report.

It is estimated that it will require approximately 20 days to complete this investigation.
Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, Cleveland

DATE: August 17, 1949

SUBJECT: THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. JAMES V. FORRESTAL, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT
Bureau File No. 46-14692

Rebuttal August 12, 1949.

This report is being prepared for dictation. A report should reach the Bureau no later than September 1, 1949.

jkb:ejs 46-783

RECORDED: 46-14692-6
17 AUG 1949

61 AUG 24 1949
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, CLEVELAND

DATE: September 7, 1949
REGISTERED MAIL

SUBJECT: THE AUSTIN COMPANY v.
JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R,
RENEGOTIATION ACT
(Bureau File 46-14692)

Bulky exhibit in referenced matter is being forwarded via Railway Express under signature.

JKE:mlk
46-783
**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**

**DATE WHEN MADE:** 9/8/49

**PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE:** 3/23/49 - 6/30/49

**REPORT MADE BY:** JOHN K. BUSTER (A) mlk

**TITLE:** THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. JAMES W. FORRESTAL, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES, TAX COURT

**DOCKET NO. 104-R**

**CHARACTER OF CASE:** RENEGOTIATION ACT

**ACCOUNTING REPORT**

**SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:** Renegotiation of the Austin Company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941 by Navy Price Adjustment Board resulted in determination of Excess Profits in amount of $400,000, and for the year ended December 31, 1942 of $2,000,000. The Austin Company filed a petition for redetermination of excess profits. Company representatives stated that they would waive the April 28 renegotiable break-off date; and likewise would stand by the court decision in the Warner & Swasey Company case as to the July 1, 1943 date for DPC contracts. Sales were broken down into three classifications: Lump Sum, CPTT and Dow Chemical. Examination of company's records shows an increase of approximately $3,000,000 in renegotiable sales for 1941. This amount caused by the company's waiver of the April 28 date. There is no change in the 1942 sales. $209,875 was disallowed as expenses in 1941 and $62,421 in 1942. The later two disallowances are final as the company's profits for 1941 and 1942 have been settled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

---

**References:**

Bureau file 46-14692.
Bureau letter to Cleveland dated February 8, 1949.
Report of Special Agent EDWARD J. ARMSTRUSTER (A) dated June 4, 1948 at Washington, D.C.
Report of Special Agent JOHN K. BUSTER (A) dated April 5, 1949 at Cleveland, Ohio.
To: COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

FEBRUARY 9, 1950

URGENT

TRANSMIT THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE TO: SAC, CLEVELAND

AUSTIN COMPANY, ET AL., TAX COURT DOCKET NO. ONE NAUGHT FOUR DASH R.

RENEGOTIATION ACT,

TO WHOM

THIS CASE IS ASSIGNED, AS WELL AS THE CASE ENTITLED QUOTE HUGHES Keenan

COMPANY V. WUPAB, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. SIX FOUR NINE DASH R UNQUOTE, WISHES

TO CONFER WITH SAA JOHN A. BUSTER IN HIS OFFICE, ROOM THREE SEVEN THREE

FOUR, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C., AT NINE THIRTY

A.M., FEBRUARY FIFTEEN, NEXT. CONFERENCE TO LAST APPROXIMATELY THREE DAYS.

SUBTEL IF SAA BUSTER UNABLE TO ATTEND CONFERENCE.

HOOVER

SA Buster conducted the entire accounting investigation in both
cases. The Austin Company case reveals excessive profits for
the year ending December 31, 1941 of $400,000 and for the year
ending December 31, 1942 of $2,000,000. In the Hughes Keenan
excessive profits amounted to $650,000. Extensive accounting
investigation was conducted in both and the report on the
latter case was submitted February 25, 1949 and on the former
case on September 8, 1949. Both reports prepared by SA
Buster. This agent not due for In-service until April 19,
1950.

COPY DESTROYED

MAY 6 1970
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Re: The Austin Company v. James Forrestal et al.; Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

Reference is made to the accounting report prepared by Special Agent John K. Buster (A), dated September 8, 1949.

The above-entitled case has been set for trial before a division of the Tax Court sitting in Cleveland, Ohio, beginning March 20, 1950. Desires to confer with Special Agent Buster relative to the above-entitled report.

[Signature]

H. G. Morison, Assistant Attorney General.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

February 9, 1950


MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Hughes-Keenan Company v. War Contract Price Adjustment Board; Tax Court
Docket No. 649-R.

It is requested that Special Agent John K. Buster (A) of your Cleveland Office be made available for conferences,
respecting the above-entitled cases, in your office, Room 3734, Department of Justice, beginning at 9:30 a.m.
on Wednesday, February 15, 1950, and lasting for approximately three days.

H. G. Morison
Assistant Attorney General.

COPY DESTROYED
197 MAY 6 1970
To: COMMUNICATION.

MARCH 1, 1943

URGENT

Transmit the following message to: SAC, CLEVELAND

O AUSTIN COMPANY VS SECRETARY OF NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER ONE ZERO FOUR DASH R, RENEGOTIATION ACT.

WILL CONTACT SPECIAL AGENT (A) JOHN K. BUSTER, CLEVELAND OFFICE, EIGHT THIRTY A.M. WEDNESDAY MARCH EIGHT NEXT. WILL ALSO CONFER WITH SPECIAL AGENT (A) CARLTON V. BRODEN AT THE SAME TIME IN THE CASE ENTITLED, QUOTE LINCOLN ELECTRIC COMPANY UNQUOTE. SUIT IN THE EVENT EITHER AGENT WILL BE UNAVAILABLE WEDNESDAY MARCH EIGHT.

HOOVER

ALM: Col

46-14692

46-9233

RECEIVED RECORDING

MAR 1 4:19 PM 70

F.B.I.

RECEIVED READING ROOM

51

EX-93

REC'D MAR 6 1959

F.B.I.

U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

MAR 6 1970

COPY DESTROYED

MAY 6 1970

10 25 1013

Per

SENT VIA

M

To: COMMUNICATION.

MARCH 1, 1943

URGENT

Transmit the following message to: SAC, CLEVELAND

O AUSTIN COMPANY VS SECRETARY OF NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER ONE ZERO FOUR DASH R, RENEGOTIATION ACT.

WILL CONTACT SPECIAL AGENT (A) JOHN K. BUSTER, CLEVELAND OFFICE, EIGHT THIRTY A.M. WEDNESDAY MARCH EIGHT NEXT. WILL ALSO CONFER WITH SPECIAL AGENT (A) CARLTON V. BRODEN AT THE SAME TIME IN THE CASE ENTITLED, QUOTE LINCOLN ELECTRIC COMPANY UNQUOTE. SUIT IN THE EVENT EITHER AGENT WILL BE UNAVAILABLE WEDNESDAY MARCH EIGHT.

HOOVER

ALM: Col

46-14692

46-9233

RECEIVED RECORDING

MAR 1 4:19 PM 70

F.B.I.

RECEIVED READING ROOM

51

EX-93

REC'D MAR 6 1959

F.B.I.

U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

MAR 6 1970

COPY DESTROYED

MAY 6 1970

10 25 1013

Per

SENT VIA

M
Sac, Cleveland

Secretary of Navy

Tax Court No. 104-R
Renegotiation Act

Reference is made to your letter dated April 26, 1950, transmitting three accounting work sheets pertaining to the above-captioned matter.

In accordance with your request, photostatic copies have been made and they are being forwarded together with the originals to your office under separate registered cover.

Mailed 14

May 2, 1950

COMM - FBI
Enclosed are three accounting work sheets prepared by the Cleveland Division.

It is requested that 27 copies of each sheet be prepared in positive photostat form. It is to be noted that two of the columns of these accounting sheets are blank, and it is requested that this blank portion be included in the positive photostats.

The original documents as well as all positive photostat copies are to be returned to the Cleveland Division.

JKB
46-783
Enclosures

RECORDED 34
SAC, Cleveland

Director, FBI

THE AUSTIN COMPANY v.
SECRETARY OF NAVY, Tax Court Docket No. 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

The Claims Division has advised that a conference has been arranged between the attorney and the accountant for the above-named petitioner to be held at the office of Mr. John F. Wolf, Claims Division, Room 3738, at 10 A.M. on May 21, 1951. The purpose of this conference is to attempt to stipulate the accounting data in this case.

Assistant Attorney General Holmes Baldridge has requested that SA John K. Buster be present in Washington on May 18, 1951, in order to thoroughly review the accounting data to be stipulated with Mr. Wolf. It was stated that Buster's services would probably not be required beyond May 21, 1951.

Sutel if SA Buster will be unable to attend this conference.

SA Buster conducted the entire accounting investigation in this case which involves excessive profits for 1941 of $400,000 and for 1942 of $2,000,000. Claims Division Attorney Wolf telephonically advised that it was necessary for SA Buster to be present prior to the conference in order that he could prepare additional accounting schedules which are necessary.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

May 2, 1951

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Re: Austin Company v. James V. Forrestal,
Secretary of the Navy
Docket No. 104-R

Reference is made to the report of Agent John K. Buster, dated September 8, 1949, relating to the above-indicated case.

A conference had been arranged between the attorney and the accountant for the above-named petitioner to be held in the office of Mr. John F. Wolf, in the Department of Justice, Room 3738, at 10:00 a.m., on May 21, 1951. The purpose of this conference is to attempt to stipulate the accounting data in this case.

It is requested that Agent Buster be directed to be present in Washington for the above-mentioned conference. In order to properly prepare for the work of this conference it is further requested that Agent Buster be directed to meet with Mr. Wolf on May 18, 1951, in order to thoroughly review the position of the Department regarding the accounting data to be stipulated. It is not thought at this time that Agent Buster's services will be required beyond May 21, 1951.

Holmes Baldridge
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

EXHIBIT PROCESSING
MAY 4, 1951

RECORDED
MAY 10 1951
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EX-123
SAC, Cleveland

Director, FBI

THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. JAMES V. PARRISH,
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

June 7, 1951

There are being enclosed herewith two copies of a self-explanatory memorandum dated May 25, 1951, which was received from Assistant Attorney General Holmes Baldridge.

A report covering the requested additional investigation should be submitted to reach the Bureau no later than July 15, 1951.
REFERENCE IS MADE TO OUR MEMORANDUM ADDRESSED TO YOU DATED MAY 2, 1951, REQUESTING THAT AGENT JOHN K. BUSTER BE PRESENT IN WASHINGTON FOR A CONFERENCE ON MAY 21, 1951.

THOSE PRESENT AT THE ABOVE-REFERRED TO CONFERENCE WERE THE AUSTIN COMPANY'S MR. L. P. GILMORE, VICE PRESIDENT AND ACCOUNTANT FOR THE AUSTIN COMPANY, AGENT JOHN K. BUSTER, AND MR. JOHN F. WOLF, ATTORNEY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

AT THIS CONFERENCE THE PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY AGREED TO WAIVE SOME OF THE ISSUES SET FORTH IN ITS PETITION. HOWEVER, IN ORDER TO PROPERLY TRY THE REMAINING ISSUES IT IS NECESSARY THAT THE FOLLOWING ACCOUNTING WORK BE DONE.

1. IT IS REQUESTED THAT AGENT BUSTER PREPARE A SCHEDULE SETTING FORTH THE AMOUNTS IN THE YEARS 1940, 1941 AND 1942 OF EQUIPMENT WHICH WAS INSTALLED BY THE PETITIONER FOR THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY.

2. SINCE THE PETITIONER WILL CONTEND THAT CONTRACT NO Y-4210 IS SEVERABLE, IT IS REQUESTED THAT AGENT BUSTER PREPARE A BREAKDOWN BY PROJECTS SHOWING THE ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL COSTS, THE AMOUNT OF THE FEES PAID AND THE TIME OF PAYMENT.

3. SINCE THE PETITIONER AGREED TO THEDisallowances OF COSTS MADE BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU FOR THE YEARS IN QUESTION, IT IS REQUESTED THAT AGENT BUSTER PREPARE PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENTS FOR EACH OF THE YEARS ADJUSTED TO CONFORM WITH THE INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU'SDisallowANCES.

4. SINCE IT NOW APPEARS THAT THE PETITIONER'S MAIN CONTENTION IS THAT IT WAS NOT ALLOWED TO RETAIN A REASONABLE PROFIT ON ITS ENGINEERING WORK, ITS STRUCTURAL STEEL FABRICATION, AND ITS EQUIPMENT RENTALS, IT IS REQUESTED THAT AGENT BUSTER ANALYZE THE RENEGOTIABLE CONTRACTS TO DETERMINE (a) THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF BILLING FOR ENGINEERING; (b) THE AMOUNT THAT PETITIONER CONTENTS IT SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED FOR THIS WORK; AND...
(c) the amount that it was left for engineering work after renegotiation. It is also requested that an analysis be made to determine the amount of structural steel fabricated by petitioner's Bliss mill for Government contracts and, if possible, to determine the amount of profits the petitioner retained on this work after renegotiation. In connection with petitioner's contention regarding equipment rentals it is requested that Agent Buster procure a tool manual from the petitioner and determine insofar as possible the basis upon which the rates set forth therein were arrived at, i.e., is it a bare cost of ownership rental or does it provide for a profit margin. The type, age and rental rate of the equipment used on Government contracts, as well as any other pertinent facts, should be ascertained.

The aggregate of the determinations of excessive profits involved in this case is $2,400,000. It appears that the proceedings before the Tax Court will take place at the first calendar to be set in Cleveland, Ohio this Fall. It is therefore requested that Agent Buster be directed to complete the requested work by August 1, 1951.

Holmes Baldridge
Assistant Attorney General
To: COMMUNICATIONS SECTION.

Transmit the following message to: SAC, CLEVELAND

V. AUSTIN COMPANY V. SEC. OF NAVY, TAX COURT
POUR DASH DASH RENEGOTIATION ACT. NOUCLET JUNE SEVEN LAST.
SUTEL MADE REPORTING AGENT AND DATE REPORT SUBMITTED.

HOOVER

CJM: 11w
46-14692

COPY DESTROYED
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TELETYPE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>$1,399,029.93</td>
<td>$1,816,249.42</td>
<td>$82,780.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>12,004,835.35</td>
<td>11,621,313.67</td>
<td>382,521.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>38,235,228.22</td>
<td>37,311,655.45</td>
<td>924,572.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>8,653,902.45</td>
<td>6,210,172.90</td>
<td>143,860.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>215,974.97</td>
<td>(111,444.45)</td>
<td>327,413.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>296,02</td>
<td>296,02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$60,783,816.57</td>
<td>$58,959,576.02</td>
<td>$1,824,242.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is included in renegotiable business for the years 1941 and 1942 sales in the amount of $50,240,566.28 and costs of $48,932,969.12 and a profit or fee paid by the Navy to the petitioner of $1,307,325.48 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>$12,004,865.36</td>
<td>$11,621,313.67</td>
<td>382,521.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>38,235,228.22</td>
<td>37,311,655.45</td>
<td>924,572.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,240,566.28</td>
<td>$48,932,969.12</td>
<td>$1,307,325.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, considering that the petitioner will contend that this contract be severable, the renegotiation on this contract would then be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>$38,235,228.22</td>
<td>$37,311,655.45</td>
<td>$924,572.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less billings to April 28, 1942</td>
<td>6,434,452.08</td>
<td>6,315,828.71</td>
<td>158,623.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31,751,776.14</td>
<td>$30,995,826.71</td>
<td>$755,949.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Petitioner if upheld would retain the profit for 1941 of $382,752.71 and for 1942 of $168,623.34 for a total retained profit of $551,376.05.

This contract was converted in 1943, according to Mr. GILMORE, from a Cost Plus Fixed Fee to a lump sum contract. The petitioner...
performed engineering as well as construction on this contract. Upon the Navy's instructions, only one payroll was maintained, hence a segregation between construction costs and engineering costs could not be obtained. The Navy furnished equipment and material was furnished from other suppliers. There were no advances on this contract.

**PETITIONER'S ADJUSTMENT OF PROFIT PER INTERNAL REVENUE ADJUSTMENTS**

The reporting Agent reviewed the Internal Revenue file concerning petitioner's profits per that Bureau for the year 1941. Bureau of Internal Revenue, Hanna Building, Cleveland, Ohio, made this file available.

It is to be noted that this return and settlement for the year 1941, included the years 1939, 1940 and 1941. There appears below the adjusted return as obtained from 1941.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added Income</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Compensation</td>
<td>$286,075.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes</td>
<td>1,220.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend Credits</td>
<td>163,784.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Expense</td>
<td>4,722.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>9,589.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Capital Stock Tax</td>
<td>(52,500.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductions Allowed</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940 Return - Excessive Compensation</td>
<td>$208,807.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 Return - Excessive Compensation</td>
<td>203,016.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reconciled per Renegotiation Schedule $4,480,849.00
CV. F. O.
46-783

The following deductions were made for the year 1941 and these disallowances have been added to the net profit as per Note A of the schedule for renegotiation for year 1941.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dividend Credits</td>
<td>$163,784.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Tax</td>
<td>1,220.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Compensation</td>
<td>83,058.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Expense</td>
<td>4,722.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>9,589.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit-Capital Stock Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$262,375.30

b6

$209,875.30

b7c

________________________
also furnished the file concerning the petitioner's income in 1942. This schedule is as follows:

1942

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Per Return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to Income</td>
<td>$ 68,420.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Compensation</td>
<td>106,215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stock Tax</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Tax</td>
<td>365.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Expense</td>
<td>19,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add: Amended Return

Executive Compensation

94,860.00

$244,701.56

549,561.56

87,338,991.57

Allowed by Conferres

Dividend Credits

38,805.42

Legal Expense

19,000.00

Return - Per Conferres

57,805.42

$7,176,326.15
According to the petitioner and conferes did not agree, so this matter went into the tax court in August, 1949. Petitioner was contesting $29,615.37 of compensation still unallowed and the Dividend Credits of $106,915. As a result of this meeting in the tax court, the following adjustments were made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disallowance Salaries</td>
<td>$68,420.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Adjustment-Conferes</td>
<td>$38,805.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Disallowed - RAR</td>
<td>$29,615.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Amended Return</td>
<td>$94,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$124,475.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAR –Disallowance</td>
<td>$29,615.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Court Dividend Credit</td>
<td>$106,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$136,530.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Deductions</td>
<td>$124,475.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disallowance</td>
<td>$12,055.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus not on Original Return</td>
<td>$94,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Disallowance</td>
<td>$106,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Per Conferes</td>
<td>$7,176,326.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Allowable Deductions</td>
<td>$124,475.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7,051,850.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This statement effects the 1942 profit as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>$68,420.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend Credit</td>
<td>$106,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Tax</td>
<td>$365.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Expense</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stock Tax</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disallowed</td>
<td>$244,701.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>$17,805.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$124,475.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$182,280.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Insurance Pre-paid</td>
<td>$62,420.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,589.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net adjustment made to Income</td>
<td>$52,831.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The amount of $91,860 as executive compensation had been claimed on an amended return and this amount had not been charged to expenses for the year 1942. The net disallowance of $52,831.72 has been added to the net profit as per Note A of the schedule of renegotiation for 1942.

**BILLINGS FOR ENGINEERING, ELISS MILL AND EQUIPMENT RENTALS**

The total amounts of billings for engineering for 1941 and 1942 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1941</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Fixed Fee</td>
<td>Dow</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$37,759.62</td>
<td>$1,235,956.19</td>
<td>$11,822.00</td>
<td>$1,285,537.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>25,304.95</td>
<td>944,994.33</td>
<td>7,535.00</td>
<td>977,834.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>$12,454.67</td>
<td>$290,961.86</td>
<td>$4,287.00</td>
<td>$307,703.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent to Engineering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1941</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$32.98</td>
<td>$23.54</td>
<td>$36.26</td>
<td>$23.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1942</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Fixed Fee</td>
<td>Dow</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$87,902.41</td>
<td>$4,920,509.92</td>
<td>$25,064.00</td>
<td>$5,033,476.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>55,826.78</td>
<td>3,930,664.83</td>
<td>18,261.00</td>
<td>4,004,752.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>$32,075.63</td>
<td>$989,845.09</td>
<td>$6,803.00</td>
<td>$1,028,723.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent to Engineering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1942</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$36.49</td>
<td>$20.12</td>
<td>$27.14</td>
<td>$20.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Petitioner contends that the usual fee on engineering in a lump sum contract is cost plus 50 per cent the fee. According to Mr. GILMORE, in a cost plus fixed fee contract the charge varies and he could not definitely state what it would be. The petitioner will contend that if the engineering had been obtained elsewhere and the Austin Company did the construction, only the fees charged the Government would have been the existing fees of the trade. The total amount of billings for structural steel fabricated by Bliss Mill for Government contracts, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lump Sum</th>
<th>Fixed Fee</th>
<th>Dow</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$47,032.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$132,608.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>37,659.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107,472.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>$9,372.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$25,136.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent to Bliss Mill Sales</td>
<td>$19.93</td>
<td>$18.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$18.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lump Sum</th>
<th>Fixed Fee</th>
<th>Dow</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$106,031.55</td>
<td>$805,832.22</td>
<td>$2,232.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>76,878.79</td>
<td>552,053.40</td>
<td>1,651.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>$29,152.76</td>
<td>$253,778.82</td>
<td>581.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent to Bliss Mill Sales</td>
<td>$27.49</td>
<td>$31.49</td>
<td>$26.03</td>
<td>$31.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Petitioner will contend that they are entitled to a profit on structural steel. They will contend that they operate four departments; Construction, Engineering, Structural Steel, and Equipment Rentals. Had the Government purchases steel on the outside, the price they would have paid would have included a margin of profit. Strict accounting theory states that true costs reflect only the cost of material, direct labor, and manufacturing overhead. However, in large concerns having various departments, it is not uncommon for them to bill sales to their own concern at a price to include a profit if told they were selling to any other customer. The Government was charged with the following rentals on equipment:

1941

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lump Sum</th>
<th>Fixed Fee</th>
<th>Dow</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,726.68</td>
<td>$4,642.87</td>
<td>$5,948.00</td>
<td>$24,317.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent to Construction Sales

|       | .699 | .119 | .125 | .175 |

1942

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lump Sum</th>
<th>Fixed Fee</th>
<th>Dow</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$23,498.57</td>
<td>$254,896.91</td>
<td>$12,070.00</td>
<td>$390,465.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent to Construction Sales

|       | .575 | .113 | .151 | .122 |

Second party equipment rentals or rentals for the use of own equipment are included in job costs. Such charges are, however, restored to profits before deducting operating expenses. Depreciation and other
expenses applicable to this owned equipment appeared to be included in operating expenses. The company was unable to readily segregate the expenses directly applicable to second party equipment rentals. The major item of such expense is depreciation, which is charged to operating expense. A portion of repairs and maintenance included in operating expense also applies to second party rentals. An aggregate depreciated value of all machinery, equipment and tools, of $206,147 at December 31, 1942, and amount $200,391 represents rentable equipment, the difference being largely the depreciated value of Bliss Mill equipment, the exact amount of which is not available. The total amounts of depreciation included in operating expenses for machinery, equipment and tools, therefore, are probably slightly greater by reason of such (Bliss Mill equipment) while the repairs and maintenance, in addition, include items applicable to building, furniture and fixtures. The original cost of rentable equipment is not readily available, nor is it reported for tax purposes.

Purchases of rentable equipment were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$29,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>284,730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>371,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>86,215.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$771,940.00

Depreciated value at December 1, 1942, was $200,391.

The company’s handling of small tools, which are generally less than $300 per unit, is set forth in the manual. It is the consistent practice to carry a reserve in the amount of the small tools so that at the end of the year they are fully reserved and have no net book value. On all jobs, except those where tools are purchased for the account of the owners of the project being constructed and become his property, a charge for small tools is made to job costs for 1/4 of 1 per cent of the contract price. A tool manual was obtained from Mr. GILMORE.

Mr. GILMORE stated that this is a revised tool manual and that there are not available the tool manual used during years 1941 and 1942. The charges in the tool manual are determined by prices set by the company.
These include depreciation and a margin of profit to cover overhead. The rates used, according to Mr. Gilmore, are generally lower than the OPA or AGC rates often used by other contractors. The manual provides that

1. No rental shall be charged to a particular contract and job after the total continuous rental of one piece of equipment reaches 75 per cent of cost.

2. Rates are based on a five day week, eight hour day operation and are increased 50 per cent for double shift operation and 100 per cent for three shift operation.

3. Rental is charged from the date when equipment is first put to use and continues until the date it is no longer required, whether or not it is removed from the job.

4. Maintenance and repairs, which do not exceed 2 per cent of this price are charged to job costs. Items in excess of 2 per cent are charged to operating expenses (apparently none is capitalized and there has been no objection by the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the amounts expensed). After, however, continuous rental charged reaches 75 per cent of cost limitation described above, all repair, replacement and maintenance costs are charged to job costs.

An attempt was made to determine what equipment was used on the construction job performed on the Government contracts, but this information was not obtainable.

The following schedule reflects profit before and after a $400,000 adjustment to fixed fee contracts:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>Non-renegotiable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales before Adjustment</td>
<td>1,964,719.59</td>
<td>19,989,929.75</td>
<td>21,954,649.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before Adjustment</td>
<td>145,905.33</td>
<td>3,377,670.94</td>
<td>3,523,576.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent to Sales</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>Non-renegotiable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales after Adjustment</td>
<td>31,964,719.59</td>
<td>49,989,929.75</td>
<td>81,954,649.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit after adjustment</td>
<td>145,905.33</td>
<td>3,377,670.94</td>
<td>3,523,576.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent to Net Sales</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following schedule reflects profits before and after the adjustment of $200,000 to lump sum contracts and $1,800,000 to the fixed fee contracts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1942</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales before Adjustment</td>
<td>4,063,073.78</td>
<td>20,715,139.13</td>
<td>24,778,213.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before Adjustment</td>
<td>456,360.60</td>
<td>1,736,235.00</td>
<td>2,212,595.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent to Sales</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1942</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales after Adjustment</td>
<td>3,883,073.78</td>
<td>20,715,139.13</td>
<td>24,598,213.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit after adjustment</td>
<td>256,360.60</td>
<td>1,736,235.00</td>
<td>2,002,605.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent to Net Sales</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES,
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

ACCOUNTING REPORT

Dow contracts examined and schedule set forth for amount of equipment installed. All billings for years 1940 through 1945 examined. Navy contract NOY L2-10 and renegotiation portion set forth. Petitioner has made final settlement with Bureau of Internal Revenue and adjustments have been made to profit. All contracts handled by petitioner were analyzed and percentage of profits on engineering, Bliss Mill and equipment rentals calculated. Tool manual obtained.

DETAILS:

AT CLEVELAND, OHIO

This investigation is predicated upon a Bureau Letter, dated June 7, 1951, forwarding a memorandum from Assistant Attorney General, HOMES BALDRIE. This memorandum requested that the following investigation be conducted:

1. In connection with its sales to the Dow Chemical Company, petitioner agreed to stipulate the dollar amount of the equipment which it installed for Dow Chemical

PROPERTY OF FBI—THIS CONFIDENTIAL REPORT AND ITS CONTENTS ARE LOANED TO YOU BY THE FBI AND ARE NOT TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE OF AGENCY TO WHICH LOANED.
Company. Petitioner, however, will contend that none of the equipment is
renegotiable. It is requested that a condensed schedule of the calculations
for determining the amount of equipment installed by the petitioner for
Dow Chemical Company during the years 1941 and 1942 be prepared.

2. Petitioner will contend that contract NOY 42-10 is severable.
Respondent will contend that it is one contract. It is requested that the
entire contract be checked to determine the amount of it that is renegotiable
and also analyze the contract to determine the estimated and actual cost and
the fees paid by the Navy under this contract.

3. Petitioner states that all executive sales were allowed as
reasonable and necessary by the Internal Revenue Bureau in 1942; however, in
1941 it appears that approximately $33,000 of executive compensation was
disallowed as excessive by Internal Revenue. It is requested that your
Agent incorporate, in accordance with agreements with petitioner's attorney,
the disallowances made by Internal Revenue in connection with real estate,
taxes, dividend credits, legal expenses, and so forth and the profit and loss
statement of the Company for the years 1941 and 1942. It is agreed that they
will stipulate that no disallowance was made in the figures which the Board
used in determining excessive profits. They will contend, however, that they
were told that disallowances in the amount stated in paragraph 3f of their
petition were made by the Board before determining excessive profits.

4. The contention set forth in paragraph 35 of the petition
appears to be the main basis for petitioner's appeal, the contention being
that after renegotiation it was not allowed a reasonable amount of profit
on its engineering work, structural steel fabricated in its Bliss Mill and
the construction equipment rentals. It is requested that an Agent analyze
the contracts to determine the total amount of billings for engineering
and attempt to determine the amount that petitioner contends it should have
received for this work. He will also analyze the contracts to determine the
amount of structural steel fabricated by Bliss Mill for Government contracts
and ascertain whether or not the determination of excessive profits leaves
the petitioner with amount of 10 per cent profit on its Bliss Mill operation.
It is also requested that an Agent procure a tool manual from the petitioner
and determine insofar as possible the basis upon which the rates set forth
therein were arrived at, i.e., is it a cost of ownership rental or does it
contend a profit margin and the number of months in a year which are considered
a full rental year.
METHOD OF ACCOUNTING

The books of the petitioner are kept on an accrual basis, separate accounts being established for each construction project. Income on long term contracts is taken up on basis of estimates of completion. Fees on Cost Plus Fixed Fee contracts are generally taken up in income as approved and passed for payment by the contracting officer or owners representatives.

Separate records are maintained for the principal departments of the company; namely, Construction, Engineering and Bliss Mill. In addition, costs of the individual contracts are charged with second party equipment rentals or rentals for the use of the company's own equipment. The method of booking the intra-company operations and equipment rental may be summarized as follows:

1. Construction costs include, at billing price, all intra-company operations and second party equipment rentals;

2. Such billing price for Engineering is generally cost plus 50 per cent on lump sum work; for Bliss Mill is based on competitive prices, and for second party equipment rentals is in accordance with a company manual. (Small tools are generally charged at 3/4 of 1% per cent of contract price) which rate appears to be below OPA and AAC rates;

3. The gross profits of the Engineering Department and of Bliss Mill are picked up as other income while the charges for the use of the company's own equipment, being a statistical calculation, are also restored to gross profit.

There follows the profit and loss statement for each of the years of 1941 and 1942, showing a breakdown between renegotiable and non-renegotiable business:
This investigation is predicated upon memorandum of Assistant Attorney General H. G. MORISON dated January 31, 1949, which was transmitted to this office with Bureau letter dated February 8, 1949. The memorandum of Mr. MORISON outlines the desired investigation in this case, and as the Bureau and the Office of Origin have copies of this memorandum, it will not be quoted in this report.

**HISTORY OF THE AUSTIN COMPANY**

The Austin Company is located at 16112 Euclid Avenue, East Cleveland, Ohio. Originally established a contracting business and carpenter shop in Cleveland in 1878. The company was incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio in 1904 as the and Son Co., which name was changed to The Austin Company in 1916.

The principal work performed has been the construction and design of industrial plants, in which field the company secured its first large contract. Construction alone, design and engineering alone, or a combination thereof are the principal services offered customers. Some maintenance work has also been handled under contract. The large expansion of the company would appear to be due in part to its development of standardized steel frame designs for one story factory buildings. The four basic designs introduced in 1914 subsequently were increased to ten.

As an outgrowth of the use of structural steel in quantity, the company established its own steel fabricating shop in 1920 to stock the sizes used. By 1930, the company entered, through a division known as Bliss Mill, the structural steel field on a commercial basis in order to supply as much as possible of the company's requirements. The company's interest in, and development of, "controlled conditions" plants (which completely control light, humidity, noise, heat, etc.) began in the late 1920's and marks another development of large size which undoubtedly contributed much to the growth of the subject company into one of the leading construction firms in the nation.

In 1915, the company decided to establish branch offices to expedite the handling of contracts in various sections of the country. It now is a nation-wide contractor with seven district offices, the main office being in East Cleveland. Under the district office system, all
This investigation is predicated upon Bureau letter of reference to which was attached a Memorandum for the Director dated December 26, 1947, from HERBERT A. BERGSON, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Claims Division, Department of Justice, a copy of which memorandum has been furnished to the Cleveland Division by the Bureau.

The memorandum of the Attorney General suggested that a summary be prepared of the petitioner’s profit and loss statements and if possible that sales be segregated to show separately the profits on the cost plus fixed fee contracts, the fixed price contracts, Defense Plant Corporation contracts and transactions with the Dow Chemical Company.

HISTORY OF THE AUSTIN COMPANY

According to the files of the Navy Price Adjustment Board the Austin Company was established on a small scale in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1878, contracting in the field of commercial and small industrial buildings. Beginning in 1912 the Company undertook larger and more complex jobs and developed as a major engineering construction organization.

Afterwards branch offices were established in fourteen cities. The policy of the Company has been to centralize responsibility in district offices and the general office merely determines policies, directs research activities and supervises the steel fabricating plant.

In 1939 the Company adopted the policy of building up its personnel so that it would be able to carry out the large and numerous war projects awarded to it. The construction and engineering accomplishments of the Company included the development of standardized steel frame designs for one story as well as more story buildings and controlled conditions in plants consisting of windowless industrial buildings in which light, temperature, humidity and dust fumes and noises are controlled.

The basic profits of the subject company for the years 1936 to 1942, according to the information found in the files, are as follows:
YEARS

SALES

NET PROFIT BEFORE TAXES

Amount

% of Sales

1936

$ 9,403,159

$ 309,187

5.29

1937

16,578,122

572,307

3.45

1938

7,991,976

71,784

0.90

1939

10,486,159

293,303

2.80

Average

1936-1939

11,114,854

311,645

2.80

1940

42,949,925

2,302,668

5.36

1941

87,600,030

4,481,532

5.11

1942

258,120,675

6,792,711

2.63

HISTORY OF RENEGOTIATION

The Austin Company was assigned to the Navy Department for renegotiation on August 6, 1942. On September 10, 1942, the Board requested the contractor to submit preliminary data for renegotiation purposes. On September 14, 1942, the Company replied to the communication and advised that the information would be forthcoming.

On November 23, 1942, the contractor submitted the first information for renegotiation purposes in connection with the Board's request.

On February 20, 1943 the Austin Company wrote to the Navy enclosing various schedules and other information which had been requested theretofore by the Board. On March 26, 1943, the Company again wrote to the Navy enclosing additional information such as financial statements and answers to specific questions which it stated constituted all of the specific schedules and information requested.

On April 19, 1943 the Company sent to the Navy schedules of contract data for the year ended December 31, 1942 showing construction sales, engineer sales, and other financial data for that particular year.

Again on June 17, 1943, the Austin Company sent to the Board a number of additional schedules containing financial information consisting of balance sheets, surplus profit and loss statements all pertaining to the fiscal year 1942. On July 8, 1943 the Board requested additional schedules from the company pertaining to its construction costs. The Company replied
on July 14, 1943 that Ernst and Ernst, CPA's would prepare the desired information.

On July 21, 1943, the company submitted to the Board various exhibits and schedules for the purpose of placing on record the pertinent facts concerning the history, work and performance of the Austin Company, as a background for the analysis of the data previously submitted.

On September 28, 1943, the company again sent to the Board additional schedules pertaining to its financial transaction. Under date of December 3, 1943 the Board mailed to the Austin Company notice that an initial conference was set for December 17, 1943, in Washington which notice the company acknowledged by its letter of December 7, 1943.

On December 17, 1943, a conference was had by the company and members of the Navy Price Adjustment Board in Washington, D.C. No final determination was made at this meeting with respect to excess profits.

Under date of February 19, 1944 the company sent to the Board additional information which had been requested by analysts of the Board. Again on April 3, 1944 the Board requested certain specific information from the company concerning details of information which it had previously submitted. The company replied to this request under date of April 18, 1944. On May 9, 1944, the company wrote to the Board, enclosing various schedules and information submitted or to be submitted to the Bureau of Internal Revenue in connection with the reasonableness of salaries for the years 1940 and 1941 which were involved in the disallowance for income tax purposes. Under date of May 16, 1944, the Austin Company sent to the Board in response to telephonic requests, additional information concerning financial transactions of the Company for the years 1936 to 1942 inclusive.

Under date of May 24, 1944, a letter was sent to the Austin Company by the Board notifying the company of a renegotiation meeting to be held on June 5, 1944, in Washington, D.C. which the company acknowledged by letter of May 29, 1944.

On June 5th and 6th renegotiation conferences were held in Washington, D.C. by the Board and the Company. No definite agreement was reached as to the excessive profits at this meeting.
Under date of June 17, 1944, the Austin Company wrote to the Board referring to the preliminary findings made at this meeting of June 6th and advising that the company had not thought that the profits under CPFF contracts should be considered subject to reduction upon renegotiation. The company also offered various reasons as to why it considered the tentative determination of excessive profits by the Board to be unreasonably high.

On July 10, 1944, the Chairman of the Board wrote the Austin Company advising it that the Board had carefully considered the information submitted theretofore and had found nothing which would justify a change in its findings made at a meeting with the company. Under date of July 17, 1944, the Company wrote the Board advising it that in order to protect its position in regard to certain legal questions it might be necessary for it to appeal to the Tax Court and that therefore the Board should make a unilateral determination.

Under date of August 14, 1944, a unilateral order was signed by the Board and mailed to the company with a letter noting that the company merely desired to protect its legal position and not to have the Chairman give further consideration to the matter. The determination of the Board was to the effect that the excessive profits for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941, amounted to $400,000 and the excessive profits for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942, amounted to $2,000,000 making a total of $2,400,000 excessive profits for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942.

On September 5, 1944 the Paymaster General of the Navy advised the company that the net balance of the excessive profits which have been determined would be $2,400,000 would be equal to $503,113.60 after the application of the tax credits to which the company would be entitled.

**DETERMINATION OF EXCESSIVE PROFITS**

The Navy PAB determined that the petitioner derived excess profits of $400,000 in the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941, which were applicable to cost plus fixed fee contracts.

The Board also determined that petitioner derived excess profits in the amount of $2,000,000 in the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942. Of this amount $200,000 was determined to be applicable to fixed price contracts and $1,800,000 was applicable to cost plus fixed fee contracts.
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The total amount of excessive profits amounts to $2,400,000 which is subject to a tax credit of $1,896,886.40 leaving net refund due the Government of $503,113.60.

1941 Excess Profits Per Board

There has been prepared as attached next hereto Exhibit A which reflects the gross receipts and adjusted profits before and after renegotiation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941.
Fixed Price Contracts (1941)

It will be noted that gross receipts and net operating profits on fixed price contracts in 1941 were as follows:

| Gross Receipts | $1,973,913.00 |
| Net Operating Profit | 141,287.00 |

Ratio 7.15%

These contracts were not subjected to excessive profits determination although they were considered 100% renegotiable.

Cost Plus Fixed Fee and Dow Contracts (1941)

The Navy PAB segregated "Dow Chemical Contracts" from other CPFF contracts, although it considered both groups as 100% renegotiable.

Briefly the receipts and profits under this category before renegotiation were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPFF</th>
<th>Dow</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipts</td>
<td>$3,619,941</td>
<td>1,897,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>825,248</td>
<td>46,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Disallowed Costs</td>
<td>$1,096,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio 3.09%

After renegotiation, less refund of $400,000 the adjusted net operating profit would be equal to $696,850 ($1,096,850 minus $400,000) or a ratio of 1.98%.

Total Renegotiable Contracts (1941)

The total renegotiable business, including Fixed Price and Cost Plus-fixed fee appears as follows:

| Gross Receipts | $37,491,293 |
| Net Operating Profit | 1,012,285 |
| Plus:  |  |  |
| Disallowed Costs | 225,872 |
| Total Adjusted Profit | 1,238,112 |

Ratio 3.30%
After renegotiation, less refund of $400,000 the adjusted profit would be reduced to $838,137 ($1,238,112 minus $400,000) equal to 2.25%.

Non-Renegotiable Business (1941)

The gross receipts and profits from non-renegotiable business for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Receipts</th>
<th>$49,989,929</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net operation profit</td>
<td>$5,182,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Disallowed Costs</td>
<td>$225,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Adjusted Profit</td>
<td>$2,937,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Business (1941) - Before Renegotiation

The gross receipts and profits for fiscal year ended December 31, 1941, appear as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Receipts</th>
<th>$87,481,222</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>$4,175,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$97,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjusted Profit</td>
<td>$4,272,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total After Renegotiation, less $400,000

Profit reduced to $3,872,724 equal to 4.45%

Disallowed Salaries

For purposes of renegotiation, the Board considered Executive Salaries too high. Compensation for Executive Officers for the year was $728,454. The Board considered that $300,000 was sufficient and disallowed $428,454. To this was added a dividend credit of $163,784, making a total disallowance of $592,218. This was applicable to the total business, however, $225,872 was apportioned to renegotiable contracts.
Other Income

The Board considered that the petitioner earned "Other Income" in the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941 in the amount of $97,496. Work papers (pp 644 and 645) reveal that same was made up of the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Not Allocable to Specific Contracts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment of small tool inventory &amp; Reserve</td>
<td>$ 29,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline and Excise Tax Refunds</td>
<td>$ 2,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit from Blueprint sales</td>
<td>$ 11,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>$  6,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49,533</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td>$ 33,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends Received</td>
<td>$  56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$139,134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses:
- Interest paid                                              | $ 10,718  |
- Miscellaneous Expenses                                      | $   389   |
| **Other Income (net)**                                       | **$127,027**  |

Less:
- Commercial & Development Expenses                          | $ 20,216  |
- Donations                                                   | $   9,315  |
- Research & Development                                      | **$29,531**  |
| **NET TO OPERATING PROFIT**                                 | **$97,496**  |

1942 Excess Profits Per Board

There has been prepared as attached next hereto Exhibit B which reflects the gross receipts and adjusted profits before and after renegotiation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lump Sum</th>
<th>CFPP</th>
<th>Dow Chemical</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Renegotiable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Sales</td>
<td>$3,876,651</td>
<td>$30,440,206</td>
<td>$4,766,538</td>
<td>$40,573,205</td>
<td>$46,070,670</td>
<td>$37,045,275</td>
<td>$87,025,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs (Direct)</td>
<td>4,555,087</td>
<td>39,429,268</td>
<td>4,225,617</td>
<td>39,476,502</td>
<td>45,293,404</td>
<td>31,776,986</td>
<td>74,904,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>844,474</td>
<td>940,938</td>
<td>535,981</td>
<td>1,294,808</td>
<td>1,679,567</td>
<td>7,408</td>
<td>6,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Gross Profit To Costs</td>
<td>10.312</td>
<td>3.189</td>
<td>7.448</td>
<td>5.444</td>
<td>7.267</td>
<td>6.441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Gross Profit To Sales</td>
<td>15.535</td>
<td>2.090</td>
<td>6.282</td>
<td>5.163</td>
<td>6.686</td>
<td>6.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>168,140</td>
<td>655,076</td>
<td>504,823</td>
<td>1,127,039</td>
<td>1,191,822</td>
<td>1,212,099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>662,384</td>
<td>287,323</td>
<td>253,399</td>
<td>1,172,996</td>
<td>1,358,794</td>
<td>1,125,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Operating Profit To Construction Sales</td>
<td>12.319</td>
<td>9.446</td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>4.532</td>
<td>3.991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>25,675</td>
<td>45,699</td>
<td>5,948</td>
<td>77,400</td>
<td>325,568</td>
<td>300,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Earnings of Engineering</td>
<td>24,596</td>
<td>597,779</td>
<td>3,287</td>
<td>326,664</td>
<td>855,962</td>
<td>579,566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Earnings of Mills</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>40,385</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>45,347</td>
<td>506,824</td>
<td>238,331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,120</td>
<td>532,526</td>
<td>10,283</td>
<td>449,611</td>
<td>779,104</td>
<td>1,283,715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Before Other Income</td>
<td>717,384</td>
<td>671,659</td>
<td>283,564</td>
<td>1,522,607</td>
<td>2,761,638</td>
<td>4,354,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Additional Income Unallowable Deductions</td>
<td>15,966</td>
<td>73,308</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>97,883</td>
<td>111,028</td>
<td>209,875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income - Net</td>
<td>720,346</td>
<td>744,967</td>
<td>295,030</td>
<td>1,700,480</td>
<td>2,872,660</td>
<td>4,163,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>720,346</td>
<td>744,967</td>
<td>295,030</td>
<td>1,700,480</td>
<td>2,872,660</td>
<td>4,163,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of operations of the Company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941 after Renegotiation refund of $400,000 is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lump Sum</th>
<th>CPF &amp;</th>
<th>Dow Chemical</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Non-Receivable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Sales</td>
<td>$4,376,561</td>
<td>$30,440,306</td>
<td>$4,756,538</td>
<td>$40,273,505</td>
<td>$46,470,870</td>
<td>$97,043,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Renegotiation Refund</td>
<td>-400,000</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-400,000</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-400,000</td>
<td>-400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Sales</td>
<td>$4,376,561</td>
<td>$30,440,306</td>
<td>$4,756,538</td>
<td>$40,273,505</td>
<td>$46,470,870</td>
<td>$97,043,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Sales</td>
<td>$4,582,087</td>
<td>$22,409,588</td>
<td>$4,482,617</td>
<td>$38,478,502</td>
<td>$42,329,484</td>
<td>$81,776,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>434,474</td>
<td>940,608</td>
<td>359,721</td>
<td>3,172,086</td>
<td>3,172,086</td>
<td>4,566,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit</td>
<td>337,222</td>
<td>730,048</td>
<td>251,815</td>
<td>1,375,977</td>
<td>2,210,880</td>
<td>4,099,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Profit Before Federal Taxes</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>6.26%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit of the company's Federal Income and Excess Profits Tax returns for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941 by the Bureau of Internal Revenue resulted in a disallowance of Real Estate Taxes, Dividend Credits on Employees Stock, Excessive Compensation, legal expenses and insurance. The disallowances were contested by the company, and extended negotiations between the company and the Bureau of Internal Revenue ensued which culminated in a basis for settlement. Excessive compensation in the amount of $203,017 was disallowed as well as legal expenses in the amount of $6,868. The total disallowance of $209,875 is shown as additional income on Schedule A. This additional income was allocated to all business on the basis of Cost of Construction Sales.

There follows the Tax Schedule for 1941:

**TAX SCHEDULE 1941**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income Per Federal Income Tax Return</td>
<td>$4,479,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Unallowable Deductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend Credits on Employees Stock</td>
<td>163,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Compensation</td>
<td>53,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Expenses</td>
<td>4,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>9,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Additional Deduction for Federal Capital Stock Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Per Books</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,689,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on the Profit and Loss Statement:

Combined sales for the year 1941, subject to renegotiation, consisting of Lump Sum, Cost Plus a Fixed Fee and Dow Chemical contracts amounted to $40,573,305. The Navy Price Adjustment Board showed a combined total of $35,517,380. This difference can be explained in that all contracts paid for and completed prior to April 28, 1942 were treated as renegotiable in this review, as per the request of Mr. GILMORE of the Austin Company. The Navy Price Adjustment Board stated in their report, "An examination of the commercial contracts in excess of $100,000 reveals that some may involve the furnishing of process equipment within the meaning of the 1942
Renegotiation Act. Such contracts cover primarily chemical plants constructed for the Dow Chemical interests under a continuing contract which has been in effect since 1939 and which provides that Dow may call upon Austin to do any or all of its construction work. For the purpose of this analysis, the 1941 and 1942 sales under three of these Dow projects, together with a small lump sum contract for Linde Air Products, have been considered to be of questionable renegotiability. On the Dow contracts, it is the company's practice to accumulate all costs and expenses by location."

The reporting agent did not question those contracts of questionable renegotiability. In the segregation of Dow Chemical sales, the writer was guided by the formula prepared by the Navy in their classification of the Dow contracts. This schedule may be found on page 773 of the Navy file.

**Lump Sum Contracts**

The results of operations under lump sum contracts are summarized on Schedule A. In reporting profits, inter-departmental charges for engineering and fabricated steel have been reflected in costs at the billing prices of the respective departments. In addition, second party equipment rental charged for the use of the company's owned equipment has been treated as an item of cost (but has been added back to restore the statistical charge to profits.) This handling of inter-departmental charges and costing of owned equipment rentals has the effect of reflecting in costs what the Austin Company would report if it obtained such services from outsiders at prices equal to those charged by the several departments.

Job costs include, in addition to the items already mentioned, labor, materials, work sublet to others and cost of equipment rented from third parties. Operating expenses are allocated on a cost of sales basis, and consists of those set forth in Schedule B, as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$34,850</td>
<td>$51,774</td>
<td>$53,118</td>
<td>$59,640</td>
<td>$68,490</td>
<td>$264,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses and Maintenance</td>
<td>$13,673</td>
<td>$18,030</td>
<td>$9,932</td>
<td>$8,958</td>
<td>$13,079</td>
<td>$14,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling Expense</td>
<td>$105,391</td>
<td>$109,644</td>
<td>$108,671</td>
<td>$104,560</td>
<td>$111,587</td>
<td>$143,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$26,578</td>
<td>$45,605</td>
<td>$51,356</td>
<td>$47,702</td>
<td>$42,677</td>
<td>$113,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating Expense</td>
<td>$57,972</td>
<td>$57,721</td>
<td>$55,687</td>
<td>$59,398</td>
<td>$47,198</td>
<td>$55,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Expense</td>
<td>$14,937</td>
<td>$25,159</td>
<td>$6,609</td>
<td>$11,491</td>
<td>$14,509</td>
<td>$19,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$16,360</td>
<td>$24,325</td>
<td>$25,142</td>
<td>$24,850</td>
<td>$26,672</td>
<td>$26,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store House Expense</td>
<td>$1,985</td>
<td>$13,525</td>
<td>$10,680</td>
<td>$15,735</td>
<td>$11,366</td>
<td>$25,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing Expense</td>
<td>$1,802</td>
<td>$(,129)</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>$(,304)</td>
<td>$(,299)</td>
<td>$11,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>$1,968</td>
<td>$(,916)</td>
<td>$3,634</td>
<td>$4,794</td>
<td>$6,130</td>
<td>$9,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>$3,499</td>
<td>$4,041</td>
<td>$4,090</td>
<td>$3,335</td>
<td>$5,816</td>
<td>$16,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>$4,260</td>
<td>$7,576</td>
<td>$12,409</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td>$5,811</td>
<td>$1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Men's Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$272,984</strong></td>
<td><strong>$564,176</strong></td>
<td><strong>$356,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217,183</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,638</strong></td>
<td><strong>$807,163</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Average 1936-1939</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Salaries</td>
<td>$163,590</td>
<td>$160,968</td>
<td>$145,826</td>
<td>$145,826</td>
<td>$150,520</td>
<td>$155,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Salaries</td>
<td>41,971</td>
<td>41,971</td>
<td>41,971</td>
<td>41,971</td>
<td>41,971</td>
<td>41,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>43,609</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>9,491</td>
<td>9,491</td>
<td>9,491</td>
<td>9,491</td>
<td>9,491</td>
<td>9,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Personal</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>5,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Telegraph</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>6,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>4,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>4,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, Heat, Water &amp; Power</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>5,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>528,636</td>
<td>528,636</td>
<td>528,636</td>
<td>528,636</td>
<td>528,636</td>
<td>528,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>908,475</td>
<td>908,475</td>
<td>908,475</td>
<td>908,475</td>
<td>908,475</td>
<td>908,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent to Sales</td>
<td>5.465</td>
<td>5.465</td>
<td>5.465</td>
<td>5.465</td>
<td>5.465</td>
<td>5.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income (Net)</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income**
- Items not Allocable to Specific Contracts
  - Adjustment to Small Tool Inventory & Reserve
  - Details Not Available

**Other Income:**
- Gasoline & Excise Tax Refund
- Total Miscellaneous Income
- Miscellaneous Income
- Interest Received
- Miscellaneous Expense
- Other Income Not Allocated to Specific Contracts

**Expenses**
- Interest Paid
- Miscellaneous Expense
- Other Income Not Allocated to Specific Contracts
Cost Plus a Fixed Fee Contracts:

The results of operations on fixed fee contracts are summarized on Schedule A. The summary treats inter-departmental charges and equipment rental in a like manner to the method used on the lump sum contract summary described before. Job costs and operating expenses are also comparable in treatment to the handling under the lump sum contracts.

Equipment Rental Income:

This is an inter-departmental charge for the rental of company owned equipment and has the effect of reflecting in costs what The Austin Company would report if it obtained such services from outside source.

Engineering Earnings:

The Austin Company performed engineering for lump sum and cost plus a fixed fee construction contracts. Engineering earnings are after deducting direct costs and after deducting operating expenses, which later were allocated on a Cost of Sales basis.

Bliss Mill Earnings:

The Bliss Mill is the company owned steel fabricating plant. Charges to contracts are based on competitive prices. The advantages gained from the operation of the plant by Austin lie primarily in speedier delivery, knowledge of available stock, and easier adaptation to special specifications and experimental operations. Bliss Mill costs were allocated to the various classifications of work on a tonnage basis. It was estimated that Bliss Mill supplied only about 10% to 15% of the company's total requirements for structural steel in recent years. Gross Profit derived from renegotiable business was added back as income.

Operating Expenses:

Operating Expenses for the year 1941 totaled $2,141,099. Of this amount $921,007 is applicable to renegotiable business. Donations in the amount of $20,216 and research and development in the amount of $9,315 were charged in their entirety to non-renegotiable business. Depreciation and amortization of small tools is charged directly to job costs,
the amount so charged representing $\frac{3}{4}$ of $1\%$ of contract price adjusted to actual at the year end. Depreciation on all other machinery, equipment and tools, as well as on buildings and fixtures, is included in operating expense. Depreciation rates are as allowed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. A rate of $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ of cost is used on building, $10\%$ of cost on furniture and fixtures, and on machinery, equipment and tools varies depending on the type of equipment. There does not appear to be any accelerated depreciation. Operating expenses were allocated on the basis of Cost of Sales. Operating expenses are detailed on Schedule B as set forth above.

**Fiscal Year Ended December 31, 1942:**

The results of operation of the company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942 are as follows:
### Schedule C

**Statement of Profit and Loss**

Year Ended December 31, 1946

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Union Sum</th>
<th>CFIT</th>
<th>Dow Chemical</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Non-Repetible</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs (Direct)</td>
<td>3,608,878</td>
<td>288,309,901</td>
<td>287,307,705</td>
<td>237,904,408</td>
<td>207,707,820</td>
<td>226,924,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>44,106,967</td>
<td>4,106,399</td>
<td>3,600,796</td>
<td>3,600,796</td>
<td>2,969,756</td>
<td>3,969,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Gross Profit to Costs</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Gross Profit to Sales</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>104,247</td>
<td>1,125,142</td>
<td>207,872</td>
<td>2,015,244</td>
<td>1,231,330</td>
<td>2,131,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>104,247</td>
<td>1,125,142</td>
<td>207,872</td>
<td>2,015,244</td>
<td>1,231,330</td>
<td>2,131,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Operating Profit to Construction Sales</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>37,720</td>
<td>288,979</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>290,956</td>
<td>207,956</td>
<td>207,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Earnings of Engineering</td>
<td>28,108</td>
<td>288,979</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>290,956</td>
<td>207,956</td>
<td>207,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Earnings of Bliss Mill</td>
<td>29,159</td>
<td>288,979</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>290,956</td>
<td>207,956</td>
<td>207,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Before Other Income</td>
<td>338,384</td>
<td>4,506,546</td>
<td>225,384</td>
<td>5,112,174</td>
<td>1,541,570</td>
<td>6,655,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income - Net</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>170,624</td>
<td>5,266</td>
<td>179,658</td>
<td>14,901</td>
<td>194,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>338,167</td>
<td>4,677,170</td>
<td>225,650</td>
<td>5,291,876</td>
<td>1,556,471</td>
<td>6,851,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Cent Before Taxes on Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Sum</th>
<th>CFIT</th>
<th>Dow Chemical</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Non-Repetible</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.99%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of operations of the company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942 after renegotiation refund is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lump Sum</th>
<th>OFFE</th>
<th>Dow Chemical</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Non-Recoverable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Sales</td>
<td>$5,881,766</td>
<td>$226,106,661</td>
<td>$9,013,753</td>
<td>$257,000,405</td>
<td>$80,757,659</td>
<td>$257,748,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Renegotiation Refund</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,680,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Sales</td>
<td>5,681,766</td>
<td>224,426,661</td>
<td>9,013,753</td>
<td>255,320,405</td>
<td>80,757,659</td>
<td>255,748,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Sales</td>
<td>5,655,272</td>
<td>240,396,572</td>
<td>7,691,282</td>
<td>231,685,727</td>
<td>15,205,879</td>
<td>250,496,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>49,494</td>
<td>3,010,089</td>
<td>241,375</td>
<td>3,380,475</td>
<td>1,588,782</td>
<td>4,300,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit</td>
<td>55,139</td>
<td>2,977,442</td>
<td>363,230</td>
<td>3,286,971</td>
<td>1,556,861</td>
<td>4,666,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent Profit Before Federal Taxes</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>3.510</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>7.805</td>
<td>2.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments on the Profit and Loss Statement:

Operations for the year 1942 were the same as in 1941. Therefore, the comments made following the Profit and Loss Statement of 1941 will apply in 1942, with the following exceptions:

Operating Expenses:

Operating expenses for the year 1942 per the company books amounted to $2,253,806. The company filed an amended return for 1942, on December 13, 1943, which shows a reduction of $94,860 in taxable income from the original return. Due to an over accrual of taxes, the compensation of certain executives, sharing in profits after taxes on a percentage basis, was increased an aggregate of $94,860. This $94,860 was not in the company's books as an expense. On the company's original return, the Revenue Agent disallowed an amount of $136,530. This consisted of excessive compensation of $136,530; capital stock tax of $50,000 and Real Estate taxes disallowed of $366,00. Also held in abeyance was an amount of $106,915 of Dividend Credits to Employees Accounts. This case, along with the company's 1941 tax case, was heard in the Tax Court in Cleveland, Ohio. The company's lawyers submitted a stipulation agreement showing that the company agreed to pay $98,551 in additional excess profits taxes. The company asserted in its petition that the Bureau of Internal Revenue improperly disallowed as deduction approximately $231,000 of $901,000 paid out in salaries and bonuses to top officials. In settlement of this matter, the company was allowed $136,530 in excessive compensation and $94,860 of the Revised Bonus. The Dividend Credit to Employees Accounts of $106,915; the $50,000 capital stock tax and $366,00 in Real Estate taxes were disallowed. This resulted in a net disallowance of $62,421 for the year 1942. Accordingly, the disallowance of $62,421 was credited to operating expenses of $2,253,806 which resulted in a net operating expense of $2,191,385.

The company listed donations in the amount of $19,939; research and development in the amount of $13,059, and Servicemen's Program in the amount of $12,903, as expenses in 1942. These latter amounts were charged in their entirety to non-renegotiable business. Operating expenses are detailed in Schedule B as set forth before.

There follows the tax schedule prepared in reconciling the 1942 taxable income to book profit.
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**T-X SCHEDULE - 1942**

**Net Income Shown in the Deficiency**
Notice Dated April 1, 1948

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$1,875,524.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions: (a) Renegotiated Profits</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions: (b) Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>$124,475.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of Adjustments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) The renegotiated profit adjustment shown in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deficiency notice dated April 1, 1948 has been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminated since the amount of excess profits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not been determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Salary Disallowance</td>
<td>$136,530.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Bonus Allowed</td>
<td>$106,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allowances</strong></td>
<td>$231,390.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dividend Credit to Employees Accounts</strong></td>
<td>$106,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Revenue Agents Report</td>
<td>$124,475.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income by Return</td>
<td>$1,875,524.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unallowable Deductions:**

(A) Excessive Compensation                             | $136,530.37  |
(B) Capital Stock Tax Disallowed                        | 50,000.00    |
(C)  Real Estate Taxes Disallowed                        | 365.77       |

**Non-Taxable and Additional Deductions**

(A) Renegotiation Profits                               | $2,000,000.00|
**Total**                                              | $5,176,326.15|
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TAX SCHEDULE - 1942 (Cont.)

1942

Net Income Per Original Return

Excessive Compensation Original R.A.R. $68,421
Employee Stock Dividend 106,975
$175,396

Add:
Allowance in Conference $38,805.42
Allowance Technical Staff 124,475.37 163,281
Net Adjustment 12,055
Capital Stock Tax 50,000
Real Estate Taxes 366
Net Disallowance
Adjusted Net Income Per Internal Revenue

$6,989,430.00

Original Net Profit Per Books $6,792,711
Adjusted Net Disallowance 208,808
208,808

Adjusted Net Disallowance
U. S. Notes 62,421
Prepaid Insurance 2,500
$7,063,940

Adjusted Net Profit Per Books $6,855,132
Add Army Refund 208,808

$7,063,940
Examination for the Year 1943:

During the conference held March 15, 1949, as reported in detail in referenced report of the writer dated April 5, 1949, Mr. advised the company that the firm's 1943 records would be checked and submitted. There follows the results of operations for the year 1943:

EXHIBITS

The following exhibits were prepared in connection with the examination of the books and records of the company:
### THE AUSTIN COMPANY, EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO

**EXHIBIT A**

**BALANCE SHEET AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1936 - 1946**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$42,640</td>
<td>$224,081</td>
<td>$824,520</td>
<td>$870,984</td>
<td>$1,156,779</td>
<td>$2,125,567</td>
<td>$3,447,045</td>
<td>$4,175,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable Securities</td>
<td>517,552</td>
<td>690,819</td>
<td>897,789</td>
<td>954,799</td>
<td>292,792</td>
<td>229,486</td>
<td>428,609</td>
<td>326,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes and Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>1,263,918</td>
<td>255,969</td>
<td>878,496</td>
<td>1,129,449</td>
<td>4,780,069</td>
<td>6,256,941</td>
<td>6,930,948</td>
<td>5,902,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>394,457</td>
<td>564,826</td>
<td>302,838</td>
<td>170,092</td>
<td>1,850,198</td>
<td>1,526,645</td>
<td>1,726,576</td>
<td>620,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,086,012</td>
<td>$2,270,424</td>
<td>$2,440,566</td>
<td>$2,440,566</td>
<td>$5,005,058</td>
<td>$5,280,065</td>
<td>$6,930,948</td>
<td>$5,902,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment in Long-Term Notes, Real Estate, etc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assets</td>
<td>124,950</td>
<td>117,066</td>
<td>64,950</td>
<td>66,038</td>
<td>190,117</td>
<td>187,455</td>
<td>297,794</td>
<td>108,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postwar Refund of Excess Profits Tax - Estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments in Fully Owned Subsidiary Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stock</td>
<td>609,924</td>
<td>509,780</td>
<td>476,466</td>
<td>470,046</td>
<td>1,569,765</td>
<td>1,569,765</td>
<td>1,470,765</td>
<td>1,370,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes and Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>1,127,402</td>
<td>1,069,497</td>
<td>1,032,498</td>
<td>990,498</td>
<td>1,076,379</td>
<td>990,498</td>
<td>990,498</td>
<td>990,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments in Fully Owned Subsidiaries</strong></td>
<td>$2,116,306</td>
<td>$2,139,277</td>
<td>$2,508,964</td>
<td>$2,466,544</td>
<td>$3,146,144</td>
<td>$2,550,946</td>
<td>$2,470,765</td>
<td>$2,370,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property, Plant and Equipment - Net</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Charges</td>
<td>10,611</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td>11,726</td>
<td>10,765</td>
<td>880,880</td>
<td>880,880</td>
<td>880,880</td>
<td>880,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$5,596,428</td>
<td>$6,282,307</td>
<td>$4,942,849</td>
<td>$4,942,849</td>
<td>$10,444,896</td>
<td>$14,437,008</td>
<td>$20,490,308</td>
<td>$11,972,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Payable</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$85,125</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>799,763</td>
<td>926,800</td>
<td>925,164</td>
<td>810,266</td>
<td>5,850,946</td>
<td>4,820,472</td>
<td>5,859,889</td>
<td>1,861,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accruals</td>
<td>67,093</td>
<td>94,044</td>
<td>80,741</td>
<td>44,788</td>
<td>190,041</td>
<td>251,043</td>
<td>192,587</td>
<td>160,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances in Excess of Billing on Contracts in Progress</td>
<td>36,466</td>
<td>14,354</td>
<td>14,233</td>
<td>16,974</td>
<td>223,783</td>
<td>252,113</td>
<td>711,042</td>
<td>461,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td>$1,034,168</td>
<td>$986,839</td>
<td>$785,408</td>
<td>$727,294</td>
<td>$3,074,418</td>
<td>$3,002,691</td>
<td>$3,011,249</td>
<td>$2,975,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes and Account Payable - Fully Owned Subsidiary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>287,744</td>
<td>287,000</td>
<td>287,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Mortgage Leaseshold Bonds</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>446,948</td>
<td>95,517</td>
<td>123,190</td>
<td>14,571</td>
<td>15,585</td>
<td>15,405</td>
<td>1,008,505</td>
<td>1,258,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments and Dividend Credits on Stock Purchase Agreements</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Stock and Surplus</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
<td>$1,014,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Stock (Less Held in Treasury)</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
<td>$1,151,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
<td>1,228,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Stock &amp; Surplus</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
<td>$3,253,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities, Capital Stock and Surplus</strong></td>
<td>$7,392,432</td>
<td>$6,268,236</td>
<td>$4,544,349</td>
<td>$5,822,900</td>
<td>$8,044,694</td>
<td>$14,417,002</td>
<td>$15,890,500</td>
<td>$11,972,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Average 1936-1939</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$9,403,159</td>
<td>$16,576,128</td>
<td>$931,76</td>
<td>$10,468,159</td>
<td>$11,914,854</td>
<td>$42,249,925</td>
<td>$27,045,875</td>
<td>$257,742,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs (Direct)</td>
<td>8,775,947</td>
<td>15,556,087</td>
<td>7,122,85</td>
<td>9,768,288</td>
<td>10,622,435</td>
<td>40,580,357</td>
<td>31,777,986</td>
<td>350,322,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Construction Profit</td>
<td>627,212</td>
<td>1,042,043</td>
<td>409,26</td>
<td>683,471</td>
<td>755,76</td>
<td>2,269,588</td>
<td>5,266,888</td>
<td>6,009,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gross Profit From:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>Average 1936-1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Sales</td>
<td>58,007</td>
<td>13,945</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>121,188</td>
<td>102,005</td>
<td>440,462</td>
<td>579,556</td>
<td>1,176,559</td>
<td>512,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>60,718</td>
<td>(22,031)</td>
<td>(19,144)</td>
<td>(14,133)</td>
<td>62,140</td>
<td>483,688</td>
<td>541,076</td>
<td>87,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rent</td>
<td>20,748</td>
<td>146,789</td>
<td>(67,372)</td>
<td>92,551</td>
<td>102,451</td>
<td>104,679</td>
<td>502,769</td>
<td>204,056</td>
<td>214,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Profit</strong></td>
<td>820,445</td>
<td>1,558,561</td>
<td>609,48</td>
<td>923,876</td>
<td>964,347</td>
<td>5,615,675</td>
<td>6,495,604</td>
<td>8,861,999</td>
<td>4,819,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent to Sales</td>
<td>8.725</td>
<td>6.955</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>8.601</td>
<td>8.676</td>
<td>8.414</td>
<td>7.462</td>
<td>5.434</td>
<td>2.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>Average 1936-1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>607,309</td>
<td>898,786</td>
<td>650,42</td>
<td>719,101</td>
<td>710,170</td>
<td>1,566,566</td>
<td>2,141,099</td>
<td>2,253,605</td>
<td>1,696,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent to Sales</td>
<td>6.606</td>
<td>5.416</td>
<td>4.119</td>
<td>5.507</td>
<td>5.437</td>
<td>5.547</td>
<td>5.554</td>
<td>5.607</td>
<td>5.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income Net</td>
<td>26,681</td>
<td>102,441</td>
<td>115,35</td>
<td>89,618</td>
<td>100,830</td>
<td>55,345</td>
<td>127,027</td>
<td>194,638</td>
<td>135,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Profit Before Federal Taxes on Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1939</th>
<th>Average 1936-1939</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1943</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>$9,403,159</td>
<td>$16,576,128</td>
<td>$931,76</td>
<td>$10,468,159</td>
<td>$11,914,854</td>
<td>$42,249,925</td>
<td>$27,045,875</td>
<td>$257,742,044</td>
<td>$160,947,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs (Direct)</td>
<td>8,775,947</td>
<td>15,556,087</td>
<td>7,122,85</td>
<td>9,768,288</td>
<td>10,622,435</td>
<td>40,580,357</td>
<td>31,777,986</td>
<td>350,322,106</td>
<td>155,827,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Construction Profit</td>
<td>627,212</td>
<td>1,042,043</td>
<td>409,26</td>
<td>683,471</td>
<td>755,76</td>
<td>2,269,588</td>
<td>5,266,888</td>
<td>6,009,238</td>
<td>3,829,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It will be noted that gross receipts and net operating profits on Fixed Price Contracts were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Receipts</th>
<th>$ 4,128,924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>455,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio 11.8%

The Fixed Price Contracts were 100% renegotiable subject to excess profits determination of $200,000.

After renegotiation, refund of $200,000, the adjusted operating profit would appear as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Receipts</th>
<th>$ 3,928,924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Adjusted Profit</td>
<td>255,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio 6.5%

Cost Plus-Fixed Fee and Dow Contracts (1942)

The receipts and profits on the CPFF Contracts which included Dow Chemical Contracts all of which were considered 100% renegotiable are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPFF</th>
<th>Dow</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipts</td>
<td>$227,619,996</td>
<td>5,835,424</td>
<td>233,455,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>4,578,026</td>
<td>240,370</td>
<td>4,818,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disallowed Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>386,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Operating Profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,100,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Plus-Fixed Fee and Dow Contracts (After Renegotiation) (1942)

After refund of $1,809,000 the gross receipts and adjusted operating profit would appear as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross receipts</th>
<th>$231,655,420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>3,300,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board did not allocate the refund to CPFF and Dow Contracts but rather on the total of this classification.

Non-Renegotiable Business (1942)

The gross receipts and profits from non-renegotiable business for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipts</td>
<td>$20,745,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>1,584,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Disallowed Costs</td>
<td>286,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Operating Profit</td>
<td>$1,297,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Business 1942 (Before Renegotiation)

The Gross Receipts and Profits for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipts</td>
<td>$258,329,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>6,852,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Other Income</td>
<td>148,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjusted Profit</td>
<td>$7,001,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Business 1942 (After Renegotiation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipts</td>
<td>$256,329,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>4,852,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Other Income</td>
<td>148,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjusted Profit</td>
<td>$5,001,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disallowed Salaries

The Board considered Executive Salaries to be excessive in the amount of $222,637 in so far as renegotiable business was concerned. Compensation for executive officials for the year 1942 was $722,637. The Board considered that $500,000 was sufficient. To this was added $106,915 dividend making a total disallowance of $329,552. This was applied to the entire business, and of this amount $286,847 was allocated to renegotiable business.
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Other Income

The Board considered that petitioner earned "Other Income" in the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942 in the net amount of $148,677. Work papers (pp. 644-645) reveal that same was made up of the following items:

Items Not Allocable to Specific Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment of Small Tock Inventory Reserve</td>
<td>$109,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline and Excise Tax refunds</td>
<td>3,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit from Blueprint sales</td>
<td>14,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent earned</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>9,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>147,745</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>32,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends Received</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>220,537</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Net Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>194,578</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less: Donations</td>
<td>$19,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>13,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicemen's Program</td>
<td>12,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,901</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Other Income** $148,677

PETITION OF CONTRACTOR

The Austin Company filed a petition in the United States Tax Court under Docket #104-R on November 10, 1944, seeking a redetermination of the excessive profits as theretofore fixed by the Navy Price Adjustment Board in its unilateral determination of August 14, 1944. The petition is quite voluminous and cites various reasons as to why the Board erred in making the determination.

Among some of the important errors listed by the company in its petition are as follows:

Petitioner contends that the Board erred in including as part of petitioner's negotiable business for the two years in question certain contracts which Defense Plant Corporation entered into prior to July 1, 1943, where the work called for by the contracts had been substantially completed and paid for prior to July 1, 1943, but where final payment had not been received because of administrative delays which were not the fault of
petitioner nor within its control.

The Company asserts that the total construction sales so included under such contracts amounted to approximately $128,000,000. The Company also claims that the Board erred in including as renegotiable business its construction work for Dow Chemical Company in the determined amount of $7,732,863, for the years 1941 and 1942 which sales petitioner claims were paid for by said company's own funds and made under private contracts.

The Company also contends that the Board erred in including in renegotiable business all of the sales made prior to April 28, 1942, in the amount of about $17,000,000 under Contract NOy-4210 with the Navy Department, in that such sales were on account of construction work completed prior to the effective date of said Renegotiation Act and except for the normal retained amount had been fully paid for April 28, 1942.

The Company also contends that the Board erred in disallowing as proper costs $225,872 for 1941 and $286,847 for 1942 on account of salaries reasonably and necessarily paid by petitioner in those years.

**EXHIBITS**

**Exhibit A**

This exhibit reflects the amount of gross receipts and adjusted net profit for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941 before and after renegotiation.

The figures appearing on this exhibit were compiled from work sheets prepared by the Navy Price Adjustment Board and ties in with the "spread sheet" showing final figures arrived at by the negotiators. (Page 791 work papers).

**Exhibit B**

This exhibit reflects the amount of gross receipts and adjusted net profit for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1942 before and after renegotiation.

The figures appearing on this exhibit were compiled from work sheets prepared by the Navy Price Adjustment Board and ties in with the "spread sheet" showing final figures arrived at by the Board. (Page 790 work papers.)
CONCLUSION

No examination has been made of the petitioner's books and records by the Washington Field Office. The figures as used herein were compiled from the Navy PAB files and records submitted to the Board by the petitioner.

The Claims Division of the Department in its memorandum requested that the Accountant classify petitioner's business under the various headings as set forth in the company's petition particularly pages 8 to 13 therein. Such segregation or breakdown as desired by the Department included the following as suggestions:

1. Cost plus-fixed fee contracts
2. Negotiated fixed amount contracts
3. Dow Chemical Company contracts
4. Defense Plant Corporation business
5. Sales prior to April 28, 1942.

The files of the Board revealed that an enormous amount of accounting had been done by accountants of the Board on this case. Schedules and exhibits were furnished by the petitioner from time to time. From these financial reports the Navy Accountants prepared detailed analyses. An attempt was made by Agent to contact the Navy accountants who assembled the final figures for the Board for the purpose of reassembling such data into the classification desired by the Department.

of the Office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Navy for Renegotiation was contacted by reporting agent concerning the reclassification of sales into the categories suggested by the Department memorandum.

advised that no such classifications had been prepared by Navy accountants. He suggested however that his office would make an effort to reassemble or reclassify such additional data if possible if requested at a subsequent date. maintains his office in Temporary Building No. 3, 17th and Constitution Avenue, N. W. Telephone extension 2029 Navy.
Thasmuch as it was determined that the Navy did not break down the sales into the categories desired by the Department nor did the Navy obtain a breakdown of the figures showing sales before and after April 28, 1942, such schedules were not prepared by reporting agent due to the lack of the necessary records.

It appears that figures as determined by the Navy and the petitioner were agreed to in principle as reflecting an estimate of the renegotiable business and profits. There appears to have been no dispute concerning the segregation of the renegotiable and non-renegotiable business but there appeared to be a definite disagreement as to the amount of excessive profits earned on the respective classifications of business by the petitioner.

The files of the Board indicate that the petitioner operated on both a departmental and an overall basis. The company's method of accounting is on a percentage of completion basis. For that reason the company requested that renegotiation for both the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 be considered on such a basis rather than on separate years. There are many complexities involved in this proceeding due to the multiplicity of operation and widely dispersed locations at which the petitioner did business. The Board has prepared a brief under date of July 2, 1946, for the Attorney General which sets out pertinent points involved in this renegotiation proceeding.

It is believed advisable not to conduct any field examination of the petitioner's books and records until such time as the Claims Division attorneys have determined what additional definite information is desired from the company's books and records. An analysis of the accounting data at the company's offices would entail a tremendous amount of work unless it was confined to a spot check or listing of certain figures on specific item or items.

The figures from which Exhibits A and B were taken were Pages 757 and 777 of the photostatic file of the Navy PAB which was submitted to this office for review. Page 757 is marked "Final Exhibit 3" while Page 777 is marked "Profit and Loss Summary based on Final Renegotiation Figures."

These schedules do not reflect the same segregation of sales and cost of sales for the years 1941 and 1942 as shown on page 8 of the company's petition; however it will be noted that the profit before taxes on renegotiable business for 1941 and 1942 does agree in total.
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The "spread sheets" and final schedules prepared by the Navy FAB did not segregate sales as to War Department, Navy Department, Defense Plant Corporation and other departments in connection with renegotiable business nor is there a breakdown of sales before and after April 28, 1942.

The files and records transmitted to the Washington Field Office through the Bureau have been returned by the writer to Room 3736.

In accordance with Bureau instructions no further work will be done in this case at this time unless and until advised to the contrary.

Two copies of this report are being designated for the Cleveland Division for information purposes. It is possible that the Bureau will instruct the Cleveland Office to perform additional accounting work at the offices of the petitioner located in Cleveland, Ohio.

- PENDING -
**PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT**

**THE AUSTIN COMPANY**

Year ended December 31, 1941

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LUMP</th>
<th>FIXED FEE</th>
<th>DOW CHEMICAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>COMPLETED AND FINAL PAYMENT RECEIVED APR. 28, 1942</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>COMPANY TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Sales</td>
<td>1,944,719.59</td>
<td>30,123,879.92</td>
<td>4,756,528.18</td>
<td>36,845,137.69</td>
<td>3,519,355.50</td>
<td>45,470,570.05</td>
<td>49,929,029.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>1,798,583.99</td>
<td>29,197,246.66</td>
<td>4,426,216.76</td>
<td>35,424,046.31</td>
<td>3,054,461.91</td>
<td>43,398,684.46</td>
<td>46,485,966.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>145,135.60</td>
<td>928,633.26</td>
<td>330,291.42</td>
<td>1,594,310.28</td>
<td>464,877.59</td>
<td>3,172,888.59</td>
<td>3,655,966.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Sales</td>
<td>9.42%</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
<td>31.21%</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Costs</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>7.44%</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>7.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses - Note A</td>
<td>55,014.30</td>
<td>565,259.55</td>
<td>95,030.45</td>
<td>715,304.30</td>
<td>107,758.99</td>
<td>1,108,165.98</td>
<td>1,215,925.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating profit</td>
<td>110,121.30</td>
<td>320,774.41</td>
<td>234,630.97</td>
<td>708,530.68</td>
<td>307,155.60</td>
<td>2,089,519.82</td>
<td>2,397,674.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Sales</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Costs</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rentals</td>
<td>13,726.68</td>
<td>44,824.87</td>
<td>59,490.00</td>
<td>64,417.56</td>
<td>62,851.61</td>
<td>223,380.44</td>
<td>236,230.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Sales</td>
<td>47,759.62</td>
<td>1,225,586.19</td>
<td>12,828.00</td>
<td>1,265,404.78</td>
<td>45,782.49</td>
<td>640,410.69</td>
<td>686,193.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>28,304.36</td>
<td>944,624.13</td>
<td>7,829.00</td>
<td>967,959.49</td>
<td>25,865.91</td>
<td>223,380.44</td>
<td>259,246.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Gross Profit</td>
<td>19,455.26</td>
<td>1,217,962.06</td>
<td>126,564.42</td>
<td>1,356,356.70</td>
<td>19,740.58</td>
<td>416,650.65</td>
<td>436,391.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Sales</td>
<td>47,020.24</td>
<td>85,576.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>132,636.06</td>
<td>84,227.88</td>
<td>1,275,565.50</td>
<td>1,359,793.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>37,666.56</td>
<td>83,618.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>121,284.76</td>
<td>84,415.02</td>
<td>228,634.20</td>
<td>213,249.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Gross Profit</td>
<td>9,353.68</td>
<td>15,958.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28,318.90</td>
<td>20,802.87</td>
<td>325,931.30</td>
<td>353,244.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before Other Income</td>
<td>145,905.33</td>
<td>712,546.76</td>
<td>244,925.97</td>
<td>1,103,178.06</td>
<td>409,372.07</td>
<td>2,935,292.45</td>
<td>3,325,672.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Sales</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Costs</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income - Net</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before taxes on Income</td>
<td>145,905.33</td>
<td>712,546.76</td>
<td>244,925.97</td>
<td>1,103,178.06</td>
<td>409,372.07</td>
<td>2,935,292.45</td>
<td>3,325,672.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Sales</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% to Construction Costs</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note A - Operating expenses have been reduced for aggregate income tax adjustments in ratio of construction costs.

Number 4,617,294, 74,934.27, 11,361.22, 90,013.31, 7,829.12, 111,162.87, 116,961.99, 209,876.50.
# Profit and Loss Statement

**The Austin Company**

Year ended December 31, 1943

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renegotiable</th>
<th>Non-Renegotiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Sales</strong></td>
<td>$4,083,073.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>$3,297,411.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Profit</strong></td>
<td>$785,662.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Sales</strong></td>
<td>11.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>12.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating expenses - Note A</strong></td>
<td>$34,825.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Profit</strong></td>
<td>$371,533.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Sales</strong></td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>10.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment rentals</strong></td>
<td>$33,499.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Sales</strong></td>
<td>$37,900.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Costs</strong></td>
<td>$55,826.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Gross Profit</strong></td>
<td>$20,073.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bliss Mill Sales</strong></td>
<td>$106,031.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bliss Mill Costs</strong></td>
<td>$76,870.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bliss Mill Gross Profit</strong></td>
<td>$29,161.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profit before Other Income</strong></td>
<td>$456,360.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Sales</strong></td>
<td>11.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>12.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profit before Taxes on Income</strong></td>
<td>$456,360.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Sales</strong></td>
<td>11.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% to Construction Costs</strong></td>
<td>12.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note A - Operating expenses have been reduced for aggregate income tax adjustments in ratio of construction sales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profit and Loss Statement</th>
<th>Renegotiable</th>
<th>Non-Renegotiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lump</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fixed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chemical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,083,073.78</td>
<td>$226,106,881.48</td>
<td>$8,013,750.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,297,411.39</td>
<td>$220,398,576.34</td>
<td>$7,691,885.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$785,662.39</td>
<td>$5,783,296.05</td>
<td>$31,974.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating expenses - Note A | $34,825.75 | $1,706,903.89 | $2,421,729.64 | $260.42 | $327,725.19 | $332,045.61 | $2,100,974.54 |
| Operating Profit | $371,533.84 | $3,103,705.34 | $3,475,239.19 | $2,714,915.97 | $1,332.14 | $1,201,475.28 | $1,202,957.42 | $4,977,771.39 |
| Equipment rentals | $33,499.57 | 254,896.94 | 12,070.00 | 290,465.51 | 119.70 | 93,292.43 | 93,300.13 | 382,987.64 |
| Engineering Sales | $37,900.41 | 4,920,569.92 | 25,054.00 | 5,053,473.33 | 79.88 | 496,753.75 | 496,753.92 | 5,503,309.69 |
| Engineering Costs | $55,826.78 | 3,930,624.52 | 18,261.00 | 4,004,725.01 | 53.25 | 348,824.26 | 348,824.82 | 4,362,742.32 |
| Engineering Gross Profit | $20,073.93 | 989,945.39 | 6,803.00 | 9,893,752.32 | 28.55 | 147,929.22 | 147,934.42 | 1,176,569.14 |
| Bliss Mill Sales | $106,031.55 | 805,828.22 | 2,232.00 | 914,091.77 | -0- | -0- | 914,091.77 | 1,590,553.11 |
| Bliss Mill Costs | $76,870.29 | 562,035.49 | 1,551.00 | 630,456.68 | -0- | -0- | 630,456.68 | 930,079.00 |
| Bliss Mill Gross Profit | $29,161.26 | 203,792.73 | 881.90 | 293,515.58 | -0- | -0- | 293,515.58 | 561,474.11 |
| Profit before Other Income | $456,360.50 | $4,602,286.19 | $259,028.99 | $5,317,615.78 | $1,552.47 | $1,540,529.08 | $1,542,016.50 | $6,859,772.28 |
| Other Income - Net | $0- | $0- | $0- | $0- | $0- | $192,078.50 | $192,078.50 | $192,078.50 |
| Profit before Taxes on Income | $456,360.60 | $4,602,286.19 | $259,028.99 | $5,317,615.78 | $1,552.47 | $1,732,706.53 | $1,734,236.00 | $7,051,850.78 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profit before Taxes on Income</th>
<th>Renegotiable</th>
<th>Non-Renegotiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$456,360.60</td>
<td>$4,602,286.19</td>
<td>$259,028.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benzottable Commercial Contracts 5 June 1944 Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Receipts at 100% (as reported)</th>
<th>Austin Job #6-295</th>
<th>Austin Job #4259</th>
<th>Austin Job #6728</th>
<th>Total 3 Day Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,712,104</td>
<td>685,501</td>
<td>2,400,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Estimate of amount applicable to original plant (paid for prior to ( \frac{1}{476} ))</td>
<td>1,712,104</td>
<td>685,501</td>
<td>2,400,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>1,712,104</td>
<td>685,501</td>
<td>2,400,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss 32.8% of 1941 (based on actual study of releases at Millard, Minn.)</td>
<td>1,118,864</td>
<td>159,620</td>
<td>1,678,484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assumed to be Subject to Renegotiation before adjustment for gross equipment and war and use (30.8% of 1941, 100 or 1942)</td>
<td>527,300</td>
<td>525,881</td>
<td>1,122,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessee Real Estate (Building Construction)</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in Percentage of Total Construction</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovered - Representing Process Equipment</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Construction</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessee Proportion of Output 30% War End Use - Percentage of Total Output</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Subject to Renegotiation - Amount % of Net assumed to be subject % of Total Receipt for Year</td>
<td>144,140</td>
<td>289,479</td>
<td>573,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Receipts, Costs and Profits at 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Receipts</th>
<th>1,712,104</th>
<th>685,501</th>
<th>2,400,605</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Cost</td>
<td>1,118,864</td>
<td>159,620</td>
<td>1,278,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Job Profit</td>
<td>593,240</td>
<td>525,881</td>
<td>1,122,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Gross Profit</td>
<td>26,855</td>
<td>15,954</td>
<td>42,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Gross Profit</td>
<td>1,188,889</td>
<td>1,661,116</td>
<td>3,850,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Party Equipment Rentals</td>
<td>15,829</td>
<td>20,112</td>
<td>35,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross</td>
<td>532,227</td>
<td>448,282</td>
<td>980,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses Per Atrium (Cost Basis)</td>
<td>22,995</td>
<td>28,995</td>
<td>51,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>50,230</td>
<td>55,287</td>
<td>105,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nen: Cost of Engineering</td>
<td>10,037</td>
<td>14,716</td>
<td>24,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Mills Hill Steel</td>
<td>22,137</td>
<td>27,166</td>
<td>49,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Receipts, Costs and Profits at Derived %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Receipts</th>
<th>184,259</th>
<th>280,975</th>
<th>465,234</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Job Profit</td>
<td>72,491</td>
<td>92,260</td>
<td>164,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Gross Profit</td>
<td>3,957</td>
<td>5,097</td>
<td>9,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills Gross Profit</td>
<td>15,746</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>17,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross</td>
<td>91,418</td>
<td>13,495</td>
<td>104,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses Per Atrium (cost basis)</td>
<td>20,455</td>
<td>28,203</td>
<td>48,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Profit</td>
<td>71,052</td>
<td>105,272</td>
<td>176,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nen: Cost of Engineering</td>
<td>12,237</td>
<td>13,427</td>
<td>25,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Mills Hill Steel</td>
<td>25,822</td>
<td>34,748</td>
<td>60,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. PAUL GILMORE, President for the Austin Company, stated that the Austin Company received one advanced payment on December 31, 1942, in the amount of $711,042. Mr. GILMORE stated that this was the only advance received from the Government and stated that on Cost Plus Fixed Fee work the Austin Company had to wait sometimes fifteen to thirty days to obtain reimbursable costs from the Government. Mr. GILMORE stated that this was an understandable delay because of the paper work in the Government departments.

DOW CHEMICAL

In a letter dated June 3, 1944, by Mr. H. A. HALLSTEIN, Vice-President of the Austin Company, directed to the Navy Department, Office of Procurement and Material, Washington, D.C., Mr. HALLSTEIN stated the following regarding Dow Chemical contract 0-254:

"Continuing contract specifies that Dow will authorize the Austin Company to perform work as specified by Dow at various locations. All work to be performed under this contract is made the subject of separate releases or purchase orders for each specific project and each project is performed on a Cost Plus Percentage Fee basis, the fee, it being the only item governed by the terms of the original continuing contract.

"We do not have available details of work and progress on the various releases under contract 0-254. At any specific date, however, we believe that some portion of this contract should not be considered as renegotiable but eliminated as applying to releases continued and paid for prior to April 28, 1942.

"No information is available on which to determine amounts of charges which should be considered real estate as distinguished from process equipment, however; information obtained in connection with the work at Midland, Michigan, for Dow Chemical Company indicates that this proportion should be 30 percent real estate and 70 percent processing equipment at Midland, Michigan, and we would suggest these same percentages be used for any consideration of the work at Pittsburg, California.

"We do not have any information indicating that percentage renegotiability of production produced by Dow Chemical Company at Pittsburg, California, however, they gave us a letter stating that their business for
the year June 1, 1942, to May 31, 1943, indicates that 50 per cent of such business is renegotiable. We believe this could be a reasonable figure to use in considering the renegotiability of work performed by the Austin Company at Pittsburgh, California."

The same letter refers to contract 2450, Dow Chemical Company — continuing contract — Freeport, Texas:

"The Freeport plant of Dow Chemical Company produces magnesium, chlorine, costic soda, ethylene, ethylene glycol, ethylene di-chloride and chlorinated solvents. The principal product of the Freeport plant is magnesium with some of the other products representing by-products of magnesium production. The magnesium is not processed beyond the pig or bar stage at Freeport. Telephone conversation with Dow representatives at Freeport indicates that they feel a proper segregation between real estate and plant equipment would be approximately 50 per cent to each classification.

"Considering the nature of the products produced at the Freeport plant, we do not believe that any of Austin construction work at this plant should be considered renegotiable."

This same letter also mentions contract No. 3672, Dow Chemical Company — continuing contract — Midland, Michigan:

"Analysis of billings on orders in progress at April 1, 1942, indicates that approximately 30 per cent of such releases would be properly classified as real estate and 70 per cent would be classified as process equipment. We believe that these percentages could be used in any consideration of Dow work as renegotiable."

Accordingly the Navy Department had made up a schedule in which they had calculated the sales of the Austin Company for the three Dow contracts, in which they had arrived at certain calculations for which they felt would be the renegotiable portion of process equipment.

As requested in the Departmental memorandum, there is set forth below a condensed schedule showing renegotiable portion of the Dow Chemical sales for each of the years 1941 and 1942:
1941

1250 DFC - CPF - Freeport, Texas
0-25h Commercial contract, Pittsburg, California,
   Per Navy calculations $2,859,099.18
1250 Commercial contract, Freeport, Texas,
   Per Navy calculations 184,569.00
6372 Commercial contract, Midland, Michigan,
   Per Navy calculations 914,176.00

1942

1250 DFC - CPF - Freeport, Texas
0-25h Commercial contract, Pittsburg, California,
   Per Navy calculations $2,178,334.02
1250 Commercial contract, Freeport, Texas,
   Per Navy calculations 2,732,195.00
6372 Commercial contract, Midland, Michigan,
   Per Navy calculations 2,862,254.00

It will be noted that contracts 0-25h, 1250 and 6372, of both years,
were taken from the Navy calculations. Contract 1250, the contract of
Freeport, Texas, was also carried by the Austin Company on their books as
a DFC Costs Plus Fixed Fee contract. These are also included in the schedule.
The amount of DFC contract of 1941 was $2,859,099.18. The DFC contract for
1942 was $2,178,334.02.

A photostat of the Navy calculations appears as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE RENEGOTIATION</th>
<th>NEGO. ALLOW</th>
<th>OTHER ALLOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>NET ALLOW</th>
<th>GRAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Plus Fixed Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipts</td>
<td>177,913</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>357,913</td>
<td>29,713</td>
<td>1,496,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Costs</td>
<td>126,285</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>338,285</td>
<td>59,725</td>
<td>1,467,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Job Profit</td>
<td>162,628</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>446,628</td>
<td>37,228</td>
<td>1,483,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Add**

- Engineering Gross Profit: 7,000
- Bliss Mill Profit: 7,270

**Total Gross Receipt**

177,913 + 126,285 + 162,628 = 466,826

**Less Operating Expenses**

- Engineering: 7,300
- Bliss Mill Costs: 8,400

**Other**

- 53,355
- 25,625

**Total**

466,826 - 15,000 = 451,826

**Net Operating Profit**

141,817

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Disallowed Costs (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,158,747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Income**

- 10,000

**Total Adjusted Profit**

141,817 + 10,000 = 151,817

**Ratio**

- 7.87%

(1) Executive Salaries

**AFTER RENEGOTIATION**

- **Less Round**
  - $200,000
  - $400,000

**Gross Receipts**

177,913

**Net Operating Profit**

141,817

**Other Income**

- 6,156

**Adj. Oper. Profit**

141,817

**Ratio**

- 7.87%
3. The gross profits of the Engineering Department and of Bliss Mill are picked up as other income while the charges for the use of the company's own equipment, being a statistical calculation, are also restored to gross profit.

EXAMINATIONS OF ACCOUNTING RECORDS

A. EXAMINATION FOR THE YEARS 1936 THROUGH 1942:

For the fiscal years ended December 31, 1941 through 1942, trial balances of the company's books were prepared and traced to the consolidated audit reports for those years issued by ERNST and ERNST, Certified Public Accountants.

B. EXAMINATION FOR THE FISCAL YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1941 AND 1942:

1. Scope of the Examination:

Balance sheet and income account data submitted by the company in connection with the renegotiation proceeding was traced to the accounting records of the company. The segregation of sales between renegotiable and non-renegotiable business was verified by reference to contracts and recapitulation sheets. Costs and expenses were traced to the accounts and the allocation thereof to renegotiable and non-renegotiable business checked for mathematical accuracy and the theory of allocation determined. In all instances, the theory of allocation was found to have been reasonable and no important differences were noted in the mathematical computations.

Net profit as shown by the books and renegotiation data of the company was reconciled with the taxable profit as shown by the Federal tax returns and appropriate adjustments were made based on reconciling items. Results of the Internal Revenue Service audit of the company's tax return for the years were obtained and appropriate adjustment made based thereon.

Analyses were made of various balance sheet and profit and loss accounts of the years under review and explanations were obtained concerning all transactions of a doubtful or unclear nature and, if necessary,
were further investigated by reference to supporting data. Adjustments made as a result thereof are discussed hereinafter under the caption "Renegotiation Adjustments" as are the adjustments made for variances between costs and expenses as recorded on the books and as allowable for tax purposes.

The financial position of the company at December 31, 1941 and 1942 is shown by Exhibit A, which is in comparative form, showing the financial position as at the end of each fiscal year 1936 through 1942. Exhibit A appears at the end of this report. Exhibit A basically reflects the financial condition of the company as reflected by the books.

2. Results of Operations:

The results of operations of the company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1941 is as follows:
INVENTORY OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED AS EVIDENCE

Cleveland Field Division
March 1, 1952 (Date)

Title and Character of Case
THE AUSTIN COMPANY vs. JAMES V. FORRESTAL
Secretary of Navy, Tax Court Docket 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

Field Division File Number
46-783

Bureau File Number
46-14692

Description of Property Being Held
3 accounting work sheets

Date Property Acquired and Authority for Acquisition
5/5/50

Source from Which Property Acquired
SA JOHN K. BUSTER

Location of Property
Exhibit room

Reason for Retention of Property and Efforts Which Have Been Made to Dispose of It
To be held for evidence until completion of case; NONE

50 MAY 13 1952
TO: Director, FBI (46-14692)  
FROM: SAC, Cleveland (46-783)  

DATE: May 2, 1952  

SUBJECT: THE AUSTIN COMPANY vs. JAMES V. FORRESTAL  
Secretary of Navy, Tax Court Docket 104-R  
RENEGOTIATION ACT  

ReBulet 4-24-52.  

Work papers of SA JOHN K. BUSTER enclosed.  

ENCLOSURE  

REGISTERED MAIL  
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED  

61 MAY 12 1952
THE AUSTIN COMPANY vs. JAMES V. FORRESTAL
Secretary of Navy, Tax Court Docket 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

The accounting work sheets presently being retained by your office in this matter should be forwarded to the Bureau for transmittal to the Claims Division.
AUSTIN COMPANY VS SECRETARY OF NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. ONE ZERO FOUR DASH R, RENEGOTIATION ACT. CIVIL DIVISION ATTORNEY JOHN WOLF ADVISED PETITIONER'S REPRESENTATIVE HAVE SUGGESTED CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON, D. C., FROM APRIL SIX TO APRIL EIGHT, NEXT. ATTORNEY WOLF DESIRES TO KNOW WHETHER SA JOHN K. BUSTER WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR CONFERENCE BEFORE SETTING DEFINITE DATE. SUBSTITUTE IMMEDIATELY REGARDING AVAILABILITY SA BUSTER. YOUR OFFICE WILL BE ADVISED WHEN CONFERENCE DEFINITELY SCHEDULED.

HOOVER

(46-14692)

CJM: eck
INVENTORY OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED AS EVIDENCE

CLEVELAND Field Division

AUGUST 28, 1952 (Date)

Title and Character of Case
THE AUSTIN COMPANY vs JAMES V. FORRESTAL Seky, of Navy, Tax Court Docket 104-R

NEGOTIATIONS ACT

Field Division File Number 46-783

Bureau File Number 46-114692

Description of Property Being Held
3 accounting work sheets

Date Property Acquired and Authority for Acquisition
5-5-50

Source from Which Property Acquired
SA JOHN K. BUSTER

Location of Property
Exhibit Room

Reason for Retention of Property and Efforts Which Have Been Made to Dispose of It

to be held for evidence until completion of case. None

46/14692

NOT RECORDED
80 SEP 11 1952

66 SEP 17 1952
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, WFO (46-0)

SUBJECT: RENEGOTIATION CASES

DATE: July 28, 1952

The following renegotiation cases are presently pending in the files of the Washington Field Office.

These are cases which have been referred to the Bureau by the Department of Justice for investigation, but which have not been disposed of by the United States Tax Court.

The docket of the Clerk, United States Tax Court is checked monthly by WFO for all of the pending cases, which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DOCKET NUMBER</th>
<th>WFO NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acme Steel Company</td>
<td>282-580-760-R</td>
<td>46-2328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alliance Brass and Bronze Company</td>
<td>633-R</td>
<td>46-18147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alliance Brass and Bronze Company</td>
<td>829-R</td>
<td>46-2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Engineering Company, Inc.</td>
<td>731-R</td>
<td>46-2412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover Motors Corporation</td>
<td>869-R</td>
<td>46-2514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Austin Company</td>
<td>104-R</td>
<td>46-1929 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlow and Seelig Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>787-R</td>
<td>46-2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Varne Barrowclough</td>
<td>823-R</td>
<td>46-2227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d/b/a Bittner Associates</td>
<td>543-R</td>
<td>46-2187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Ornamental Company</td>
<td>690-R</td>
<td>46-2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevets Aero-Macaniques S. A. Company</td>
<td>301-605-735-R</td>
<td>46-2214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enea Bossi and Walter Lyon, Et Al</td>
<td>766-R</td>
<td>46-2182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. C. Brown Company</td>
<td>77-R</td>
<td>46-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>859-860-R</td>
<td>46-2348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac Tool and Die Company</td>
<td>827-R</td>
<td>46-2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadillac Tool and Die Company</td>
<td>825-R</td>
<td>46-2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Research Corporation</td>
<td>891-R</td>
<td>46-2474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Warehouse Corporation</td>
<td>723-R</td>
<td>46-2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Wood Preserving Company</td>
<td>877-R</td>
<td>46-2434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Corboy Company</td>
<td>602-627-R</td>
<td>46-2114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat Corporation of America</td>
<td>569-R</td>
<td>46-1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>DOCKET NUMBER</td>
<td>WFO NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Coast Corporation of America</td>
<td>705-797-R</td>
<td>46-2392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Radio Products Company</td>
<td>623-R</td>
<td>46-2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastline Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>791-R</td>
<td>46-2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Curtis Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>888-R</td>
<td>46-2455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Dant and Dant of Kentucky, Et Al</td>
<td>511-R</td>
<td>46-2408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>863-864-R</td>
<td>46-2288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Steel Corporation</td>
<td>650-697-R</td>
<td>46-2155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Steel Corporation</td>
<td>286-R</td>
<td>46-1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E The Ebco Manufacturing Company, Et Al</td>
<td>589-R</td>
<td>46-1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Edward Valve and Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>308-R</td>
<td>46-1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Valves, Inc.</td>
<td>813-814-R</td>
<td>46-2139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie Basin Metal Products Inc.</td>
<td>558-R</td>
<td>46-2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversharp, Inc.</td>
<td>777-R</td>
<td>46-2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior Mills</td>
<td>201-R</td>
<td>46-2289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ferro Company Corporation</td>
<td>550-R</td>
<td>46-2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris Instrument Corporation</td>
<td>273-326-R</td>
<td>46-2235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Finnie Company</td>
<td>665-R</td>
<td>46-2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Kimsey</td>
<td>607-608-R</td>
<td>46-2309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Hardwood Sales Company</td>
<td>553-R</td>
<td>46-1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (Wood Specialties Co.)</td>
<td>804-R</td>
<td>46-2234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanlon-Waters, Inc.</td>
<td>531-727-R</td>
<td>46-1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. M. Harper Company</td>
<td>543-R</td>
<td>46-2137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Philip Machine Shop)</td>
<td>466-610-R</td>
<td>46-2064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Volcanic Specialties Co.)</td>
<td>828-R</td>
<td>46-2257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Volcanic Specialties Co.)</td>
<td>634-R</td>
<td>46-2099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker Electro Chemical Company</td>
<td>454-663-795-R</td>
<td>46-1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I The Ingersoll Milling Machine Company</td>
<td>216-463-R</td>
<td>46-1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iverson and Laux, Inc.</td>
<td>299-R</td>
<td>46-2208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (Lamson and Company)</td>
<td>730-R</td>
<td>46-2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolart Metal Products Company</td>
<td>855-R</td>
<td>46-2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet Industrials, Inc.</td>
<td>821-R</td>
<td>46-2270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet Chemicals, Inc.</td>
<td>820-R</td>
<td>46-2269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet Chemicals, Ltd.</td>
<td>818-R</td>
<td>46-2265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jowein, Inc.</td>
<td>765-R</td>
<td>46-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L LaGrand Industrial Supply Company</td>
<td>659-R</td>
<td>46-1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Bridge and Iron Company</td>
<td>306-345-R</td>
<td>46-1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>DOCKET NUMBER</td>
<td>WFO NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K  Kenametal Company</td>
<td>900-R</td>
<td>46-2568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenametal, Inc.</td>
<td>482-R</td>
<td>46-2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Carbon Company</td>
<td>713-R</td>
<td>46-2179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M  Magazine Repeating Raxor Company</td>
<td>619-R</td>
<td>46-2146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maguire Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>885-886-R</td>
<td>46-2192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Manufacturing and Supply Company</td>
<td>642-R</td>
<td>46-1930 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews Cotton Mill</td>
<td>756-R</td>
<td>46-2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews Cotton Mill</td>
<td>807-R</td>
<td>46-2115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattison Machine Works</td>
<td>135-1474-R</td>
<td>46-2144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; R Products, Inc.</td>
<td>753-R</td>
<td>46-2086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Parts Corporation</td>
<td>771-R</td>
<td>46-2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Parts Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>816-817-R</td>
<td>46-2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Ordnance, Inc.</td>
<td>721-788-R</td>
<td>46-2072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N  W. R. McDonough Company</td>
<td>252-R</td>
<td>46-2252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Electric Welding Machine Co.</td>
<td>819-R</td>
<td>46-2267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Electric Welding Machines Co.</td>
<td>166-R</td>
<td>46-1451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Electric Welding Machines Co.</td>
<td>153-R</td>
<td>46-2331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Tent and Awning Supply Company</td>
<td>775-R</td>
<td>46-2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Automatic Products Corporation</td>
<td>799-R</td>
<td>46-2239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Automatic Products Corporation</td>
<td>798-R</td>
<td>46-2235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P  Pacific Chain and Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>831-832-R</td>
<td>46-2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific-Atlantic Steamship Company</td>
<td>871-R</td>
<td>46-2334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer-Bee Company</td>
<td>898-R</td>
<td>46-2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Bloomington, Inc.</td>
<td>699-R</td>
<td>46-2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sherman Company</td>
<td>707-R</td>
<td>46-2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sherman Company</td>
<td>698-R</td>
<td>46-2387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Company (Island Machine)</td>
<td>750-R</td>
<td>46-2290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Iron and Machine Works</td>
<td>830-R</td>
<td>46-2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Metal Products Company</td>
<td>857-R</td>
<td>46-2333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Metal Products Company</td>
<td>856-R</td>
<td>46-2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>717-718-R</td>
<td>46-2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Maintenance Corporation</td>
<td>876-R</td>
<td>46-2427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona Aircraft Company</td>
<td>793-R</td>
<td>46-2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona Aircraft Company, Et Al</td>
<td>810-R</td>
<td>46-2263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Pacific Company, Et Al</td>
<td>833-834-R</td>
<td>46-2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procelain Steels, Inc.</td>
<td>430-R</td>
<td>46-1439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DOCKET NUMBER</th>
<th>WFO NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rainwear, Inc.</td>
<td>704-R</td>
<td>46-2390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regal Chemical Corporation</td>
<td>889-890-R</td>
<td>46-2483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Arms Company</td>
<td>538-R</td>
<td>46-1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robersonville Tent Company</td>
<td>773-R</td>
<td>46-2268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Rushlight Company</td>
<td>127.128-R</td>
<td>46-1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandia Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>778-R</td>
<td>46-2094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph E. Seagram and Sons, Inc., Et Al</td>
<td>593-R</td>
<td>46-2409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sebastian Lathe Company</td>
<td>769-770-R</td>
<td>46-2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanaman Brothers</td>
<td>655-R</td>
<td>46-1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanaman Brothers</td>
<td>875-R</td>
<td>46-2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Sheaffer Pen Company</td>
<td>731-R</td>
<td>46-2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Steel Company, Et Al</td>
<td>794-R</td>
<td>46-2261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Steel Company, Et Al</td>
<td>839-R</td>
<td>46-2261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Steel Company</td>
<td>676-R</td>
<td>46-1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A. E. Sheve Company</td>
<td>343-R</td>
<td>46-2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Fireproofing Company</td>
<td>901-R</td>
<td>46-2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill Tent Company, Inc.</td>
<td>774-R</td>
<td>46-2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Machinery Company</td>
<td>805-R</td>
<td>46-2231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Steamship Company</td>
<td>872-R</td>
<td>46-2327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>370-R</td>
<td>46-1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>80-R</td>
<td>46-1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. A. Stuart Oil Company, Ltd.</td>
<td>486-493-702-R</td>
<td>46-2126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Tarboro Tent Company</td>
<td>776-R</td>
<td>46-2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrift Packing Company</td>
<td>684-R</td>
<td>46-2065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Flexible Coupling Company</td>
<td>256-338-639-R</td>
<td>46-1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Foundation Company</td>
<td>193-R</td>
<td>46-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Metal Craft Company</td>
<td>866-R</td>
<td>46-2361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Metal Craft Company</td>
<td>867-R</td>
<td>46-2363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Cartridge Company</td>
<td>470-716-R</td>
<td>46-1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Van Dorn Iron Works Company</td>
<td>141-R</td>
<td>46-1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dorn Iron Works</td>
<td>133-R</td>
<td>46-2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dorn Iron Works</td>
<td>746-R</td>
<td>46-2071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>DOCKET NUMBER</td>
<td>WFO NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Products Corporation</td>
<td>692-R</td>
<td>46-2063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Die and Engineering Company, Et Al</td>
<td>826-R</td>
<td>46-2449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Die and Engineering Company, Et Al</td>
<td>824-R</td>
<td>46-2448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>713-R</td>
<td>46-2233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>616-R</td>
<td>46-2232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks Stevedoring Company, Inc.</td>
<td>679-480-481-R</td>
<td>46-2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Stag Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>677-R</td>
<td>46-2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Tent and Awning Company, Inc.</td>
<td>762-R</td>
<td>46-2057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E. Wolfe Construction Company, Inc.</td>
<td>503-R</td>
<td>46-1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Parts, Inc.</td>
<td>432-R</td>
<td>46-1636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Transmit the following Teletype message to: BUREAU

DIRECTOR, FBI (46-14692) 3-10-53

SAG, CLEVELAND URGENT

AUSTIN COMPANY VS SECRETARY OF NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. ONE ZERO FOUR

DASH R, RENEGOTIATION ACT. REBU AIRTEL MARCH SIX, LAST. SA JOHN K.

BUSTER SUBPOENNAED FOR TRIAL IN LOUISVILLE, KY. SCHEDULED TO BEGIN APRIL

ONE, NEXT WHICH MAY EXTEND THROUGH APRIL SIX. SUGGEST CONFERENCE WITH

DEPARTMENTAL ATTORNEY JOHN WOLF BE SCHEDULED ON OR AFTER APRIL EIGHT,

NEXT.

MC GABE

END

ECK:rlk
46-783

3-11-'53

Jablonski, Acting

Approved: __________________________ Sent: ________ M ________ Per: ______

Special Agent in Charge

AIR TEL

RECORDED - 56 MAR 11 1953
TRANSMIT THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE TO: SAC, CLEVELAND

THE AUSTIN COMPANY VS. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER ONE NAUGHT FOUR R, RENEGOTIATION ACT. REURAIRTEL MARCH TEN-LAST. CIVIL DIVISION REQUESTS THAT SA JOHN K. BUSTER REPORT TO WASHINGTON, D.C., TEN A.M., APRIL NINE NEXT FOR CONFERENCES. CIVIL DIVISION BELIEVES SA BUSTER'S PRESENCE WILL BE NECESSARY UNTIL AND INCLUDING APRIL FOURTEEN NEXT. SA BUSTER SHOULD REPORT TO ROOM FOUR SEVEN ONE TWO, BUREAU, PRIOR TO CONFERENCE. SUAIRTEL IMMEDIATELY RE AVAILABILITY SA BUSTER.

NOTE: This case involves a suit in the U.S. Tax Court seeking re-determination of excessive profits in the amount of $2,400,000. SA John Buster of the Cleveland Office conducted an accounting investigation in this case.
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Re: The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy; Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

A conference has been scheduled with the contractor's attorney in the above-entitled case in the office of our for the morning of . The purpose of the conference is to draft a stipulation for presentation to the Tax Court at the trial of the above case in July 1953. The excessive profits involved total $2,400,000.

It is requested that Special Agent John Buster of your Cleveland office be authorized to attend the above conference since numerous accounting adjustments made by Special Agent Buster in his examination of petitioner's books will largely be the subject matter of the conference. Since at least several days of preparation will be required for the conference it is requested that Special Agent Buster report to our in Room 3134 at 10:00 A.M. on the morning of . It is believed that Mr. Buster's services will be required to and including April 14, 1953.

Warren E. Burger
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

COPY DESTROYED
197/MAY 6 1970
This case involves a suit in the U. S. Tax Court seeking redetermination of excessive profits in the amount of $2,400,000. SA John Buster of the Cleveland Office conducted an accounting investigation. By memo 3-25-53, Civil Division previously requested that SA Buster report to Washington on April 9, 1953. By airtel dated 4-6-53 Cleveland advised SA Buster was tied up on a trial in Owensboro, Ky., and would not be available before 4-13-53. Attorney Civil Division now requests that SA Buster report to Washington on 4-16-53. This request was made on 4-9-53.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Transmit the following Teletype message to: BUREAU
FBI, CLEVELAND 4-6-53
DIRECTOR, FBI

THE AUSTIN CO. VS. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT, DOCKET 46-14692-21
NO. ONE NAUGHT FOUR R: RENEGOTIATION ACT. REURAILTEL APRIL FIRST, FIFTYTHREE. SA JOHN K. BUSTER NECESSARY WITNESS
TRIAL OF FOR PERIOD 2 OR 3 DAYS AND WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE TO REPORT WASHINGTON BEFORE MONDAY, APRIL 13. ADVISE.

END.

MC CABE

CAH-jmc
46-783

Approved: Special Agent in Charge

Sent M Per

RECORDED - 23

APR. 7, 1953
SAC, Cleveland

RECORD

Director, FBI (46-14692)

THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY;
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

May 1, 1953
0-1 to Ch. 8 2/3 30/153
Go

There is being enclosed herewith for each office one copy of a self-explanatory memorandum dated April 28, 1953, from Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger. The enclosures referred to in Mr. Burger's memorandum are being transmitted to the Cleveland Office under separate cover by railway express.

The Bureau desires that the Cleveland Office give this matter immediate and continuous attention and promptly set forth any necessary leads for auxiliary offices. Inasmuch as the case is presently set for trial before a division of the Tax Court in Cleveland, Ohio, beginning July 6, 1953, the Bureau desires that the entire investigation in this matter be completed no later than June 15, 1953.

The Bureau and Washington Field Office should be informed of the nature of the leads being set forth for auxiliary offices and all auxiliary offices should be instructed by the Cleveland Office to submit reports in this matter to the Bureau by routing slip for the attention of the Investigative Division, Accounting and Fraud Section.

As requested by the Civil Division, the Bureau should be informed when the contracts have been assembled in order that the Civil Division may be advised of this fact in the event they deem it advisable to have a Department attorney analyze the contracts.

Enclosure

cc: 2-Washington Field, with enclosure
cc: 1-Package (RAILWAY EXPRESS)

NOTE: The enclosures being forwarded to Cleveland under separate cover have been sent to the Supply Room for forwarding to Cleveland.

CJM: ige

78 MAY 12, 1953
MAILED 25
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

FROM: Warren E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

SUBJECT: The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy; Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

Renegetion Act

At a conference held in Washington on April 20, 1953 between counsel for the contractor, one of their vice presidents, our office, and Special Agent John K. Buster of your Cleveland office, it was agreed that considerable further investigation of the contractor's records was necessary in order to ascertain facts for the purpose of properly preparing a stipulation of facts for the Tax Court in the trial of this renegotiation case. The case is presently set for trial before a division of the Tax Court in Cleveland, Ohio, on a calendar beginning July 6, 1953.

The case involves a petition filed in the Tax Court by the Austin Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, for a redetermination of their excessive profits totalling $2,400,000 for their fiscal years 1941 and 1942. The contracts were fixed price, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, guaranteed maximum and cost plus a percentage of costs contracts under Defense Plant Corporation contracts, prime contracts with the Army and the Navy, and subcontracts under prime contracts with these Departments. The Austin Company constructed defense and industrial plants of a value of approximately $300,000,000 in 1941 and 1942.

In its operations the contractor produced structural steel in its division known as "Eliss Mill." This steel was used in the performance of its fixed price and cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts and apparently was charged, in the case of the cost plus contracts, to reimbursable costs at a price of approximately $123 per ton. This figure included a profit element. Similarly, costs representing charges for use of company owned equipment and engineering services rendered included a profit element charged to reimbursable costs in excess of actual costs. A like situation may have prevailed in charging as perishable, non-capitalized tool costs an amount in excess of actual depreciation and other applicable costs. In the case of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts it is not known whether the contract provisions permitted the inclusion in reimbursable costs of the profit element described above. In a trial of this case the Department will probably argue that where the contracts did not so provide, the entire added profit is excessive and if the contracts did so provide, that some of the profits charged were unreasonable and, to that extent, were excessive. Since the reimbursable costs...
on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts approximate $250,000,000 for the years 1941 and 1942 this question may be of considerable importance in the trial of this case. For this reason it is requested that all of the contractor's contracts, including fixed price, cost-plus-fixed-fee and others be examined to determine whether the profit above described was properly included in costs within the meaning of the applicable provisions of the contracts. Mr. Gilmore, Vice President of the Austin Company, has agreed to make these contracts available for analysis. It is further requested that Mr. Buster advise this office when the contracts have been assembled in the event that an analysis by the Department attorney to whom the case is assigned is considered advisable.

There are described below several schedules which should be prepared for use in the proposed stipulation to the Tax Court. In all of the requested schedules the costs should be broken down to include each separate item of cost usually set forth in the cost of sales and cost of Goods Sold elements of a profit and loss statement. Where cost figures involve Bliss Mill operations, engineering service costs, company owned equipment rental charges and perishable tool charges only the actually incurred costs should be included in the schedules and the profit element described above should be shown separately on a schedule supplemental to the primary schedule involved. It is not expected that the contractor will agree to the disallowance of any of these profits as unreasonable costs.

In the schedules requested below, figures pertaining to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts and cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracts should be shown only as costs and fees and should not be totaled to represent "sales" figures.

There is set forth below the requested information and schedules which will be necessary for the proper preparation of this case for trial.

1. The contractor's Vice President, Mr. Gilmore, will make available a list of approximately 26 contracts (along with the pertinent "Plancor" numbers) which were executed by the contractor and Defense Plant Corporation and/or industrial concerns acting as agents for DPC. Counsel agree that all business secured from these contracts is subject to renegotiation where final payment was made after April 28, 1942, subject to counsel's reservation of a constitutional question. It is requested that a preliminary report be submitted as soon as possible showing, for each of the approximately 26 DPC contracts the name of the prime contractor with whom the Austin Company contracted, the prime contract number (if signed by DPC), the "Plancor" number, a brief description of the plant and facilities constructed and the location thereof. In the final report, the DPC receipts, accruals and profits should be shown as follows for each of the fiscal years 1941 and 1942:
a. Fixed Price DPC Contracts

Sales, costs and profits showing DPC contracts on which final payment was made before April 28, 1942. Sales, costs and profits for 1941 and 1942 from DPC fixed price contracts where final payment was made on or after April 28, 1942 and before July 1, 1943. Sales, costs and profits for 1941 and 1942 from DPC fixed price contracts where final payment was made on or after July 1, 1943.

b. Cost-Plus-A-Fixed-Fee DPC Contracts

The same information requested above for fixed price DPC contracts should be shown for CPFF contracts except that the schedules should show properly reimbursable costs (see discussion above re showing questionable "Bliss Mill" etc. profits as costs) and the fees derived therefrom.

2. The contractor maintains that prime contract NOy-4210 dated July 11, 1940 is a severable contract and that the approximately eleven supplementary agreements executed under Contract NOy-4210 are actually individual contracts. Total costs and fees under this contract were approximately $70,000,000. It is therefore requested that a schedule be prepared showing the "properly reimbursable costs" plus the fixed fees involved for the years 1941 and 1942 derived from each supplement and under the contract as originally executed. The date of final payment should be shown for the work performed on each supplement and under the contract as originally executed. A consolidated schedule should then be prepared showing the costs and fees under each supplement and/or the original contract for the years 1941 and 1942 where final payment was made before April 28, 1942 and where final payment was made on or after April 28, 1942.

3. A separate schedule should be prepared showing the sales, costs and profits for 1941 and 1942 on all fixed price prime contracts between the Austin Company and Departments of the Government named in the Renegotiation Act (exclusive of DPC provided for above) with a segregation for 1941 and 1942 between contracts on which final payment was made before April 28, 1942 and on which final payment was made on or after April 28, 1942.

4. The Austin Company entered into numerous fixed price and cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts in 1940-1-2 with private corporations for the construction of buildings and facilities. Mr. Gilmore has agreed to make available for FBEI examination copies of these contracts, their supplements and change orders. All such contracts should be considered nonrenegotiable if final payment thereunder was made to the Austin Company before April 28, 1942. Where final payment was made on or after April 28, 1952, an examination should be made of each
of the contracts involved to determine whether, under its terms, title to the plant and facilities was to be in the Government immediately or ultimately. If so, all receipts and accruals or fees thereunder should be considered entirely renegotiable, unless the contract, by its terms, is specifically exempted from renegotiation. If title is not to be in the Government immediately or ultimately the receipts, accruals and attendant sales costs and profits and/or fees should be segregated between (1) those attributable to construction of the building itself and all utilities, piping, elevators, heating, lighting, air-conditioning and like installations which by their nature do not pertain to the production or manufacture of the products for which the building was constructed (all of which should be listed as nonrenegotiable) and (2) the receipts etc. which are attributable to machinery and equipment such as vats, assembly lines, cranes, ramps, jigs etc. installed in the building primarily for use in connection with the production and manufacture of the products for which the plant was designed, constructed and used. In the case of this latter group (No. 2) a preliminary report should be submitted showing the figures requested for 1941 and 1942 in totals by contract for each prime contractor involved, and the date of completion of each prime contract set forth. An attempt will then be made by this office to determine the percentage of renegotiability by reference to the appropriate records of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board pertaining to the renegotiation of the prime contractors.

5. Mr. Gilmore has agreed to make available for FBI examination all pertinent books and records in order to determine the approximate amount of the business for 1941 and 1942 which was subcontracted to others. A possible typical source of this information may be the Cleveland, Ohio, Field office records of the Austin Company. It is requested that appropriate records be examined in Cleveland and, if necessary, in the various Austin branch offices, to determine the amount of subcontracting and that, in the preparation of the various schedules requested herein, the amount of subcontracting be shown separately as an item of cost.

There is forwarded herewith pertinent files of the Navy Price Adjustment Board which will be helpful to your accountants in their further investigation.

Enc. No. 187156
Office Memorandum  •  UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

DATE: May 25, 1953

FROM: SAC, Cleveland (46-783)

SUBJECT: THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY; TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R
       RENEGOTIATION ACT

ReBulet 5-1-53, and enclosed report.

There are enclosed herewith four copies of the report of SA JOHN K. BUSTER, dated 5-25-53.

The contracts referred to in Departmental memorandum, dated April 28, 1953, have been reviewed and assembled and are available for an examination by Departmental attorney's.

The agents conducting this investigation are presently surveying the Cleveland District Files. This phase of the investigation must be completed in order to intelligently set forth leads and instructions to auxiliary offices.

For the information of the Bureau, The Austin Company's headquarters are located in East Cleveland, Ohio. They operate the following District Offices, which maintain all the original accounting data:

- Cleveland
- New York
- Detroit
- Seattle
- Chicago
- Houston
- Oakland

In the event the sub-contracting (set forth later in memo) must be checked in detail, it would entail setting forth leads to the Bureau Field Offices, encompassing the Austin District Offices, to gather this data.

The method of accounting used by the Austin Company is such that all details are kept in the District Offices, while the summaries are contained on work sheets in the Cleveland Office.

JKB'lvh
Enc. (4)
Director, FBI

The total sales of Petitioner for the years 1941 and 1942 approximate $300,000,000. The greater percentage of these sales are on a fee basis, i.e., cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, guaranteed maximum, and cost plus a percentage of costs.

There is contained in this total of $300,000,000, an amount that is sub-contracted on every job, such as glazing, painting and decorating, sheet metal and duck work, roofing, plumbing, etc.

Likewise if condition warrant, some of the excavating and labor would be sub-contracted.

The Department in defending the action and determination of the Navy Price Adjustment Board is contemplating challenging the contractor, that the fees paid and the resulting excessive profit is too high. That because a good deal of the work was sub-contracted, the total sales figure does not represent in its entirety the Austin Company's skill and ingenuity.

Therefore the Departmental attorney handling this case has instructed that the exact amount of sub-contracting be determined.

Because of the type of accounting system used by construction engineers and designers, which has been in use for years and which they have found successful, in order to ascertain the sub-contracting accurately, it has been estimated, and this is due to their system as set forth above, that 500 agent days would be required.

This estimate was made by the reporting Agents after a careful survey and with the help of Mr. GILMORE, who formerly worked for the CPA firm of Ernst and Ernst and is now a Vice-President of the Austin Company.

It is suggested that the Department be advised of the magnitude of the task involved. It is believed that a conference with the Departmental attorney handling this case would in all probability result in a revision or elimination of much of the data requested by the Department.
Director, FBI

It is pointed out for the information of the Bureau that SA BUSTER, who is now a Resident Agent at Toledo, Ohio, conducted considerable accounting investigation in this case in 1949 and is familiar with the accounting record of the Austin Company. For this reason and in order to expedite this investigation SA BUSTER has been assigned this case as a special in Cleveland, headquarters city, and the necessary additional accounting personnel will be made available in order to complete this investigation at the earliest possible date.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON FIELD

REPORT MADE AT CLEVELAND DATE WHEN MADE 5/25/53 PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE 5/11-21/53

REPORT MADE BY JOHN K. BUSTER 1vh

CHARACTER OF CASE RENEGOTIATION ACT

TITLE THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY; TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R

TWO-WEEK REPORT

This investigation is predicated upon Bureau letter, dated May 1, 1953, with accompanying memorandum from Assistant Attorney General WARREN E. BURGER, setting forth in detail the investigation desired.

All contracts held by the Petitioner during the years 1941 and 1942 have been assembled.

In regard to Navy contract NOY-4210, the contract has been located in Cleveland, however, the accounting data is in the Seattle District Office. [REDACTED] has written to the Austin Company, Seattle District Office, requesting them to advise him as to what is available in these records.

[REDACTED] for this contract is now assigned to the Cleveland Office. [REDACTED] was interviewed concerning his recollection as to what records were maintained. He stated that separate costs were maintained on each job site. He also stated that he thought that a summary was prepared at the conclusion of each job.

Investigation to date has been mainly assembling the various contracts. Also reviewing the DPC contracts.

As requested in the Departmental memorandum, the 26 DPC contracts have been reviewed. The requested information enclosed.

COPY DESTROYED

MAY 6 1970
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APPROVED AND FORWARDED: STANDARDS DIV.

SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE:

DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES

LETTED [REDACTED] 5/28/53

RECORDED - 106

PROPERTY OF FBI—THIS CONFIDENTIAL REPORT AND ITS CONTENTS ARE LOANED TO YOU BY THE FBI AND ARE NOT TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE OF AGENCY TO WHICH LOANED.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1952—O-216616

10—02255-5
CV. F. O.
46-783

is submitted as an enclosure with this report for transmittal to the Department.

The investigation presently in progress is the surveying of the commercial contracts in the Cleveland District Office in order to ascertain what information is available regarding process equipment and sub-contracting, and the preparation of the various schedules as requested by the Department.

This investigation is being conducted by SA (A) and the reporting Agent.

It is estimated that 120 agent days will be necessary in order to complete the Cleveland phase of this investigation.

ENCLOSURE TO BUREAU: List DPC Contracts.

- P -
CV. F. O.
46-783

REFERENCE: Bureau letter, 5-1-53.
Assistant Attorney General  
Warren E. Burger

June 4, 1953

Reference is made to your memorandum dated April 28, 1953, and to the report of Special Agent John K. Buster, dated May 25, 1953, at Cleveland, Ohio, in the above-captioned matter. Your memorandum dated April 28, 1953, requests that appropriate records be examined in Cleveland and, if necessary, in the various Austin branch offices to determine the amount of subcontracting and that the amount of subcontracting be shown separately as an item of cost in the schedules to be prepared in this case.

Our Cleveland Office has advised that, because of the type of accounting system used by construction engineers and designers, it has been estimated that it will require 500 agent days to ascertain the amount of subcontracting. This estimate was made by agents of our Cleveland Office after a careful survey and with the help of Mr. Gilmore, formerly employed by the certified public accounting firm of Ernst and Ernst, who is now Vice President of the Austin Company.

Our Cleveland Office has suggested that a conference between Special Agent John K. Buster and the attorney assigned to this matter regarding the scope of the investigation to be performed concerning the subcontracting work might be desirable.

It is our understanding that [blank] of your staff intends to go to Cleveland, Ohio, in the near future in order to review the Defense Plant Corporation contracts in this matter. It is suggested that the Bureau be informed as to the exact date that [blank] intends to be in Cleveland in order that arrangements can be made to have Special Agent John K. Buster available to confer with [blank] concerning the scope of the investigation in this matter.

cc: l-Cleveland (46-783)

cc: Mr. Glavin

SEE NOTE ON PAGE 2

COMM — FBI

JUN 4 1953

MAILED 27
NOTE: The attached memorandum from Cleveland dated May 25, 1953, points out that Special Agent John K. Buster, who is now a Resident Agent at Toledo, Ohio, has conducted considerable accounting investigation in this case and is familiar with the accounting records of the Austin Company. The Cleveland Office has advised that for this reason and in order to expedite the investigation, Special Agent Buster has been assigned this case as a special in Cleveland, Ohio, and that necessary additional accounting personnel will be made available in order to complete this investigation at the earliest possible date. It is noted that in this case the petitioner has filed a suit in the U. S. Tax Court seeking a redetermination of excessive profits totalling $2,400,000. Special Agent Buster has engaged in extensive conferences with the Department attorneys in Washington, D. C., concerning this case.
May 22, 1953

You will recall that in a conference in Washington on April 20, 1953, among you, Special Agent John Buster of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and our it was agreed that additional accounting investigation would be made of petitioner's books and records.

At April 23, 1953, we requested the Director of the FBI to authorize Mr. Buster to make the additional investigation. We believe that he had already commenced his further examination. The memorandum to the Director outlined in considerable detail the scope of the additional investigation. We have requested the FBI to authorize Mr. Buster to discuss these accounting problems with you particularly to determine whether the information to be secured conforms with the matters agreed to in our conference of April 20, 1953. If, since our conference you have determined that there is additional accounting data which you may wish to stipulate to the Tax Court we suggest that you request Mr. Buster to verify such data during the course of his present examination.

Since it is agreed that the scope of the accounting investigation is such that it will not be completed in sufficient time for the trial of this case, presently set for July 6, 1953, may we suggest that you prepare a motion for continuance and supporting memorandum substantially in the form of prior motion for continuance granted by the Tax Court on January 13, 1953. Upon receipt of the motion we will sign it and attend to its filing in the Tax Court.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN E. BURGER
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

By:

EDWARD H. HIGGINS
Chief, General Litigation Section
May 28, 1953

SAC, Cleveland

110 Director, FBI (46-14692)

THE AUSTIN COMPANY V. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY;
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

There is being enclosed herewith for the Cleveland Office two copies of a memorandum dated May 22, 1953, from Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger together with one copy of the enclosure referred to therein.

The Cleveland Office should contact petitioner's representatives to discuss the accounting problems in this matter if same has not already been done. The Agent should, of course, confine any discussion with petitioner's representaives solely to accounting problems, and no opinion should be expressed by the Agent as to merits of this case or possible settlement or stipulation.

Enclosure

CJM: feb
TO: Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
DATE: May 22, 1953
FROM: Warren E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Division
SUBJECT: The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy;  
Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

We enclose herewith two copies of a self-explanatory letter dated May 22, 1953, to opposing counsel in the above-entitled Tax Court renegotiation case.

We request that one copy of this letter be forwarded to Special Agent John Buster of your Cleveland office and that he be authorized to confer with opposing counsel concerning the matter set forth in the enclosed letter.

Enc. No. 187130
JUNE 26, 1953

THE AUSTIN COMPANY VS. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET #1014-R; RENEGOTIATION ACT.

ADVISE CASE POSTPONED UNTIL FALL. INVESTIGATION SHOULD STILL BE GIVEN EXPEDITIOUS ATTENTION. ADVISES HE IS UNABLE TO GO TO CLEVELAND FOR CONFERENCE IN IMMEDIATE FUTURE SINCE HE MAY BE TIED UP WITH ANOTHER CASE DURING ENTIRE MONTH OF JULY. ALL INVESTIGATION OTHER THAN THAT PORTION BEING HELD IN ABYXANCE PENDING CONFERENCE WITH SHOULD BE CONDUCTED EXPEDITIOUSLY.

ADVISE BUREAU APPROXIMATE DATE REPORT MAY BE EXPECTED COMPLETING INVESTIGATION OTHER THAN THAT PORTION BEING HELD IN ABYXANCE PENDING CONFERENCE WITH

HOOVER

Bufile (46-14692)

NOTE:

Civil Division, stated he will forward a memorandum to the Bureau advising that the hearing in this matter has been postponed.

CJM: mrs

Mailed: 9

JUN 26 1953

EX-127.
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (46-14692)
FROM: SAC, CLEVELAND (42-783)
SUBJECT: THE AUSTIN COMPANY VS. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
TAX COURT DOCKET #104-R
RE: NEGOTIATION ACT

Re your airtel June 26, 1953.

It is expected that a report will be submitted to reach
the Bureau by July 20, 1953.

TE: cvn

DATE: July 3, 1953
Office Memo  n \* UNITED \* GOVERNMENT

TO: Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

FROM: Warren E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

SUBJECT: The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy;
Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

This will advise you that on June 19, 1953, the Tax Court
granted the parties' joint motion for continuance of the above-
entitled renegotiation case from the Cleveland, Ohio, July 6,
1953 calendar to the next scheduled Cleveland calendar.

In your memorandum to this office dated June 4, 1953, you
requested that the Bureau be advised of the exact date on which
our [] intends to be in Cleveland in order to examine certain of petitioners' contracts and to make decisions
which will affect the course of the examination of petitioners' books now being conducted by Special Agent John K. Buster of your
office. Because of the present trial commitments of [ ],
it will not be possible for him to travel to Cleveland at any date
earlier than August 10. We will advise you further when a definite
date has been determined for [ ] visit to Cleveland.
Office Memorandum  UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Director, FBI (46-14692)  DATE: July 27, 1953

FROM: SAC, Cleveland (46-783)

SUBJECT: THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY; TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R RENEGOTIATION ACT

Reference is made to the attached report of SA JOHN K. BUSTER at Cleveland, dated July 27, 1953.

There is being forwarded at the present time the work papers of the Special Agents who conducted this examination.

In view of the fact that [REDACTED] is expected in Cleveland for a conference approximately the middle of August in which additional investigation may be necessary in this case, the remaining bulky exhibit will be maintained in the Cleveland Office until the conclusion of this conference.

JKB'mmc

Enclosures (4)
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JUL 31 1953
### FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

**Form No. 1**  
**This Case Originated At** WASHINGTON, D. C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT MADE AT</th>
<th>DATE WHEN MADE</th>
<th>PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE</th>
<th>REPORT MADE BY</th>
<th>CHARACTER OF CASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND</td>
<td>7/27/53</td>
<td>5/22-6/8</td>
<td>JOHN K. BUSTER</td>
<td>RENEGOTIATION ACT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title**  
THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY;  
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 104-R

**Synopsis of Facts:**  
Review of contracts reflects Engineering and Bliss Mill charges in accordance with contract specifications. Totals set forth. Requested schedules submitted as enclosure.

**Details:**  
**AT CLEVELAND, OHIO**

This investigation is predicated upon Bureau letter, dated May 1, 1953 with accompanying memorandum from Assistant Attorney General WARREN E. BURGER setting forth in detail the investigation desired. Set forth as follows are the totals of the numbers requested in this memorandum and the detail work sheets are being forwarded as an enclosure to this report.

---

**Approve and Forwarded:**

**SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE:**

**CLOSURE:**

**Do not write in these spaces:**

---

**Copy Destroyed:**

18 MAY Bureau (46-11692) (ENC)  
2 - Washington Field Office  
2 - Cleveland (46-783)

**Recorded:** 25  
**EX-123**

**Property of FBI—This Confidential Report and its Contents are loaned to you by the FBI and are not to be distributed outside of the agency to which loaned.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1941</th>
<th>1942</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$1,076,049.94</td>
<td>$1,618,824.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>312,830.01</td>
<td>285,307.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>1,199.47</td>
<td>36,153.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>599.74</td>
<td>23,482.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>30,603.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>11,257.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>6,881.03</td>
<td>13,227.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>27,121.74</td>
<td>32,921.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>293,189.04</td>
<td>289,096.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</td>
<td>293,189.04</td>
<td>300,353.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renegotiable Government Contracts (Other Than DFC)</td>
<td>Final Payment Made Prior to April 28, 1942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$2,167,344.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>362,128.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>18,000.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>13,269.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>19,591.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>4,559.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>9,725.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>92,919.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>292,203.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</td>
<td>296,762.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Payment Made After April 28, 1942</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$23,888,624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>674,338.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>564,755.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>190,108.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>5,474.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>325.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>20,911.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>495,174.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>390,184.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</td>
<td>390,510.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RENEGOTIABLE GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS
(OTHER THAN DPC)
CPFF-1942
FINAL PAYMENT MADE PRIOR TO APRIL 28, 1942

Construction Costs $5,000,094.74
Construction Fees 94.74*
Engineering Costs 39.78
Engineering Fees 19.89
Bliss Mill Costs none
Bliss Mill Fees none
Equipment Rental Income 16.20
Allocated Operating Expense 122.60
Operating Profit 181.25*
Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit) 181.25*

FINAL PAYMENT MADE AFTER APRIL 28, 1942

Construction Costs $95,347,500.60
Construction Fees 1,919,663.69
Engineering Costs 1,433,422.16
Engineering Fees 176,488.88
Bliss Mill Costs 442,322.42
Bliss Mill Fees 196,406.10
Equipment Rental Income 34,516.75
Allocated Operating Expense 677,362.28
Operating Profit 1,453,277.04
Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit) 1,649,683.14

* Denotes Red Figure
**DPC—FIXED PRICE CONTRACTS**

**FINAL PAYMENT MADE BETWEEN APRIL 1, 1942 AND JULY 1, 1943**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$554,705.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>49,397.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>16,060.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>7,832.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>37,659.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>9,372.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>6,268.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>25,590.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>37,907.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</td>
<td>47,280.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL PAYMENT MADE AFTER JULY 1, 1943**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$168,598.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>11,945.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>8,044.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>4,022.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>577.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>6,919.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>9,625.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</td>
<td>9,625.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FINAL PAYMENT MADE BETWEEN APRIL 1, 1942 AND JULY 1, 1943

### 1942

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$627,598.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>57,485.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>7,707.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>2,642.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>46,274.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>17,564.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>2,211.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>7,228.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>55,011.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,576.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1943

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$1,380,991.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>112,865.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>11,965.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>5,950.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>8,059.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>44,539.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>82,335.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,335.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$310,107.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>311,425.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>114,555.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>34,002.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>12,244.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>97,740.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>259,932.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Profit</td>
<td>259,932.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL PAYMENT AFTER JULY 1, 1943**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$3,612,098.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>186,384.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>265,682.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>66,850.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>64,337.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>15,138.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>11,686.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>105,554.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>161,699.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</td>
<td>177,137.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$28,233,763.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>891,834.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>345,098.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>98,249.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>30,272.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>13,792.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>59,515.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>216,235.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>833,364.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</strong></td>
<td>847,157.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL PAYMENT MADE AFTER JULY 1, 1943**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$98,864,900.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fees</td>
<td>2,029,582.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Costs</td>
<td>2,152,143.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Fees</td>
<td>715,106.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Costs</td>
<td>79,558.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss Mill Fees</td>
<td>43,579.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental Income</td>
<td>160,865.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated Operating Expense</td>
<td>873,109.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>2,032,444.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Profit (Bliss Mill plus Operating Profit)</strong></td>
<td>2,076,024.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All contracts referred to in Departmental memorandum, dated April 28, 1953 have been reviewed and assembled and are available for examination by Departmental attorneys. A review of these contracts reflected that the Engineering and Bliss Mill charges were in accordance with contract specifications.

Referenced Departmental memorandum requested that properly reimbursable costs, plus fix fees involved for the years 1941 and 1942 derived from each supplement and under the contract as originally executed for prime contract NOY-4210, be obtained.

All records involved in this contract are in the Austin Company, Seattle District Office. Mr. PAUL GILMORE, Vice-President of the Austin Company, caused a search to be made by his organization of the type and costs maintained at their Seattle Office. Mr. GILMORE advised that his Seattle Office reported that costs were maintained by stations, that is, the location of the work performed. However, the costs were not broken down in these stations by releases. Therefore, it will be impossible from the available records to ascertain that a certain release was completed by a given date.

Referenced memorandum also requested that the exact amount of sub-contracting be determined on each contract handled by the Austin Company. Because of the type of accounting system used by construction engineers and designers which has been in use for years, it is impossible from this type of record to ascertain the sub-contracting accurately.

ENCLOSURE: To Bureau - Agent's Work Sheets.
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At Cleveland, Ohio

Will report results of conference with [ ] Department relative to further investigation required.

REFERENCE: Bulet to Cleveland, dated May 28, 1953.
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RADIOGRAM

SAC, BALTIMORE

THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER ONE NAUGHT FOUR DASH R, PENEGOATION ACT. CIVIL DIVISION REQUESTS THAT SA JOHN K. BUSTER REPORT WASHINGTON, D.C. NINE A.M. SEPTEMBER TWENTYTHIRD, NEXT FOR CONFERENCE WITH DEPARTMENT SA BUSTER INVESTIGATED THIS CASE DURING ASSIGNMENT AT CLEVELAND. SA BUSTER SHOULD REPORT ROOM FOUR SEVEN ONE SIX BUREAU PRIOR TO CONFERENCE.

HOOVER

46-14692

CJH: [signature]

NOTE: Movement Section states SA Buster arrived Baltimore 9-2-53 and ordered to Hyattsville as resident agent 9-21-53. The excessive profits in this case amount to $2,500,000.

[Handwritten notes and signatures]
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FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

11:37 P.M. RECEIVED PG

[Signatures]
Office Memorandum  UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director,
Federal Bureau of Investigation

FROM: Mr. Warren E. Burger, Assistant
Attorney General, Civil Division

DATE: September 15, 1953

WEB: JHP:dsb
152-10h

SUBJECT: The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy
Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

Please refer to our memorandum to you dated June 29, 1953, in which we advised you that we did not then know the exact date on which our would be in Cleveland, Ohio in order to examine certain of petitioner's contracts and to make decisions which will affect the course of a further examination of petitioner's books which was being conducted by Special Agent John K. Buster of your Cleveland office.

Following the conclusion of the Louisville, Kentucky Tax Court calendar beginning September 29, 1953, will go to Cleveland for the purpose of conducting the examination of petitioner's contracts. It is requested that Mr. Buster (who, we understand has recently been transferred to your Baltimore office for duty as Resident Agent in Hyattsville, Maryland) be instructed to proceed to Cleveland in order to confer with upon the conclusion of the Louisville Tax Court calendar. Since it is not now possible to state the exact date on which will arrive in Cleveland, Mr. Prentice will advise you Mr. Christopher J. Moran from Louisville, Kentucky by wire when Mr. Buster should report to at the Federal Bureau of Investigation office in Cleveland.

It is expected that Mr. Buster's services will be required for a period of approximately three days.
THE AUSTIN COMPANY V. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. ONE NAUGHT FOUR DASH R, RENEGOTIATION ACT. REFURAD TO BALTIMORE SEPTEMBER TWENTY TWO LAST. CIVIL DIVISION

HAS REQUESTED SA JOHN K. BUSTER, BALTIMORE OFFICE, REPORT CLEVELAND, OHIO, MONDAY SEPTEMBER TWENTY EIGHT NEXT FOR CONFERENCE OF APPROXIMATELY THREE DAYS DURATION FOR PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING SCOPE OF REMAINING ACCOUNTING INVESTIGATION AND TO ASCERTAIN WHAT PORTION PREVIOUS INVESTIGATION IS SUBJECT TO STIPULATION. SA BUSTER HAS ALREADY BEEN INFORMED OF REQUEST OF CIVIL DIVISION THAT HE PROCEED CLEVELAND SEPTEMBER TWENTY EIGHT NEXT.

NOTE: This case involved excessive profits in the amount of $2,400,000. SA John K. Buster now assigned Baltimore as Resident Agent Hyattsville conducted extensive accounting investigation in this case when assigned to Cleveland and has participated in past conferences with Department attorneys. An examination of petitioner's subcontracting work which if checked in detail would require 500 Agent days has been held in abeyance until Civil Division could go to Cleveland to review certain contracts and confer with Buster. In the interim SA Buster was transferred to Baltimore on 9/2/53. By memorandum 9/15/53, the Civil Division advised that would proceed to Cleveland upon conclusion of another trial in Louisville, Kentucky.
and requested that SA Buster be available for conferences in Cleveland. On 9/21/53, [ ] advised the Louisville case has been dismissed and he would proceed to Cleveland directly from Washington in the near future. He requested that SA Buster confer with him on 9/23/53, in Washington and Baltimore made SA Buster available for this conference pursuant to Bureau radiogram 9/22/53. After this conference [ ] said it would be necessary for Buster to attend conferences in Cleveland, Ohio, beginning 9/28/53, for approximately 3 days. These conferences may obviate a great deal of work to be done by other offices which would offset the cost of SA Buster's proceeding to Cleveland. Also during the three day period SA Buster will confer with [ ] and petitioner's representatives to determine if stipulations can be reached. In view of SA Buster's familiarity with the case, it is recommended that he be authorized to attend the conferences in Washington and Cleveland.

CJM
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, WFO (46-0)

SUBJECT: RENEGOTIATION CASES

The following renegotiation cases are presently pending in the files of the Washington Field Office.

These are cases which have been referred to the Bureau by the Department of Justice for investigation, but which have not been disposed of by the United States Tax Court.

The docket of the Clerk, United States Tax Court is checked monthly by WFO for all of the pending cases, which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DOCKET NUMBER</th>
<th>WFO NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Acme Steel Company</td>
<td>282-580-760-R</td>
<td>46-2328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alliance Brass and Bronze Company</td>
<td>623-R</td>
<td>46-1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alliance Brass and Bronze Company</td>
<td>829-R</td>
<td>46-2258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Textile Machine Company</td>
<td>836-837-R</td>
<td>46-2972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Engineering Company, Inc.</td>
<td>731-R</td>
<td>46-2442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover Motors Corporation</td>
<td>869-R</td>
<td>46-2514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Austin Company</td>
<td>104-R</td>
<td>46-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Barlow and Seelig Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>787-R</td>
<td>46-2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bayer Company</td>
<td>705-R</td>
<td>46-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. T., D. E., and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners, d/b/a Bittner Associates</td>
<td>354-R</td>
<td>46-2187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Ornamental Company</td>
<td>690-R</td>
<td>46-2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. C. Brown Company</td>
<td>77-R</td>
<td>46-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Cannon Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>859-860-R</td>
<td>46-2348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Warehousing Corporation</td>
<td>723-R</td>
<td>46-2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Wood Preserving Company</td>
<td>877-R</td>
<td>46-2434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Corboy Company</td>
<td>602-627-R</td>
<td>46-2141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Corporation of America</td>
<td>569-R</td>
<td>46-1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Corporation of America</td>
<td>705-797-R</td>
<td>46-2392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Radio Products Company</td>
<td>623-R</td>
<td>46-2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene Curtis Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>888-R</td>
<td>46-2455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Detroit Steel Corporation</td>
<td>650-697-R</td>
<td>46-2155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Steel Corporation</td>
<td>286-R</td>
<td>46-1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E The Ebco Manufacturing Company, Et Al</td>
<td>589-R</td>
<td>46-1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Edward Valve and Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>308-R</td>
<td>46-1441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EJA: MEE

NOT RECORDED
FSC AUG 14 1953
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DOCKET NUMBER</th>
<th>WTO NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Valves, Inc.</td>
<td>813-814-R</td>
<td>46-2139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc.</td>
<td>558-R</td>
<td>46-2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferro Company Corporation</td>
<td>550-R</td>
<td>46-2536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris Instrument Corporation</td>
<td>273-326-R</td>
<td>46-2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Finnie Company</td>
<td>665-R</td>
<td>46-2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Philip Machine Shop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Volcanic Specialties Co.)</td>
<td>831-R</td>
<td>46-2257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Volcanic Specialties Co.)</td>
<td>634-R</td>
<td>46-2099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker Electro Chemical Company</td>
<td>454-663-795-R</td>
<td>46-1611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iverson and Laux, Inc.</td>
<td>299-R</td>
<td>46-2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolart Metal Products Company</td>
<td>730-R</td>
<td>46-2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet Industrials, Inc.</td>
<td>851-R</td>
<td>46-2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet Chemicals, Inc.</td>
<td>821-R</td>
<td>46-2270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet Chemicals, Ltd.</td>
<td>820-R</td>
<td>46-2269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jowlit, Inc.</td>
<td>765-R</td>
<td>46-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrande Industrial Supply Company</td>
<td>659-R</td>
<td>46-1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Bridge and Iron Company</td>
<td>305-645-R</td>
<td>46-1507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennametal Company</td>
<td>900-R</td>
<td>46-2586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennametal, Inc.</td>
<td>482-R</td>
<td>46-2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Carbon Company</td>
<td>743-R</td>
<td>46-2179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maguire Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>885-886-R</td>
<td>46-2492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Manufacturing and Supply Company</td>
<td>642-R</td>
<td>46-1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews Cotton Mill</td>
<td>756-R</td>
<td>46-2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews Cotton Mill</td>
<td>807-R</td>
<td>46-2145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; R Products, Inc.</td>
<td>753-R</td>
<td>46-2086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Parts Corporation</td>
<td>771-R</td>
<td>46-2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Parts Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>816-817-R</td>
<td>46-2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Joliet Chemicals, Ltd.)</td>
<td>819-R</td>
<td>46-2267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Tent and Awning Supply Company</td>
<td>775-R</td>
<td>46-2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Automatic Products Corporation</td>
<td>799-R</td>
<td>46-2239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Automatic Products Corporation</td>
<td>798-R</td>
<td>46-2335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Chain and Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>831-832-R</td>
<td>46-2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific-Atlantic Steamship Company</td>
<td>871-R</td>
<td>46-2334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer-Bee Company</td>
<td>898-R</td>
<td>46-2439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Bloomington, Inc.</td>
<td>699-R</td>
<td>46-2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sherman Company</td>
<td>707-R</td>
<td>46-2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sherman Company</td>
<td>698-R</td>
<td>46-2387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula I.on and Machine Works</td>
<td>830-R</td>
<td>46-2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Metal Products Company</td>
<td>857-R</td>
<td>46-2333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Metal Products Company</td>
<td>856-R</td>
<td>46-2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>DOCKET NUMBER</td>
<td>WFO NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Pick Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>717-718-R</td>
<td>46-2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Maintenance Corporation</td>
<td>876-R</td>
<td>46-2427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Pacific Company, Et Al</td>
<td>833-834-R</td>
<td>46-2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procelain Steels, Inc.</td>
<td>430-R</td>
<td>46-1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Rainwear, Inc.</td>
<td>704-R</td>
<td>46-2390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regal Chemical Corporation</td>
<td>889-890-R</td>
<td>46-2483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Arms Company</td>
<td>538-R</td>
<td>46-1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robersonville Tent Company</td>
<td>773-R</td>
<td>46-2268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Rushlight Company</td>
<td>427-428-R</td>
<td>46-1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandia Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>775-R</td>
<td>46-2094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sebastian Lathe Company</td>
<td>769-770-R</td>
<td>46-2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanaman Brothers</td>
<td>655-R</td>
<td>46-1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanaman Brothers</td>
<td>875-R</td>
<td>46-2428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Sheaffer Pen Company</td>
<td>734-R</td>
<td>46-2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A. B. Sneve Company</td>
<td>343-R</td>
<td>46-2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Fireproofing Company</td>
<td>901-R</td>
<td>46-2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill Tent Company, Inc.</td>
<td>774-R</td>
<td>46-2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Steamship Company</td>
<td>872-R</td>
<td>46-2327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>370-R</td>
<td>46-1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner Manufacturing Corporation</td>
<td>80-R</td>
<td>46-1528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Tarboro Tent Company</td>
<td>776-R</td>
<td>46-2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Flexible Coupling Company</td>
<td>256-338-639-R</td>
<td>46-1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U United Metal Craft Company</td>
<td>866-R</td>
<td>46-2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Metal Craft Company</td>
<td>867-R</td>
<td>46-2363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Cartridge Company</td>
<td>470-716-R</td>
<td>46-1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Virginia Products Corporation</td>
<td>692-R</td>
<td>46-2063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Weeks Stevedoring Company, Inc.</td>
<td>479-480-481-R</td>
<td>46-2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Stag Manufacturing Company</td>
<td>677-R</td>
<td>46-2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Tent and Awning Company, Inc.</td>
<td>763-R</td>
<td>46-2057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E. Wolfe Construction Company, Inc.</td>
<td>503-R</td>
<td>46-1789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office Memorandum  

TO: Director, FBI (46-14692)  
FROM: SAC, Cleveland (46-783)  
DATE: September 30, 1953

SUBJECT:  
THE AUSTIN COMPANY v.  
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY;  
TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER 104-R  
RENEGOTIATION ACT

ReBu air-tel, 9-24-53.

A conference was held September 29, 1953 at the offices of the Austin Company, 16112 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. In attendance at this conference were

SA (A)  
and JOHN K. BUSTER

for the Government, and PAUL GILMORE, Vice-President of the Austin Company, and Counsel for the petitioner.

It was the purpose of this conference to stipulate accounting data in preparation of the trial of this case in the United States Tax Court which is scheduled to sit in Cleveland November 9, next. As a result of this conference, the petitioners stated that they would concede that their excessive profits for the years 1941 and 1942 were $1,300,000. Petitioners further decided that they would make an offer to compromise, stating that their excessive profits for the year 1941 were $200,000 and that their excessive profits for the year 1942 were $1,100,000, for a total of $1,300,000 profits. At this time stated that the petitioner should make this offer to compromise in writing to the Attorney General. Counsel for the petitioner stated that they would within the next few days send a formal offer of compromise to the Attorney General admitting their excessive profits to be $1,300,000. It was also decided at this time that in view of this offer to compromise, the petitioner's counsel would about the latter part of October, next petition the Tax Court for a continuance of the case set for November 9, next, in view of the fact that a compromise in this case is now pending.

after this meeting, in conference with Bureau Agents, stated that he believed that this offer to compromise this case of $1,300,000 was an equitable one, inasmuch as only

JKB/hs

CC: Package

PCT 7 1953
Director, FBI

one case concerning cost plus fixed fee contracts had been decided in the Tax Court and that profits of 3.7 and 2.9 per cent respectively were left to the petitioner in this case, namely the Press Steel Car Company. The petitioners originally had stated that they believed their excessive profits for the years 1941 and 1942 were no more than $500,000. Mr. ______ felt that if this case went to the Tax Court, in view of the fact that the Navy Price Adjustment Board had declared excessive profits to be $2,400,000 which left the petitioner only a 1.33 per cent profit, the Government had a very strong chance of losing this case. This case has been pending for nine years and if the Government would lose this case, the $500,000 which the petitioner has paid to the Government at 4 per cent interest for nine years would be approximately $180,000.

__________ felt that because of the accounting data and information prepared by this Bureau, he was able to convince the petitioner at this conference that their excessive profits were in excess of $500,000 and hence the petitioner made this offer to compromise of $1,300,000.

In view of this offer to compromise and the likelihood that this offer will be accepted by the Government, the exhibits now in the Cleveland Office of this case are being forwarded under separate cover to the Bureau for return to the Department.
To: COMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENT

TRANSMIT THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE TO: SAC, BALTIMORE

THE JUAN COMPANY V. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT NO.
104-N, RENEGOTIATION ACT. CIVIL DIVISION REQUESTS SA JOHN
K. BUSTER, RESIDENT AGENT, HYATTSVILLE, MARYLAND, REPORT
WASHINGTON, D.C., TEN A.M., JANUARY 18, 1954, FOR
CONFERENCE OF APPROXIMATELY TWO DAYS' DURATION WITH CIVIL
DIVISION [REDACTED] AND REPRESENTATIVES OF
DEPARTMENT OF NAVY AND RENEGOTIATION BOARD. SA BUSTER SHOULD
REPORT ROOM 4716, BUREAU, PRIOR TO CONFERENCE. SUPREME
IMMEDIATELY IN EVENT SA BUSTER NOT AVAILABLE.

HOOVER

46-14692

CC: MR. GLAVIN

CJM: JGE

NOTE: In this case, petitioner has filed suit for redetermination
of excessive profits in the amount of $2,400,000. SA John
K. Buster, now assigned to the Hyattsville Resident Agency,
conducted a comprehensive accounting investigation in this
case during the time he was assigned to Cleveland, Ohio.
Office Memo

To: J. Edgar Hoover, Director,
Federal Bureau of Investigation

From: Warren E. Burger, Assistant
      Attorney General, Civil Division

Subject: The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy.
         Tax Court No. 10h-R.

Renegotiation Act

A conference has been scheduled for January 19, 1954, with
representatives of the Department of the Navy and the Renegotiation
Board in order to discuss petitioner's offer in compromise proposed
to the Department in the above entitled Tax Court renegotiation case.

Special Agent John K. Buster, resident agent in Hyattsville, Md.,
examined petitioner's books and records and submitted several accounting
reports which will, among other things, be the subject of the con-
ference on January 19, 1954. It is requested that Special Agent Buster
be instructed to attend this conference and further that he be in-
structed to report to our [illegible] Room 3134, Department
of Justice Building, at 10:00 a.m. on January 18, 1954. It is believed
that one day of conferring between Mr. Buster and [illegible] will
be necessary in preparation for the conference on January 19, 1954.
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (46-14692)
FROM: SAC, CLEVELAND (46-783)

DATE: January 15, 1954

SUBJECT: THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER 104-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

Remylet 9/30/53.

A review of the file in this case indicates that there is no further investigation to be conducted by this office.

In view of the foregoing, this matter is considered RUC by this office.

CAH-jmc

cc: Washington Field (46-1929)

RECORDED - 68
146-14672 - 33
20 JAN 18 1954

EX-127
February 21, 1955

Department of the Navy,
Washington D.C., Feb.

Attorneys General Counsel

For: The United States v. The U.S. Navy, Tax Case No. 14-

Sentiment

As your files will indicate, in your letter of September 3, 1954, you indicated that you were not prepared to abide by this department's judgment in the matter of endeavoring to prosecute the above tax court contest case. At that time the department had under consideration a compromise proposal submitted by the contractor under the terms of which the contractor would concede the tax court that the United States had sustained excessive profits in the amounts of $22,000 and $100,000 for the contractor's fiscal years ended December 31, 1953 and December 31, 1954.

After careful consideration of the offer and after having reviewed the records of the determination board, it was determined that the offer should be rejected and a counteroffer proposed to the contractor. Accordingly, the offer was rejected and on February 7, 1955, counsel for United advised the department that the counteroffer was acceptable. Under the terms of the counteroffer the parties agreed to stipulate to the tax court that the United States had sustained excessive profits in the amounts of $20,000 and $100,000 for the respective fiscal years 1953 and 1954.

Accordingly, and after the filing of a stipulation of settlement, the tax court, on February 15, 1955, entered its
decision ordering and determining that the Austin Company had realized excessive profits in the respective amounts of $30,000 and $1,200,000 for 1911 and 1912.

The Tax Court decision superseded the unilateral order of the Navy Price Adjustment Board dated August 18, 1911, under the terms of which the contractor's excessive profits had been determined to be in the respective amounts of $100,000 and $2,000,000 for the calendar years 1911 and 1912.

The department has closed its file in this case.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM E. SHIPP
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

By:

Edward H. Dickey
Chief, General Litigation Section

/\ Negotiation Board
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Internal Revenue Service.

Dr. Curtis E. Woodsie, Chief,
Negotiation Debate Branch,
General Services Administration.
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, WFO (46-C)

SUBJECT: PENDING RENEGOTIATION CASES

The following renegotiation cases are presently pending in the files of WFO subject to a monthly check of the docket, United States Tax Court:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DOCKET NO.</th>
<th>WFO NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acme Steel Co.</td>
<td>282-R</td>
<td>46-2328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>580-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>760-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Textile Mach. Corp.</td>
<td>363-R</td>
<td>46-2372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Engineering Co.</td>
<td>731-R</td>
<td>46-2442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover Motors Corp.</td>
<td>569-R</td>
<td>46-2514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Company</td>
<td>104-R</td>
<td>46-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayer Company</td>
<td>706-R</td>
<td>46-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bittner Associates</td>
<td>354-R</td>
<td>46-2137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinale Warehousing Corp.</td>
<td>723-R</td>
<td>46-2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat Corp of America</td>
<td>569-R</td>
<td>46-1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat Corp of America</td>
<td>705-R</td>
<td>46-2392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat Corp of America</td>
<td>797-R</td>
<td>46-2392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Wood Preserving Co.</td>
<td>377-R</td>
<td>46-2434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Radio Products Co.</td>
<td>623-R</td>
<td>46-2229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corboy Co. M-J.</td>
<td>602-R</td>
<td>46-2141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>627-R</td>
<td>46-2141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards Valve &amp; Mfg. Co.</td>
<td>308-R</td>
<td>46-1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards Valve Mfg. Co.</td>
<td>813-R</td>
<td>46-2139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc.</td>
<td>558-R</td>
<td>46-2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferro - Co-operative</td>
<td>550-R</td>
<td>46-2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris Instrument Corp.</td>
<td>237-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>326-R</td>
<td>46-2215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnie Company</td>
<td>665-R</td>
<td>46-2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher Aviation Co.</td>
<td>906-R</td>
<td>46-3339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamelin et. al</td>
<td>302-R</td>
<td>46-2557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamson &amp; Co et al</td>
<td>610-R</td>
<td>46-2964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730-R</td>
<td>46-2440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EJA: rpb

893 OCT 26 1954

46 SEP 29 1954

NOT RECORDED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LOCKET NO.</th>
<th>WFO NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JoLart Metal Products Co.</td>
<td>855-R</td>
<td>46-2332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>820-R</td>
<td>46-2269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>813-R</td>
<td>46-2265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>821-R</td>
<td>46-2270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenametal Inc.</td>
<td>900-R</td>
<td>46-2568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>482-R</td>
<td>46-2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Carbon Co.</td>
<td>743-R</td>
<td>46-2179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maguire Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>885-R</td>
<td>46-2492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>886-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Mfg. &amp; Supply Co.</td>
<td>642-R</td>
<td>46-1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Parts Corp.</td>
<td>771-R</td>
<td>46-2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;V &amp; R. Products, Co.&quot;</td>
<td>753-R</td>
<td>46-2086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Automatic Screw Fro. Corp.</td>
<td>798-R</td>
<td>46-2235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohmer Corporation</td>
<td>792-R</td>
<td>46-2979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Chain &amp; Mfg. Co.</td>
<td>831-832-R</td>
<td>46-2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific-Atlantic S.S. Co.</td>
<td>871-R</td>
<td>46-2334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer-Bea Co.</td>
<td>898-R</td>
<td>46-2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park-Bloomington, Inc.</td>
<td>699-R</td>
<td>46-2389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Sherman Co.</td>
<td>707-R</td>
<td>46-2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>698-R</td>
<td>46-2387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Iron &amp; Machine Works</td>
<td>830-R</td>
<td>46-2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Metal Products Co.</td>
<td>857-R</td>
<td>46-2333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>856-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck Manufacturing Co.</td>
<td>717-R</td>
<td>46-2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck Industries Inc</td>
<td>718-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Maintenance Corp</td>
<td>876-R</td>
<td>46-2427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poirier &amp; Mc Lane Corp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland-Pacific Co.</td>
<td>333-34-R</td>
<td>46-2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwear Inc.</td>
<td>704-R</td>
<td>46-2390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regal Chemical Corp</td>
<td>889-R</td>
<td>26-2483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedlee Chemical Corp</td>
<td>890-R</td>
<td>46-2483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Arms Co</td>
<td>538-R</td>
<td>46-1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushlight, W.A., Co.</td>
<td>427-28-R</td>
<td>46-1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandia Mfg. Co.</td>
<td>778-R</td>
<td>46-2094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Lathe Co.</td>
<td>769-770-R</td>
<td>46-2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanahan Brothers</td>
<td>655-R</td>
<td>46-1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuecker, W.A., Fen Co.</td>
<td>734-R</td>
<td>46-2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Steamship Co.</td>
<td>872-R</td>
<td>46-2327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Rubber Co.</td>
<td>911-R</td>
<td>46-3388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Metalcraft Co.</td>
<td>866-R</td>
<td>46-2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>867-R</td>
<td>46-2363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>DOCKET NO.</td>
<td>WFO NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Cartridge Co.</td>
<td>470-716-R</td>
<td>46-1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Products Corp</td>
<td>692-R</td>
<td>46-2063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks Stevadoring Co.</td>
<td>479-480-481-R</td>
<td>46-2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Stag Mfg. Co.</td>
<td>677-R</td>
<td>46-2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe Construction Co.</td>
<td>503-R</td>
<td>46-1789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assistant Attorney General
Warren E. Burger

March 10, 1954

Director, FBI

The Austin Company v. Secretary of the Navy
Tax Court Docket No. 104-R
RENegotiation ACT

Reference is made to your memorandum dated March 3, 1954, in the above-captioned matter.

The Bureau has no objection to your loaning copies of Bureau accounting reports in this and other Civil Renegotiation Act cases to the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, General Services Administration, Department of Commerce, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for their consideration in reviewing offers in compromise, providing that you deem such procedure advisable.

It is our understanding that in cases where copies of Bureau reports are loaned to the above agencies by the Civil Division, the agency involved will return such reports to the Civil Division upon completion of the review.

66-6200-46

cc: 46-14692

NOTE: By memorandum dated May 28, 1952, we advised the Civil Division that we had no objection to their loaning copies of Bureau reports in Civil Renegotiation Act cases to the Renegotiation Board for the Board's consideration in reviewing offers in compromise.

The attached memorandum dated 3-3-54 from Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger points out that in cases arising out of the Renegotiation Act of 1942 offers in compromise will not be handled by the Renegotiation Board, but will be handled by certain agencies named in the Renegotiation Act of 1942. The Civil Division has requested that we provide them with blanket authority to loan Bureau accounting reports in Civil Renegotiation Act cases to the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, General Services Administration, Department of Commerce, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for their use in evaluating offers in compromise arising out of the Renegotiation Act of 1942. (Continued on next page)
These investigations arise from requests by the Civil Division. The reports are of an accounting nature in almost every case, and the investigation is generally confined to a determination of the petitioner's profit and loss on renegotiable business for the year in question. It is felt administrative handling may be saved by giving the Civil Division blanket authority to loan reports to the agencies involved rather than authorizing these matters on an individual case basis. As stated above, we have already furnished them authority to loan reports in these cases to the Renegotiation Board.
March 3, 1954

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director,
Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Warren E. Burger, Assistant
Attorney General, Civil Division.

The Austin Company v. Sec. of the Navy.
Tax Court Docket No. 104-R.

In the above entitled Tax Court renegotiation case the contractor has submitted an offer in compromise to the Department of Justice totaling $1,300,000 in lieu of the determinations of excessive profits for the years 1941 and 1942 made by the Navy Price Adjustment Board in amounts totaling $2,400,000. The Department of the Navy has been requested to provide us with a recommendation with respect to the offer in compromise.

As your files will indicate, you have previously provided the Civil Division with blanket authority to loan FBI accounting reports to the renegotiation Board in connection with considering their recommendations on offers in compromise submitted to the Department of renegotiation cases arising under the renegotiation Act of 1942. The Renegotiation Board is the statutory successor to the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board which made the determinations of excessive profits under the renegotiation Act of 1943.

However, determinations of excessive profits made under the renegotiation Act of 1942, such as are involved in the above case, were made by the Department of the Navy, Department of the Army, and other departments named in that renegotiation Act. Consequently, recommendations on offers in compromise arising under the renegotiation Act of 1942 will not be made by the renegotiation Board.

In view of the above we request that the Civil Division be provided with blanket authority to loan FBI accounting reports pertaining to renegotiation cases arising under the renegotiation Act of 1942 to the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, the General Services Administration, the Department of Commerce (successor to the Maritime Administration) and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for their use in evaluating offers in compromise and preparing their recommendations.

[Signature]

NOT RECORDED
138, Mar. 15, 1934
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

THE AUSTIN COMPANY v. SECRETARY OF
THE NAVY, Tax Court Docket Number 104-F

RENEGOTIATION ACT

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

Docket of U. S. Tax Court reflects that on 2/16/55, the Court entered an order that excessive profits for the years 1941 and 1942 amounted to $300,000 and $1,200,000 respectively. Previously, the WCAPB had determined that the excessive profits for the years in question amounted to $400,000 and $2,000,000 respectively.

DETAILS: AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

A check of the Docket in the Office of the Clerk, United States Tax Court reflects that on February 16, 1955, the Court entered an order, based upon a stipulation, that the excessive profits on renegotiable business for the years 1941 and 1942 amounted to $300,000 and $1,200,000 respectively. Previously, the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board had determined that the excessive profits for the years in question on renegotiable business amounted to $400,000 and $2,000,000 respectively.

COPY DESTROYED

197 MAY 6 1970

PROPERTY OF FBI—THIS REPORT IS LOANED TO YOU BY THE FBI, AND NEITHER IT NOR ITS CONTENTS ARE TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE THE AGENCY TO WHICH LOANED.
One copy of this report is being designated for the Cleveland Division to complete its file on this investigation which was conducted by that office.

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

Re: A. P. Dowell, Jr., v. James F. Forrestal,
Secretary, United States Navy Department,
Tax Court No. 626-R; A. P. Dowell, Jr., v.
James F. Forrestal, Secretary, USN, 696-R

[Text below is not legible]
Dear Sirs,

Sincerely yours,

For the Attorney General

H. O. Morison
Assistant Attorney General

Ct.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue
Washington 25, D. C.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

RECORD 4-106
D. 23, 1943
Department of the Navy
Washington 25, D.C.

Attn: Mr. Harold B. Gross
General Counsel

Re: A. P. Downie, Sr., v.
S. E. Marshall, Secretary of the
Inter. Tax Court Board No. 626-8

Sincerely yours,

For the Attorney General

H. O. Marisim
Assistant Attorney General

c/c:
Bureau of Internal Revenue
Internal Revenue Building
Washington 25, D.C.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Navy Nonnegotiation Section
Navy Department

RECORDED: 1031 46-15045 - 6
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REPORT MADE AT: WASHINGTON, D.C.
DATE WHEN MADE: 12-21-49
PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE: 12-16-49
REPORT MADE BY: EDWARD J. ARMSTRONG (A)
CHARACTER OF CASE: RENEGOTIATION ACT

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

REFERENCE:

DETAILS: AT WASHINGTON, D.C.

RECEIVED

WASHINGTON, D.C.
JAN 3, 1957

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

FOURTEENTH DISTRICT

DETROIT, MICH.

WASHINGTON FIELD
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MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

Re: M. J. Corboy Company v. James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy,
Tax Court Docket No. 602-R; and M. J. Corboy Company v.
Contracts Price Adjustment Board, Tax Court Docket No. 627-R.

In the above-entitled cases, the petitioner

The petitioner

The following information and material is herewith forwarded.
### FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

**File No. 1**

**Case Originated At:** Washington, D.C.

**Report Made At:** Washington, D.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date When Made</th>
<th>Period For Which Made</th>
<th>Report Made By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-21-49</td>
<td>1/25-27; 2/1-7</td>
<td>James E. Nugent (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**File:**
- M.J. Corboy Company, v. James V. Forrestal
- Secretary of the Navy: Tax Court Docket No.
- Renegotiation Act
- Price Adjustment Board: Tax Court Docket No.

**Synopsis of Facts:**

**Reference:**


46-15707-2

**Copies of this Report:**
- Bureau (endl.)
- Chicago
- Washington Field

**Approved and Charged:**

**Do Not Write in These Spaces:**

46-15707-2

**Recorded:** 160

358 Mar 17, 1949
January 16, 1959

SAC, Chicago

Director, FBI

REGULATED RATE

M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 502-R; and
M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. WAR CONTRACTS PRICE
ADJUSTMENT BOARD, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 527-R
RENTEGATION ACT

Ranslet November 16, 1948, and report of Special Agent (A) James B.

Attached hereto are two copies of a self-explanatory memorandum from
E. G. Harison, Assistant Attorney General, dated January 11, 1959, together
with the enclosures referred to therein. A copy of this same memorandum is
being furnished the Washington Field Office, office of origin.

You are instructed to advise the Bureau by return mail the exact
copy. You are also instructed to return to the
Bureau by registered mail the attached enclosures after they have served their
purpose.

Enclosures:
[Redacted]

cc - Washington Field, with enclosure

Atk:ige.
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Re: H. J. Corboy Company v. James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, Tax Court Docket No. 602-R; and
H. J. Corboy Company v. War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, Tax Court Docket No. 627-R.

With reference to my memoranda to you dated November 5, 1949, relating to the
above-entitled cases, we are in receipt of report dated February 24, 1949, of
James E. Nugent (A), Washington field office. This report analyzes data herefore
submitted.

It is now requested that you

1. contain the report analysis

Due consideration for the suggestions contained therein.

2. Gent's comments are desired with respect to

3. Any other facts which may develop during the examination which you
TO: Director, FBI
FROM: SAC, Chicago

DATE: February 2, 1950

SUBJECT: M. J. Corboy Company v. James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, Tax Court Docket No. 602-R; and K. J. Corboy Company v. War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, Tax Court Docket No. 627-R. RENEGOTIATION ACT (File No. 46-15707)


ONT:nrc
46-1049

46-15707-4 R

RECORDED 6  [46-15707-4]
FEB 8 1950

6 L 1 3 1950.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

REPORT MADE AT
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

DATE WHEN MADE
2/29/50

PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE
2/3/50 TO 10/50

REPORT MADE BY
ORVILLE N. THOMAS (A) BJE

CHARACTER OF CASE
E. J. CORBOY COMPANY vs. JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO.
E-627-R; and M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. WAR
CONTRACTS PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD, TAX COURT
DOCKET NO. 627-R

TEN DAY REPORT

This report is predicated on a request from H. G.
MORRISON, Assistant Attorney General, dated January
11, 1950, that the petitioner's books and records be examined for the fiscal years ending December 31,
1942, and December 31, 1943.

COPY IN PH.

RECORDED 28
SAC, Chicago

February 23, 1950

Director, FBI

N. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO.
602-R; and N. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. WAR CONTRACTS
PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 627-R
REMITTANCE ACT

Reference report of Special Agent (A) Orville N. Thomas, Chicago, Illinois,
dated February 20, 1950.

Your attention is particularly called to my letter of January 16, 1950,
wherein instructions were furnished to the effect that only four copies of all reports
submitted should be furnished to the Bureau since only two years were under review.
It is noted that five copies of referenced ten day report were furnished.

The Claims Division attorney to whom this case has been assigned has requested
that this matter be completed at the earliest possible date. Therefore, it is
recommended that the investigation be pursued continuously and, if any questions
arise, they should be expeditiously submitted to the Bureau for a decision.

46-15707-6

cc: Washington Field
SAC, Chicago

April 2, 1950

Director, FBI

U. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 602-R;
U. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. WAR CONTRACTS PRICE
ADJUSTMENT BOARD, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 627-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

Remylet February 28, 1950:

As you will note in relist, the Claims Division Attorney
to whom this case is assigned has requested that this matter be
completed at the earliest possible date. It is noted in the
progress report of Special Agent (A) Orville H. Thomas, Chicago,
dated March 15, 1950, that an estimate of 60 Agent days was
indicated as the time necessary to complete the remaining inves-
tigation. It is recommended that assistance be afforded Special
Agent Thomas in order that this investigation may be completed
at an earlier date and a final accounting report submitted in
accordance with the request of the Claims Division.

You are instructed to advise the Bureau what arrangements
have been made to expedite this matter.

cc: Washington Field
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

DATE NO. 1
THE CASE ORIGINATED AT Washington, D. C.

REPORT MADE AT: Chicago, Illinois
DATE WHEN MADE: 3/15/50
PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE: 2/18, 15, 16
6, 7, 8, 9/50.

REPORT MADE BY: ORVILLE N. THOMAS (A) RLE

FIELD NO. 40

TITLE: W. J. CORBOY COMPANY vs. JAMES V. FORESTAL, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 602-R. and W. J. CORBOY COMPANY vs. WAR CONTRACTS PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD; TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 627-R.

CHARACTER OF CASE: RENEGOTIATION ACT

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

PROGRESS REPORT

DETAILS: AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

The following work has been completed to date.

Work to be completed.

SPECIAL AGENT

MAY 11, 1970

COPY IN FILE

DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES

RECORDED: 16

BUREAU
WASHINGTON FIELD (46-2141)
CHICAGO

1

MAR 17, 1950

3
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**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**

**Form No. 1**

**CASE ORIGINATED AT:** WASHINGTON, D. C.

**FILE NO.:** 46-1049

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT MADE AT</th>
<th>DATE WHEN MADE</th>
<th>PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE</th>
<th>REPORT MADE BY</th>
<th>CHARACTER OF CASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHICAGO, ILLINOIS</td>
<td>4/7/50</td>
<td>2/7/50-10/13, 15-17,20,21,23</td>
<td>ORVILLE N. THOMAS (A)</td>
<td>RENEGOTIATION ACT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H. J. Corboy Company vs. James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, Tax Court Docket No. 622R; and H. J. Corboy Company vs. War Contract Price Adjustment Board, Tax Court Docket No. 627R.**

**Synopsis of Facts:** ACCOUNTING REPORT

46-15707

46-15707-2

349 MAY 11 1970

APR 10 1939

RECORDED: 149

**Copies Destroyed**

349 MAY 11 1970

**Copies of this Report**

1. Washington Field (46-2141)
2. Chicago: MAI 1930
3. BUREAU (Engls.-Registered Mail)

**DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES**
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, CHICAGO

DATE: APR 7, 1950


Repor of Special Agent (A) ORVILE N. THOMAS, dated April 7, 1950, at Chicago.

Enclosed herewith are the documents referred to in above report as enclosures.
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Re: M. J. CORBOY COMPANY, v. James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, Tax Court Docket No. 602-R;
M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, Tax Court Docket No. 627-R.
TO: Director, FBI
CC: SAC, Chicago
To: COMMUNICATIONS SECTION.

FEBRUARY 26, 1954

AIRTEL

SAC, CHICAGO (46-1047), AIR MAIL

W. J. CORBOY COMPANY VS. JAMES V. FORRESTAL, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,

TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 602R; AND W. J. CORBOY COMPANY VS. WAR CONTRACTS

PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 627R, RENEGOTIATION ACT.

HOUGHTON

46-15707

CJM: 189

RECORDED 94

MAR. 2, 1954

COMM — FBI

FEB. 26, 1954

MAILED 27

MAR. 4, 1954

SENT VIA RAIL

POST

570
Office Memorandum - UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (46-15707)

FROM: SAC, CHICAGO (46-1049)

DATE: March 2, 1954

SUBJECT: M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. JAMES V. FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy, TAX COURT DOCKET No. 602-R;
M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v. WAR CONTRACTS PRICE
ADJUSTMENT BOARD, TAX COURT DOCKET No. 627-R
RENEGO TiATION ACT

Reuraitarl dated February 26, 1954.

Enclosed are the work papers, tax returns, and agent's accounting papers in this case per your request.

ONT: OH

Encl. (1)

CC: PACKAGE (Registered Mail)
March 8, 1954

SAC, Chicago (46-1047)  
46 - 15707 - 13
Director, FBI (46-15707)

RECORDED-14

RENegotiation Act

There are being enclosed herewith two copies of a memorandum dated March 3, 1954, from Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger, requesting that SA Orville N. Thomas be available for the conferences and trial of this matter beginning Monday, April 19, 1954, at Chicago, Illinois.

For the information of the Chicago Office, the attorney handling this matter in the Civil Division of the Department is

Chicago should inform the Bureau by return mail as to the availability of SA Thomas for the conferences and trial.

Enclosure
cc: Washington Field

CJM:ige

MAIL 8
MAR 8 - 1954
COMM. 50

MAR 19 1954

46-15707-13
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (46-15707)  
FROM: SAC, CHICAGO (46-1049)  

DATE: March 15, 1954

SUBJECT: M. J. CORBOY COMPANY
      TAX COURT DOCKET NOS. 602-R and 627-R
      RENEGOTIATION ACT

Rebuted March 8, 1954.

You are advised SA ORVILLE N. THOMAS will be available in Chicago as requested beginning April 19, 1954.

OMH: DSH
SAC, Chicago (46-1047):

March 24, 1954

Director, FBI (46-15707)

M. J. CORBOY COMPANY versus SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER 602-R.
M. J. CORBOY COMPANY versus WCPAB
TAX COURT DOCKET NUMBER 627-R.
RENEGOTIATION ACT

There is being enclosed herewith for each office one copy of a self-explanatory memorandum dated March 19, 1954, from Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger.

The Chicago Office should give this matter immediate and continuous attention and submit report to reach the Bureau no later than April 12, 1954, by routing slip for the attention of the Investigative Division, etc.

46-15707-1

Attachment 46-15707-1

MAR 24 1954
MAILED 27
Transmit the following message to:

FBI, CHICAGO (46-1049) APRIL 1, 1954
DIRECTOR, FBI (46-15707) (AMSD)

M. J. CORBOY COMPANY, ET AL, RENEGOTIATION ACT. REBULET
MARCH 24, 1954, AND DEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM DATED MARCH 19,
1954.

ADvised the writer on April 1, 1954, that he was directing a letter

to the department on this date to get their consent to get
this case taken off the April tax court calendar. Inasmuch
as [handwritten] president of petitioning company, is leaving
next week on a European trip. [handwritten] president, was
contacted by the writer at 405 North Desplaines Avenue,
Chicago, regarding making bid and contract data for years
1942-1943 available for examination at which time [handwritten]
advised that he would cause a search of records to be made
to determine if these documents were still available but
advised that if they were not destroyed he would probably
have them removed from storage sometime during the week of
April 5, 1954. [handwritten] arthur young & company, certified public accountants, advised that he would cause
a search of their files to determine if completed contract
information for year ending December 31, 1943, was incorporated
in their working papers of M. J. Corboy Company audits.

REcorded: [handwritten]

Approved: [handwritten] special agent in charge

58 APR 8, 1954
Assistant Attorney General  
Warren E. Burger  

April 20, 1954

Director, FBI

RECORDED 59

46-15707-19

M. J. CORBOY COMPANY vs. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
Tax Court Docket Number 602-R

EX. 118

M. J. CORBOY COMPANY vs. WOPAB
Tax Court Docket Number 627-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT

Reference is made to your memorandum dated March 19, 1954, in the above-captioned matter.

In connection with the investigation now being conducted, our Chicago Office has requested that the Civil Division furnish the Federal income tax returns of the petitioner for the years 1936 through 1943, inclusive.

It is believed that the above tax returns are now in the possession of the Civil Division and it will be appreciated if they are forwarded to the Bureau for transmittal to our Chicago Office.

File 46-15707

APR 27 1954

COMM. FBI
SAC, Chicago (46-1049)

Director, FBI (46-15707)

April 30, 1954

M. J. CORBOY CO. v. SECRETARY OF NAVY
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 602-R
M. J. CORBOY CO. v. WCPAB
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 627-R
RENEGOITIATION ACT.

There are being enclosed herewith two copies of
a self-explanatory memorandum dated April 26, 1954, from
Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger, together
with the enclosures referred to therein.

Endorsement

CJH: MED

46-15707-21

716279
July 14, 1954

Director, FBI (46-15707)

M. J. "CORBOY COMPANY,"
V. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT.
DOCKET NO. 602-R; M. J. CORBOY COMPANY V.
WAR CONTRACTS PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD,
TAX COURT-DOCKET NO. 627-R.
RENEGOTIATION ACT.

Rerep SA 7/2/54, at Chicago.

There are being enclosed herewith two copies of a
self-explanatory memorandum dated July 9, 1954, from Acting Assistant
Attorney General referred to therein.

A copy of memorandum is being enclosed

for the Washington Field Office.

Attachment

23: 2-Washington Field Office (46-23411) (Attachment)

COMM.-46. 15707-24

0 O JUL 23 1954
Mailed 27
SAC, Chicago (46-1049)                               July 28, 1954

Director, FBI (46-15707)

M. J. CORBOY COMPANY,
v. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, TAX COURT,
DOCKET NO. 602-R; M. J. CORBOY COMPANY,
v. WAR CONRACTS PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD,
TAX COURT, DOCKET NO. 627-R
RENEGOTIATION ACT


Attorney [REDACTED], Civil Division, has advised that this case has been set on the Tax
Court Docket, Chicago, Illinois, for October 4, 1954.

The Chicago Office is requested to advise as to the date when a report may be expected.

DEN:ige
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPORT MADE AT</td>
<td>CHICAGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE WHEN MADE</td>
<td>8/4/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE</td>
<td>3/30, 31; 5/1, 2, 5-9, 12, 16, 5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT MADE BY</td>
<td>(A) RCD: mov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITL E</td>
<td>M.J. CORBOY COMPANY V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, Tax</td>
<td>6/18, 30, 7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT DOCKET NO. 602-R.</td>
<td>6, 9, 22, 23, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEGOTIATION ACT</td>
<td>28/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD, Tax COURT DOCKET NO. 627-R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNOPSIS OF FACTS</td>
<td>No pertinent changes in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAILS</td>
<td>The following agents participated in this investigation and the writer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPIES DESTROYED</td>
<td>349: May 11, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED AND FORWARDED</td>
<td>02/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE</td>
<td>W. L. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES</td>
<td>15/7/62011 - 12/6 - RECORD 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPIES OF THIS REPORT</td>
<td>2 - Bureau (46-15907), USN (Enc.) (Registered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Washington Field (46-2141)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Chicago (46-1049)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58: Aug 1 7, 1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (46-15707)
FROM: SAC, CHICAGO (46-1049)

SUBJECT: M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v.
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 602-R;
M. J. CORBOY COMPANY v.
WAR CONTRACTS PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD,
TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 627-R
RENEGOITIATION ACT


Enclosed herewith are the documents referred to in above report as enclosures.

REGISTERED
RCD: mcv

46-15707-28
RECORDED 1953
7-17-1954
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Form No. 1
THIS CASE ORIGINATED AT
WASHINGTON FIELD

REPORT MADE AT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 11/17/54

DATE WHEN MADE
11/15/54

PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE

REPORT MADE BY
EDWARD J. ARMBRUSTER

CHARACTER OF CASE
RENEGOTIATION ACT

TITLE
M. J. CORBOY COMPANY VS. SECRETARY OF
THE NAVY, TAX COURT DOCKET NO. 607R;
M. J. CORBOY COMPANY VS. WAR CONTRACTS
PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD, TAX COURT
DOCKET NO. 627R

SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:

DETAILS:
AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

OPINIONS DESTROYED

MAY 11 1954

APPROVED AND
FORWARDED:

SPECIAL AGENT
IN CHARGE

DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES

RECEIVED

COPIES OF THIS REPORT

Bureau (66-19707)
Chicago (46-1049) (Info)
Washington (46-2141)

COPY IN FILE

1 DEC 7 1954

PROPERTY OF FBI - THIS REPORT IS LOANED TO YOU BY THE FBI AND NEITHER IT NOR ITS CONTENTS ARE TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE THE AGENCY TO WHICH LOANED.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOI/PA
DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
FOI/PA# 1255380-0

Total Deleted Page(s) = 12
Page 6 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 7 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 13 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 16 ~ b6; b7C;
Page 18 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 26 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 37 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 39 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 40 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 41 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 55 ~ Referral/Direct;
Page 56 ~ Referral/Direct;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s) X
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FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

DATE December 9, 1943

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

On December 7, 1943, while you were out of the city of Washington, I met Under Secretary James V. Forrestal of the Navy at his office, and he expressed great interest in the Bureau's work in America.

The two countries in which Mr. Forrestal was greatly interested in were Mexico and Argentina. He expressed grave doubts as to the sincerity of Mexico's expressions of cooperation with the United States and based his conclusions on the fact that the Mexicans had refused to permit American capital to take over various businesses formerly belonging to German nationals in Mexico. Mr. Forrestal stated his banking friends had told him these various corporations are now being held by Mexican "dummies" who at the conclusion of the war would return the properties to the Germans.

With respect to Argentina, Mr. Forrestal inquired as to whether the government of Argentina was as hostile to the United States as the American press stated, and if so, what did the Argentine government expect to gain by such an attitude? To these questions, the writer answered that the American Ambassador, Norman Armour, had told me that he was completely disgusted with the present Argentine government which would do anything if it could publicly embarrass the United States of America. I added it was common gossip in Argentina that the present government hoped to remain neutral until the end of the war as it believed after the war the United States of America would completely forget the Argentine's failure to break relations with the Axis; whereas, if it would break relations with the Axis, Germany and Japan would never forget it.

Mr. Forrestal inquired as to whether the Argentine thought the Axis was going to win the war. I advised him that there were no indications that there was such a feeling in Argentina.

In addition to these two countries, Mr. Forrestal inquired as to whether the Nelson Rockefeller organization was as inefficient as it was painted by Senator Butler, to which question I made no answer other than to say I was in no position to pass judgment on the Rockefeller Committee.

Mr. Forrestal inquired as to the popularity in Latin America of Vice President Henry Wallace. I told him that in the course of my trip there were no indications as to whether Wallace was popular or unpopular. Mr. Forrestal
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inquired as to whether I had heard Wallace's "performance" in Peru (meaning Wallace's attempt to sound out public opinion acting incognito, which greatly enraged officialdom in Peru). I answered Mr. Forrestal that I had heard of this incident while in Peru. Mr. Forrestal then stated that he had understood that Milo Perkins' organization had made a great mess of their job in Latin America; to which I stated there were several instances where members of the Board of Economic Warfare were attempting to act as "amateur detectives" and that in several instances I heard there were entirely too many members of that organization in South America.

Mr. Forrestal inquired as to the cooperation throughout Latin America between representatives of the United States Navy and the Bureau's representatives. I told him that generally speaking representatives of these two government agencies got along extremely well with each other. I cited the instance in Argentina where the Bureau's Legal Attache and the United States Naval Attache, acting in concert, were able to bring about the seizure of contraband platinum and the arrest of the smuggler off the coast of Gibraltar. Mr. Forrestal then inquired as to how the Navy was doing their job generally throughout Latin America; to which I again answered I had heard no adverse criticism.

Time and again during this talk with Mr. Forrestal he expressed admiration of the Bureau's ability to adjust itself in foreign fields and to bring about the results which it has. In addition, he stated he was glad the Bureau was more and more taking over the complete domestic intelligence field and that the Navy was withdrawing and cutting down on its personnel in ONI. He added that the writer should get quite a "kick out of this" inasmuch as the writer had recommended in the fall of 1940 to Mr. Forrestal and Secretary Knox that ONI's domestic intelligence field should never be developed any further than a small skeleton organization.

During the course of this conference Mr. Forrestal exhibited to the writer a letter dated October 14, 1943, addressed to Ferdinand Eberstadt, 39 Broadway, New York City (Mr. Eberstadt was formerly Chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board; then Vice Chairman of the War Productions Board, who in the spring of 1943 was forced to resign from the War Productions Board due to an administration fight with [redacted] and others in that organization). Mr. Forrestal stated that this letter had been forwarded to him by Mr. Eberstadt from New York City with the request that Mr. Forrestal advise him what action he should take with regard to the contents of the letter. Briefly, the writer of the letter was a [redacted] of Mr. Eberstadt who states that she has certain information concerning the reasons why Mr. Eberstadt was forced out of his high position in the government and that she will sell this information to Mr. Eberstadt. Also mentioned in the letter are Judge Robert Patterson, Under Secretary of War; [redacted] Charles E. Wilson of the War Productions Board, and Mr. Forrestal. Mr. Forrestal requested that I present this letter to you to determine what action should be taken.
Memorandum for the Director

I mention this to you in this memorandum in the event you should run into Mr. Forrestal here in Washington. The letter itself will be forwarded to the Investigative Division with the request for an appropriate investigation inasmuch as there exists a possible violation either of the war fraud statutes or the bribery statutes of the United States Code.

In conclusion, Mr. Forrestal advised me that in the event any matters of a procurement or investigative nature should come up of interest to the Bureau where he, as Under Secretary of the Navy, could be of assistance, the Bureau should not hesitate to call upon him to help.

Respectfully,

Jerome Doyle
Do you think the three of us should lunch, or shall I explore it first with Ed?
PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL
BY SPECIAL MESSNGER

Honorable James V. Forrestal
Under Secretary of the Navy
Navy Department
Washington, D. C.

Dear Jim:

As of possible interest to you, there is attached for your strictly confidential information a memorandum relating to the origin and history of this Bureau's Special Intelligence Service in Latin America.

The information in this memorandum is also indicative of the accomplishments of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Western Hemisphere intelligence operations.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

[Attachment]

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
MAR 8 1944
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
April 23, 1944

Honorable James V. Forrestal
The Under Secretary of the Navy
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Forrestal:

I wanted to drop you this personal note to express the sorrow of myself and my associates on the passing of the Secretary.

Deepest of the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarded him as a true friend and will miss him in the days ahead. More important than that, a nation has lost one of its truly great citizens, and I did want to extend to you and his associates in the Navy our heartfelt sympathy in this hour.

With expressions of my highest esteem and admiration,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Deleted Copy Sent]

By Letter Dated 6-21-44 Request
May 11, 1944

BY SPECIAL MESSENGER

Delivered by S. D. Dated
Per FOIPA Request

Dear Jim:

It was a real thrill to see the headlines in last night's papers announcing your appointment as Secretary of the Navy.

I know that this is a real source of gratification to your many friends. The appointment is well deserved by your sterling and steadfast efforts during the past crucial years. I know you will take your new office with the same determination and enjoy the same success which has marked your career in the past.

If at any time I can ever be of assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me either personally or officially.

With expressions of my highest esteem and admiration,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

May 26, 1944

Communications Section
MAILED

MAY 11 1944

Receivd Direct
FBI

May 11 to 24, AM 24

Federal Bureau of Investigation
C. J. Department of Justice
June 1, 1944

The Honorable
The Secretary of the Navy
Washington, D.C.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

As a matter of interest, I am transmitting herewith a two-volume work styled "Free Germany" which has been prepared by this Bureau.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Attachment

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

RECEIVED AT ONCE

5-3-44

3RD, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL
BY SPECIAL MESSENGER

THE Honorable James V. Forrestal
The Secretary of the Navy
Washington, D. C.

To Jim:

As of possible interest to you, there is transmitted herewith a copy of a monograph prepared concerning Guatemala.

The information contained therein has been compiled from data based on reports received from confidential and reliable sources.

Sincerely,

Enclosure
July 11, 1945

Honorable James V. Forrestal
Secretary of the Navy
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jim:

I thought you would be interested in being advised of recent political developments in the Island of Martinique, particularly in view of its proximity to the United States. Elections on that Island in June, 1945, disclosed a pronounced leftward trend. In Fort de France, the capital of Martinique, twenty-nine Communists were elected to a thirty-two-man city council.

In so far as the entire island is concerned, the Socialist Party carried eleven communes, the Radical-Socialists carried seven communes, while the Communist Party carried three communes.

The island is headed by a French-appointed governor but its administration and election laws are the same as those in France.

The population of Martinique is 250,000 of whom 9,000 are white.

Practically all of the land on the island is owned by fifteen French families and is devoted to sugar plantations, which are subsidized by the French Government. ("Daily Worker," June 30, 1945, page 8)

Sincerely yours,
All information contained herein is privileged and confidential

Recording 02-252977

December 15, 1997

Deleted copy sent by letter dated 11/27/97

Security Interest

Secretary is waging a broad campaign for the democratic nomination to the Senate from New York State. He has made certain commitments in connection therewith despite the fact that Robert Wagner's term does not expire until 1951.
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Sir:

We are revising Secretary Forrestal's address list and I shall appreciate it very much if you will fill in the attached card and mail it to me as soon as convenient.

[Attached card]

Deleted Copy Sent by Letter Dated 1-25-47
Per FOIPA Request

RECORD NO: 62-74409-11X
15 APR 5-1947

60 APR 12 1947
July 28, 1947

Honorable James V. Forrestal
3508 Prospect Avenue
Washington, D. C.

Dear Jim:

I wanted to extend you my heartiest congratulations on your designation as Secretary of Defense and the speedy confirmation which followed your appointment, which in my opinion is a real tribute for a job well done and a wonderful performance of public service.

If at any time I can be of assistance, either personally or officially, I do hope you will not hesitate to call upon me.

With best wishes and kind regards,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Rewrite

LDN: hbm
TO:       D. H. IADD
FROM:    L. L. LAUGHLIN
DATE:    July 31, 1947


Inasmuch as there is no information in the Bureau's files concerning the source of the material contained in the above article, I telephoned the New York Office at 10:35 A. M. today and, in the absence of ASAC Belmont, talked with [Redacted] I asked [Redacted] to check the files of the New York Office to determine whether they contained any information relative to the source of the material in this article. I also suggested that inquiry be made through various confidential sources available to the New York Office in an effort to develop some information regarding this matter. I told [Redacted] that for his confidential information the Bureau had been contacted on this matter by the Special Assistant to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

Deleted copy sent by letter dated 12-17.
Per FOIPA Request

Lill:ll
August 1, 1947

Captain M. W. Perry
Special Assistant to the Secretary
Office of the Secretary
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C.

Dear Captain Perry:

With regard to your letter of July 30, 1947, we regret to advise that we have no information on the source of the material contained in Art Shiel's article on page one of the July 28th issue of the "Daily Worker."

We have developed information, however, indicating that the "Daily Worker" for August 3rd, on page three, will carry another article on Secretary Forrestal. This article, it is our understanding, sets forth the sources from which the information was obtained. For example, it allegedly quotes former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, the Wall Street Directory, Senate Committee hearings, Zoby's Encyclopedia, the Standard Wall Street Guide, The New York Times, and the American Government Weekly.

We shall be alert to the possibility of obtaining additional information concerning this matter and, in the event we are successful, we shall, of course, be pleased to advise you.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

---

Communications Section
MAILED 9
AUG 1947 P.M.
Witwenismus to Fascism, Religiosening Fascism

"Menestria Vaticana is the Desirable..."

"Crack the Infamous Thing..." Voltaire
Secretary James Forestal
        Navy Department
        Washington, D.C.

Yours sincerely,
Congress Ends Jag, U. S. Nurses Hangover

WEATHER
Partly Cloudy,
Scattered
Showers

Daily Worker

STANDARD OIL
AGENTS JOIN DUTCH
IN INDONESIA WAR
15 Years Ago Today—Attack on Bonus Marchers

On July 28, 1932, World War I veterans were driven from Washington with tear gas and bayonets. Orders were given by Apple Herbie Hoover and executed by police and troops under the command of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. (See Page 6).

Forrestal Helped Re-Arm Reich

James V. Forrestal, the new Secretary of National Defense, had a major part in the re-arming of Germany and the promotion of the German war trusts. The Worker will give a detailed story of Forrestal's active connection with the German war makers in next Sunday's issue.

Forrestal maintained the closest connection with the Nazi death trusts in the early years of the second World War. His appointment is a threat to world peace. Forrestal, the former president of Dillon, Rea & Co., the international banking house, has an enormous personal interest in the revival of the German war trusts that kick so much to establish.

This is a man whom President Truman has placed in one of the world's biggest imperialist Navy and the world's biggest imperialist Army, as well as atom bomb stock piles, espionage services and troops for striking-down duty.

BODES ILL

Forrestal's appointment also bodes no good to Latin America. As a partner of Dillon, Read & Co., he helped float hundreds of millions of dollars in loans to buttress the most reactionary governments in the great continent to the South.

All the governments that Forrestal financed have since been overthrown. Many of the Latin American countries he helped to float have been repudiated, with immense losses to the rank and file middle class investors in the United States, who bit at his bait.

But Forrestal will now be in a position to help the Latin American reactionaries again. As U.S. military chief he will be in a position to arm every reactionary government—every stooge of Wall Street—against the people of every land to the South.

Brazil alone got more than $130,000,000 from Forrestal's company in the early and mid-1920's.

(Continued on Back Page)
Standard Oil Agents Join Dutch
In War Against Indonesia Republic

Standard Oil representatives yesterday joined the operations of the Dutch air and ground forces in the war against the Indonesian republic. American officials of Socony-Vacuum, Standard Oil subsidiary in foreign lands, traveling with the Dutch army, reached the Socony oil fields in southern Sumatra yesterday, and are battling against Indonesians who are scorching the earth in an effort to stem the advancing Dutch columns.

The Socony-Vacuum fields at Pendopo, 60 air-line miles southeast of Palembang, were captured two days ago by two Dutch columns. Two other columns captured the British owned Royal Dutch Shell fields at Talang Dijlah.

Flying in a U.S. made Dutch air force bomber, a B-25, Standard Oil agents flew reconnaissance over the Socony fields and saw clouds of black smoke rising 4,500 feet. They immediately made radio contact with Tom Conger, New Orleans field superintendent for the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. here, who was directing efforts against the Indonesian guerrillas' scorched-earth tactics.

A Dutch airforce officer in the plane said the fires must have been set the night before. "The Republicans must have infiltrated during the night," he said.

Major Dutch strategy has been to protect the U.S., British and Dutch oil and rubber investments in the islands.

Aches of war and destruction are widespread in the area, where the Japanese destroyed several oil fields and took a large number of prisoners.

DUTCH BANDOENG

A Dutch communiqué asserted the Dutch had suffered heavy losses from artillery fire and that Semarang was under attack from both the east and west. Yes.

The Dutch communiqué claimed Bandoeng, which the Indonesians said they recaptured yesterday, and from Madjilara, 12 miles southeast of Bandoeng.

The Netherlands forces were withdrawn, the Dutch communiqué said, "in connection with fresh duties elsewhere."

The Lembajang power station was captured by Netherlands troops, the Dutch bulletin said, although "heaver resistance than usual" was met there.

The Indonesian communiqué claimed that Republican forces in the Bandoeng area also recaptured Tjumah, five miles west of Bandoeng on the strategic Bandoeng-Buitenzorg road and rail lines, and Sindangwangi near Tabalong.

British Business Backs
Rebuilding of Ruhr

By George Tate

LONDON, July 27.—Big Business here launched an attack against the Government's social service program, calling for abandonment of all nationalization plans, and endorsing the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of the Ruhr.

"We must accept the need for curtailing expenditures on long-term projects, housing, schools and hospitals," said Sir Clive Balliley, chairman of the Broom Co. Ltd., and fellow of the London School of Economics.

Austria CP Asks
Allies to Insure
Chiang Bids for More U.S. Arms, Pledges 'Victory'

In a bid to the Gen. Wedemeyer mission for increased U.S. military aid, Chiang Kai-shek yesterday told junketing American editors in Nanking there was no chance of peace with the Communists, promising that victory "will not take very long." Five months ago the Chinese dictator promised "victory" in three months. Since then his armies were driven out of all but coastal cities of Manchuria and suffered severe setbacks in Shantung province. He mentioned no time limit in yesterday's statement.

Chiang Kal-shek answered American criticism of corruption in his government with the alliteration that armed action of the Communist-led forces prevented him from carrying out "reforms." The Chinese dictator walked into a tea party his wife was giving for the group of American editors. It told Madame's guests that America has a stake in "his fight against the Communists."

CHINA

Expel 430 Students For Political Views

SHANGHAI, July 27.—About 430 secondary schools and college students have been expelled here the last few weeks, most of them for their political views, the English language China Press charged today. Parents of the dismissed students issued a protest against the action.

Yuan Hits MacArthur On Japan Industry

NANKING, July 27.—The Control Yuan today opposed Gen. Douglas MacArthur's plan to maintain Japanese industry at the 1933-34 level. In a memorandum for submission to the Cabinet, the Yuan, which is supposed to supervise general administration, also asked that the Ministry of Industry be given $750,000,000 of the bullion, diamonds, precious metals and cloth now held by the Japanese government.

BARE ANGLO-AMERICAN ARMS PACT

By William F. McMenamin

United Press Staff Correspondent

WASHINGTON, July 27.—The United States and Great Britain have a "long-range" gentlemen's agreement for standardization of "arms that gives each nation access to the latest developments in guided missiles, jet propelled planes and other advanced weapons, high-ranking army officers said today.

One general staff officer said the agreement has not been put in writing, but is just as "binding as if it were laid down in a formal treaty.

He said the agreement does not mean that the British and American armies will have access to the same types of airplanes, tanks, planes and rockets. But a switch would be wasteful, he said.

But it does mean that the British have access to the latest U.S. developments in guided missiles and that the German V-2 rocket tests at White Sands, N. M., and American experiments with jet propulsion and other phases of atomic bomb-shells, he said.

On August 1, Gen. MacArthur left the United States on a 10-day trip to study the war situation in other areas. He brought with him a full report of the military situation in Japan, and the Allied military, including the British, will receive this report before they meet in Australia. Additionally, War Department officials said that the British jet plane was the basis of the American jet. The British were interested in standardizing such things as tank parts, gun calibers and truck parts. They also had expressed an interest in modifying their general staff in accordance with the British plan. The cryptographic communications facilities of the two nations are open books to each other. Although the wartime cooperation between the British and the United States has somewhat curtailed it, they still carry on joint projects and permit each other's observers to view experiments.
Films — Books — The Arts

What New York Movie Fans Think of 'Crossfire''

By David Platt

Crossfire is a useful and necessary film and there should be many more like it.

That's what more than fifty moviegoers told this reporter when button-holed for their opinions in the crowded lobby of the Rivoli last Friday afternoon.

Following are some of the replies (with one exception, they were all willing to be quoted in the Daily Worker):

E. L. Hallock, 32 Vine Road, Larchmont, N. Y.: "I used to sort of feel the way 'Monty' did about Jews. I can see the point now. And I think this film can really help people to understand this question."

William Howard, 236 Sixth Ave., N. Y.: "Very important message. A film like that about the Negro people would be a contribution today."

Gene Brandwein, 603 Van Sickelen Ave., Brooklyn: "A realist picture. I have been called 'Jew Boy' in the army myself. I hope some of the fellows in my outfit get to see it. They may learn something from it."

Allen Goldberg, 9 Prospect Park W., Brooklyn: "Excellent—except for Robert Young's long speech. The film was everything the critics said it was. Don't recall ever seeing anything like it."

Henry Diamond, 192 Summer Ave., Brooklyn: "Not a very deep picture. Not enough information along this line."


Marjorie Harrison, Bronxville, N. Y.: "One of the most honest films of its kind. One of the things about it that I liked is the naturalness of all the characters. The film did not make them out to be big heroes. They were just people. But the fact that they very definitely put across some excellent ideas as to how hatred leads to murder. It hit me right between the eyes. After the film we've had in the past two years, it's nice to see a picture coming out like this. We need an awful lot of that. We're behind the times in this world situation and we've got to do something in order to make people like other people."

Harry Goldman, 1503 Metropolitan Ave., Bronx: "I am Jewish. I am concerned about the problem which is brought forth in the picture. I think they did a pretty good job in presenting the case. The picture is entertaining as well as instructive."

Joan McKernan, 502 E. 81st St., N. Y.: "It shows how people should get along with other races and religions. If a lot of people saw it they would understand why there shouldn't be wars going on. I speak as a Catholic."

Michael Driscoll, 417 10th Ave., N. Y.: "I liked it. It's the sort of thing Hollywood should turn out more often. Hope the GIs get something out of it."

Lawrence Ashinoff, 1760 Sterling Pl., Brooklyn: "It gives people an idea of what can happen to a guy if he carries a grudge against a race or religion. Just the film to help people to see how wrong it is to hate anyone with a different race, color or creed."

Ann Buretta, 223 W. 39th St., N. Y.: "Should be more pictures like it not only about Jews but about other oppressed minorities."

Two French Satires
At 5th Avenue

The Fifth Ave. Playhouse's current double French revival program consists of two Gallic satires, Raimu in The Man Who Seeks The Truth and Rene Clair's The Last Millionaire. Both have complete English titles.

Goldman Concerts
To End Aug. 10

There will be only seven more of Guggenheim Memorial concerts by the Goldman Band, under the direction of Edwin Franko Goldman. The closing concert for Prospect Park will be given on Saturday evening, Aug. 9.
Belgian Buchenwald Film

It is a great pity that We Lived through Buchenwald, now at the 67th Street Theatre, should be an atavistic and diffused melodrama. Certainly in this year 1948, when our leaders usually ignore the result of one reparation of the Fatherland, an active screening of the horror it was Buchenwald could be of use.

But this Belgian film (French is a language predominantly used in dialogue) not only technically poor in its advertising and continuity, most important, it fails to present with 1 and impact all the dramatic element in this Nazi concentration up for the nations of Europe.

ROISMO UNFOLDED

Just as a hungry man cannot

unmove by the sight of 1

no matter how ill-prepared

anyone whose hatred of fascism

all its ways be undermined

but forget at times the de
dinces of film production as the
des art buchery and allied

and hereditary.

The story is that of a band of

an patriotic sent to Buchenwald

with Russian, French, Czech,

and other comrades, they

despair, hope, and finally,

on the eve of the triumphant entry of American tank forces, drive out the Nazi garrison with guns clandestinely made.

Among memorable scenes is that of a group of Russian prisoners, expressing the yearning for home as they sing their Red Army Cavalry song to their comrades-in-arms. Another shows the fervent, jubilant rhythm of America's national anthem when the news of invasion comes.

Parts of the movie are described as having been made in Buchenwald itself, after the Nazis' ouster.

Starring in the film are Rene Herde, Andre Gevrey, and Marcel Moos.

Bernard Herrmann
Conducts at Stadium

Bernard Herrmann, CBS Symphonic conductor, will ascend the Stadium Concert podium for the first time tonight (Monday) directing the New York Philharmonia-Symphonie Orchestra for this and the Stadium Concerts of Tuesday, July 28, and Wednesday, July 30.

Highlight on Monday evening will be William Field playing the Rachmaninoff Piano Concerto No. 3 in C minor.

1947 CRITICS PRIZE PLAY

"STONE FLOWER"

and French resistence film, "JEREMIO"

THALIA 50TH STREET & BROADWAY

FINIAN'S RAINBOW

46th St., Theat - W. 46th Ave. Air Cond.

MADAME BUTTERFLY PAYMENT FRIDAYS

SUMMER TUESDAY \\
FRIDAYS \\
WEDNESDAYS \\
SUNDAY & WEDNESDAY 8:30, 5:30, 9:30, 12:30, 2:30, 7:30, 8:30, 10:00

PATRONIZE

ADVERTISERS
Deported Jews Will
Land in France Today

MARSEILLE, France, July 27 (UP).—Forty-five hundred Jewish refugees, sent back from Palestine to France, are expected to arrive off Marseille tomorrow morning, a communique issued by the prefect of the Department of Bouches du Rhone said tonight.

The Jews, in the British transports Empire Vigour, Ocean Vigour and Rannymeade Park, may be disembarked here or at the little port of Bouc 20 miles west, according to latest word.

The government has announced it will "welcome" the Jews back to this country. But it added it would not take any steps to force them to land.

Representatives of the Haganah, Jewish underground organization, which is handing the immigration sign, are posted at ports around Marseille, seeking to urge the refugees to resist any attempts to put them ashore.

However, both French and Jewish relief organizations are preparing facilities to receive the immigrants.

It was reported the refugees included 800 children under six years of age, 150 pregnant women and 600 aged persons.

It was understood that as soon as the refugees arrived French officials would go aboard to identify the passengers. The passengers then will be told France will accommodate any who wish to land but that the French administration will not force anybody to land, it was said.

Notices conveying this information are to be distributed in French, Yiddish and Hebrew, it was said.

Jerusalem, July 27.—An official British statement said tonight:

"A commission of inquiry is being held under the chairmanship of Lord Irwin, a member of the British Ministry of Labor. The commission is investigating the condition of the Jewish community in Palestine and the possibility of establishing a Jewish state there.

"The commission is expected to report its findings by the end of the year."

Rem-Rand Union
Wins 8c, 6 Holidays

An agreement to end the seven-week-old strike of 9,500 CIO United Electrical Workers against Remington-Rand Corp. plants in five cities was announced here yesterday subject to local ratification of the provisions which include an eight-hour day and an hour wage increase.

The settlement, if ratified at membership meetings tomorrow, will return workers to the company's plants at Syracuse, Illion, Tonawanda, and North Tonawanda, N.Y., and at Benton Harbor, Mich.

Provisions of the agreement include, in addition to the wage increase, six paid holidays and submission to arbitration of any further wage increase and of any unresolved issues which are not settled in negotiations on a local level.

The union had demanded a 10 cents an hour package increase which was to include paid holidays. The difference between this and the actual offer will be the issue in wage arbitration.

The settlement also agrees to a two-year contract, expiring on April 1, 1949, with a provision that wage negotiations can be reopened on April 1, 1948.

Approximately 6,500 members of the International Association of Machinists, independent, who are or strike at a Remington plant at Elmsford, N.Y., are not covered by the agreement.

Forrestal

(Continued from Page 1)

One $25,000,000 bond issue to
Bolivia in 1924 was used to help
finance Bolivia's war with Paraguay
in the Chaco jungles.

Bolivia fought this war as a mercenary for the Standard Oil Inter-

est in Bolivia's oil wells.

The Standard Oil Company has been in business in Bolivia since 1923 and has been a major force in the development of the country.

The $25,000,000 bond issue was used to finance Bolivia's war with Paraguay in the Chaco jungles.

The war was a disaster for Bolivia, which lost a large portion of its territory to Paraguay.

Forrestal's company admitted that much of this loan was used to pay for armaments from the British Vickers arms factory.

Forrestal was making millions a year in flush years on Wall Street.

His early days were troubled, however, and some of his winnings were at the expense of the government's tax collectors.

He admitted to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1933 that he had failed to pay any taxes on one block of $800,000 in stock market profits in 1929 for four years. Then he paid only $1,000.

Under cross-examination Forrestal told how he set up a Canadian holding company for tax purposes. The Canadian company was owned by a Maryland company in turn, and the latter was controlled by Forrestal himself. By juggling the securities around he dodged the tax collectors.

It was a crude—and crude that someone else might have gone somewhere else, and not to the cabinet.

The present Defense Secretary told the committee that he actually paid some $300,000 in taxes in '33. His income ran into the millions, after making allowances for the usual "deductions" and "exclusions" and the low tax rate prevailing that year.

Forrestal isn't as rich as the Rockefellers nor the Morgans, whose representatives sit on the boards of his company's securities' affiliates.

But the former president of Dillon, Read is the teammate of the Rockefellers, Morgans and Gilloons, and he is the chief of Wall Street in the super-powerful post of Secretary of National Defense.

Machine Union
Quizzes AFL
On Rejoining

WASHINGTON, July 27 (UP).—The International Association of

Jersey Crops Plowed Under
As Farmers' Take Is Slashed

As Farmers' Take Is Slashed
migrants were approaching the esti- mate coast with about 1,100 im-
migrants.

"While the government reserves its rights regarding destination and future deportations, these refugees will be taken to Cyprus," the statement said.

This meant that the refugees would be taken to internment camps on Cyprus and, unless the government changed its mind, would remain there awaiting "legal" entry to Palestine under the 1,500-a-
month immigration quota.

NEW CAMPAIGN

A government informant said there was evidence that the big underground organization Hagana had embarked on a campaign aimed at bringing 35,000 Jewish immigrants to Palestine in 20 ships. The
President Garfield was the first of the 25, the informant said.

Troops cordoned off the Haifa and Mix. Carmel radar stations to-day as a precaution against another Hagana attack on them. The stations aided the navy and forces in intercepting immigrant ships.

Three British deportation ships arrived at Haifa early this event- awaiting the immigrants. Precations were taken, by system, of dropping of depth bombs in a harbor to prevent Hagana "fishermen" from swimming out and tempting to sink them.

VINELAND, N. J., July 27.—South Jersey truck farmers are being forced to plow cash crops under. Scores of acres of beans, pickles, cucumbers, peppers, beets and squash are today disked up and whole crops of asparagus left in the fields to go to seed. As the Labor Dept. announced that food prices had hit a new high, 139 per-
cent from the 1933-1939 average, South Jersey's produce farmers are finding that they cannot get cost of
production returns from produce-
buyers and commission merchants.

The crops, sold last year for $3.50 a bushel, are now getting
80 cents to $1.65 a bushel. The last week, they hit a 10-year low of 50 cents but spontaneous action of 200 farmers re-

tuning to sell at the Landisville produce auction, forced wholesale
buyers to bid 75 cents.

Thirty-five miles away in the Camden-Philadelphia retail area, the same pickles and cucumbers are costing city consumers five cents a

able. String beans, on which cost of production is estimated at $1.60 to $1.75 a bushel, are bringing 50c to 

Leon, selling for $4.90 to $4.50 a 24-head box last year, is now get-

Congress

(Continued from Page 3)

The brunt of the Taft-Hartley Act and in the long run they will pay, in one way or another, for the Tru-
man Doctrine. But they will also suffer because of legislation which Congress refused to enact, includ-

Adequate housing, especially for veterans.

Raising the minimum wage from 40 to 55 or 75 cents an hour.

Curbs on the monopolies and trusts which grew tremendously in power during the war.

Authorization for the Federal Government to punish lynchers.

Prohibition of discrimination against Negroes and other minority

groups in hiring and firing in private

employment.

Elimination of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in federal elections.

Although President Truman has disavowed any intention of calling a special session in the fall, it is generally felt Congress will recon-
vene to appropriate funds for the Marshall Plan. The carrot which lured the U.S. State Department into

Again, before the people of Europe

is a supply of dollars to carry them through the rigorous winter of 1947-

These dollars cannot be made available by that time without a

special session.

If any prominent Republicans have expressed guarded opposition to spending money for the Marshall Plan. But by fall, it is believed

Wall Street will have succeeded in persuading them of the necessity of further expenditures to "combat communism."

Perhaps the most accurate measure

of the failure of the 80th Con-
gress to serve the American people, is the continued ascent in the cost-
of-living index.

On the day Congress adjourned, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor announced
that between May 15 and June 15 (the latest figures available) the retail price of beef and veal climbed
10 percent, all meat, poultry and fish, six percent. Retail food prices rose 31 percent since June 1946, the last month in which price controls operated.

British Won't Pledge Goods for Soviet Grain

LONDON, July 27 (UP)—Cocow Radio in its first comment on the breakdown of Anglo-Rus-
trade negotiations said tonight that

Britain would not guarantee delivery of promised steel rail and s.

In its broadcast recordings Moscow said that the
breakdown came—as reported from Mos-
don—over disagreement on price.

Price Britain would pay for tin

"Both sides agreed on a price, and the price for which agreements were agreed on at a figure consis-

lower than the price at which

Britain recently bought a large

quantity of wheat in Argentinia

and lower than that at which the

present time exists on the Can-

dian market," the broadcast said.

After noting that the steel ques-
tion was the first cause of the breakdown, Moscow said the second reason was:

TIME CREDIT TERMS

"On the question of prolongation of the 1941 credits the Soviet pro-

posal consisted in a reduction of percentage rates on credits to 5

per cent per annum and prolongation of payments to 15 years that-

is, from the end of 1944 in 12 an-

num equal amounts.

This Moscow said, would mean granting Russia time credit terms no worse than those which Britain only recently granted France on a
prolonged wartime debt.

"The British rejected the com-

promise proposal," Moscow said.

"In order to reach agreement the

Soviet side withdrew its proposal for prolongation of credits already granted and proposed that only half of
this sum be prolonged, agreeing to preserve the period of repayments for the other half.

The British side rejected this proposal, and proposed that only one-quarter of the credits be prolonged, which was clearly un-

acceptable to the Russian side.

Since the position of the British side was not acceptable to the Soviet Union negotiations were ended."
October 23, 1947

3:40 PM

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. TOLESON
MR. FAUS
MR. LAGO

James

Secretary of National Defense Forrestal telephoned me in regards to the meeting which will be held in his office at 10:00 AM tomorrow. He stated that he had nothing particular in mind, but he wanted to gain the impressions from those who are to attend on a number of general aspects of the internal and external security situations. Secretary Forrestal said that he also wanted to take up the question of Secretary of Commerce's proposal for an active counter-agitation propaganda. He stated that if it doesn't embarrass me he would like to have me sit in on these meetings. I told him that I would be happy to do so and that I would be at his office at ten tomorrow morning.

Very truly yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

Deleted Copy Sent by Letter Dist. Per FJ99A Request

SE 29 62-74469-16

JEH: DJK
cc - Mr. Nease
Telephone Room
March 23, 1942

Secretary James Forrestal,
Department of National Defense,
Washington, D. C.

Secretary Forrestal,

Not knowing how much time you and your co-conspirators against the peace are going to leave us former veterans, I write you now to tell you of the contempt, disgust and dislike we have for you and the other military dogs who are not only betraying the people of this nation into the hands of a gang of brass-hats but betraying all humanity into oblivion.

Good luck to you and yours.

Frank Forrestal

[Signature]

69 APR 6 1948
January 11, 1949

MEMORANDUM FOR M. TOLESON

M. LAZ

I returned the Attorney General's call and he advised me that he had talked to Secretary of Defense Forrestal who, he stated, was quite upset at what he called a smear campaign which was being directed at him. The Attorney General stated that Forrestal had shown him some messages which he stated had supposedly emanated from some woman by the name of [redacted] and he, the Attorney General, wanted to know if we had any information in our files on such a person. I advised him that we would be glad to check and let him know.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

John Edgar Hoover
Director

Deleted Copy Sent by Letter dated Feb 4, 99, I sent

JCH

RECORDED - 94

31 JAN 1949

INEXED - 94

EX-76

Mr. Tolson
Mr. Claflin
Mr. Dean
Mr. Haldin
Mr. Rosen
Mr. Tracy
Mr. Dunn
Mr. Gurnsey
Mr. Hanna
Mr. John
Mr. Pennington
Mr. Quinn Tangle
Mr. Kenee
Mr. Nease
Mr. Gandy

62 JAN 1949

62-74-09-70

TIME 1-1-49

DATE 1-1-49

BY M.

62-74-09-70
March 4, 1949

Honorable James V. Forrestal
Secretary of Defense
National Defense Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jim:

As you prepare to return to private life, I want you to know how deeply I have appreciated the privilege of the close relationship which we have had during your career in the government. I shall always recall with pleasure these associations and I do hope that even though you are leaving official life I may have the pleasure of seeing you from time to time. If I can ever be of service I hope you will not hesitate to call upon me.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

LBN: hmc
EX-152
cc:
(REWRITE OF 6-12-48, FEC: GO)

Mr. Tolson
Mr. Clepp
Mr. Grable
Mr. Ladd
Mr. Nicholson
Mr. Rosen
Mr. Tracy
Mr. Garner
Mr. Harbo
Mr. Kohn
Mr. Pennington
Mr. Quinz Team
Tola, Boss
Mr. Nease
Mar County

58 Mar 17 1949
March 20, 1949

11:19

FBI FILES FOR MR. TOLSON
Mr. Laid

I returned the call of Honorable James Forrestal, former Secretary of Defense. Mr. Forrestal told me that he suspected his phone was being tapped and he wondered if it would be possible for us to check into this matter. I advised him that I would be very glad to look into this and also discussed with him a few precautionary measures he could take in order to prevent such an incident occurring.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

John Edgar Hoover
Director

cc: Mr. Mason

Deleted Copy Sent by Letter Dated
Per FOLD Request

[Signature]
Mr. James Forrestal called—phoned.

Phone No. ______________

Hour 5:00p.m Date Mar. 28, 1949

REMARKS

Asked if Mr. Hoover was in town, and was told that Mr. Hoover was out of the office the remainder of the day and asked if there was a message. He said he would call [Blank] to see if he knew if Mr. Hoover was returning, and inquired if he wouldn't know. It was explained that the Director was out of the office and not expected to return, but if he contacted the office, a message of his call would be given the Director. He was requested to give his name so the Director could be advised and he pronounced his name as "Mr. Forrest." The spelling was verified and he gave it as "Mr. Forrestal" and later gave his first name as "James." He was asked if he would like to leave his number, and he stated he could still be reached through the White House and he would like Mr. Hoover to call him at home.

He was thanked for calling and told Mr. Hoover would be informed of his message as soon as possible. He spoke quickly and used short abrupt sentences.
March 28, 1949

There was a party at the White House this afternoon for Mr. Forrestal and during the afternoon he remarked to [redacted] that he suspects that his phones are being tapped and asked to whom he should speak about this [redacted] told him Mr. Hoover was the one to talk to about it and told Mr. Forrestal he would be glad to call for him. He said no, he would call Mr. Hoover himself.

hug Mr. Tolson was odious
March 30, 1949

Honorable James V. Forrestal
3508 Prospect Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Jim:

I wanted to let you know that we have completed the check of the telephone lines and instruments in your residence and that all were found to be clear.

It was a pleasure to be of this assistance to you.

With expressions of my highest regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: MR. D. H. LADD

FROM: MR. F. J. BAUMGARDNER

SUBJECT: SOVIET ESPIONAGE - R

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this memorandum is to set forth information telephonically furnished by the WFO at 1:30 P.M., April 7, 1949, to the effect that James Forrestal, former Secretary of Defense, had attempted to commit suicide on April 5, 1949.

DETAILS:

Mr. Kenneth Delavigne of the WFO telephonically advised that on April 6, 1949, through a technical surveillance maintained on the WFO obtained a recording of a conversation. The conversation was carried on in the Russian language and the translation, the results of which are set forth below, according to Mr. Delavigne had just been completed.

As you know, no papers were printed in Washington yesterday due to the printers' strike. A perusal of today's Washington Post does not carry any information to the effect that Forrestal attempted to commit suicide.

For your additional information is the subject of a pending investigation along with other subjects in the Soviet espionage case.

ACTION:

None. The above is for your information.

FEB:mer

Classified by 4417
Exempt from NARA
Date: 5-23-76
1-6-3-24

53 APR 13 49
James Forrestal
Washington, D.C.

April 7, 1949

My dear Mr. Hoover:

In the absence of Mr. Forrestal, this will acknowledge receipt of your note to him of March 30th. It will be shown to him at the first opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

Hon. J. Edgar Hoover
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice
Washington 25, D.C.

RECORDED - 123
50 Apr 27, 1949
TO : MR. H. B. FLETCHER
FROM : MR. E. M. HOLROYD
SUBJECT: FORMER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
JAMES V. FORRESTALL
INFORMATION CONCERNING

This is to advise that at 11:05 a.m., Inspector J. J. McGuire telephonically advised that former Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal committed suicide this morning by jumping out of a window at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. Mr. McGuire advised that Mr. Forrestal's suicide had not yet appeared in the newspapers or on the radio but would probably be on the radio within the next two hours. Mr. McGuire requested that Mr. Ladd be notified of the suicide of Forrestal.

ACTION TAKEN

At 11:05 a.m., the home of Assistant to the Director Ladd was telephonically contacted and the information concerning the suicide of former Secretary of Defense Forrestal was given to Mrs. Ladd.
May 23, 1949

Mrs. James V. Forrestal
3508 Prospect Street, Northwest
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Forrestal:

Jim's passing was a terrific shock to me and I wanted to write you this personal note to let you know I am thinking of you in your hour of sorrow. Please let me know if there is any way at all I can be of assistance. During the entire period of Jim's illness I was most distressed because I had come to regard him as an intimate friend upon whom I could lean heavily for advice, guidance and counsel. In his death you have lost a good husband and I have lost a close, understanding friend. The entire Nation has been deprived of a distinguished public servant.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. Edgar Hoover
MAY 10 1952
BB

62-74409-28

CHANGED TO

62-91196-2
Office Memo • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO: The Director
FROM: D. M. Ladd
SUBJECT: DIARY OF THE LATE JAMES FORRESTAL

PURPOSE

To inform you that publication rights to the diary of the late James Forrestal have been assigned to the New York Herald Tribune, which is preparing for publication and sale a book based thereon. The Joint Chiefs of Staff has referred to the Bureau an excerpt from this diary dated 11/8/45 relating to information furnished to Forrestal’s office by the FBI. The names of individuals concerned and the data relating to them are incorrectly set forth. The Joint Chiefs of Staff request our comments as to whether the data can be published. It is recommended that Liaison advise the Joint Chiefs of Staff that this excerpt is incorrect and that the Bureau recommends against its publication.

DETAILS

By memorandum dated 1/10/51 the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised the Bureau through Liaison that the publication rights to the diary of the late James Forrestal have been assigned by the executors of the estate to the "New York Herald Tribune," which is preparing for publication and public sale a book based thereon. In accordance with an agreement made between the representatives of the White House, the Defense Department and the executors, all publications prepared from the Forrestal papers are to be reviewed by appropriate governmental authority.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff referred to the Bureau for its comments the following reference from the Forrestal diary:

"8 November 1945 ATOMIC BOMB - FBI

"Admiral advised me today that the FBI had identified a man named (in the Special Scientific Group attached to the COMINCH (Commander in Chief’s) office) who had been isolated—that is, he will no longer receive information of significance—and he is being followed by FBI agents. He was one of Dr. Vannevar Bush’s scientists.

COPIES DESTROYED 332 DEC 11 1964
"I was also informed me that another man named____ who was in New Mexico, has also been identified as an enemy agent."

**ANALYSIS**

The Bureau on or before 11/8/45 did not identify to Forrestal's office anyone named____ connected with atomic bomb espionage.

The matter to which the diary refers is probably investigation resulting from the disclosures made by____

A memorandum on Soviet espionage activity, dated 10/19/45, including the most current information at that time concerning the organization of Soviet espionage activities in the U. S. and Canada in connection with the____ matter was transmitted to the Honorable James V. Forrestal. This memorandum and its cover letter were delivered to Secretary Forrestal's office by Bureau Liaison 10/22/45.

(100-342972-16,37,67X2)

The individual referred to as____ is probably____ was then assigned as Consultant in the Office of the Commander-in-Chief, United States Navy, Navy Department, and has been identified as the____

There were no allegations that____ was engaged in atomic bomb espionage or had ever furnished the Soviets any atomic bomb information.

The individual referred to in the diary entry as____ is probably____ and was dealt with in some detail in the memorandum which Forrestal was furnished. The memorandum, however, does not show that____ was ever in New Mexico and, in fact, the Bureau had no information at that time regarding any travel by____ to any____ in the U. S. other than the so-called____ at the

CONFIDENTIAL
After the receipt of the aforementioned memorandum by Forrestal's office, Captain [redacted] of the Naval Intelligence conferred with [redacted] on 10/26/45 concerning [redacted] inquired whether the Bureau could give any assurance that [redacted] was not passing information which he received from his employment and was told that the Bureau very emphatically could not give any such assurance, since we had only a loose and casual surveillance upon [redacted] which was at the very best a "spot check." (100-343506-3x1)

With regard to the significance of the date of the diary entry, it is noted that on the morning of 11/8/45, Admiral [redacted] of the Navy Department interviewed [redacted] regarding [redacted].

[redacted] advised that [redacted] was working on a project relative to [redacted] which enabled him to review the [redacted] was looking for some "out" for the Navy, since he felt that he could not leave [redacted] in the latter's assignment.

[redacted] pointed out to [redacted] that the case had been discussed on a Cabinet level and after considerable discussion, indicated he would take the matter up with the Secretary of the Navy, Forrestal, and request that the Secretary of the Navy take such steps as were possible either to bring about the consummation of prosecution or some other action which would effectuate elimination of [redacted] access to restricted material. (100-343506-3x4)

On this memorandum you noted, "Right, it is the Navy's 'hot potato.'"

Under date of 11/13/45, Secretary Forrestal transmitted a note to you, thanking you for your letter of October 19 and its attached memorandum regarding Soviet espionage activity in the United States and Canada.

There would appear to be no valid reason for the erroneous information contained in the diary entry, when Forrestal had in his possession, or at least in his office since 10/22/45, correct information. (100-342972-68x)
STATUS OF

_________________________ was convicted

in __________________________ of violation of the __________________________

and is serving a term of imprisonment.

_________________________ was separated from his Navy

employment in the __________________________ to take a __________________________

at __________________________ He is currently __________________________

is in the Bureau's __________________________ No evidence of

overt acts of espionage was ever established against __________________________

The Canadian authorities are of the opinion that __________________________ was probably supplying information to Soviet agents who were his associates, but the Canadian authorities are unable to establish any overt acts of espionage by __________________________ (100-343506-158, 162, 163)

OBSERVATIONS

The entry in Forrestal's diary is incorrect as to both names and facts. The Navy Department at that time was trying to get out of an embarrassing situation with regard to their employment of __________________________. It would appear that no good purpose would be served by permitting the publication of wholly erroneous information.

ACTION

It is respectfully recommended that the Liaison Section of the Bureau advise Lt. Colonel __________________________ of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the diary entry is erroneous factually, and we recommend against its publication.

Confidential
called and while discussing other matters, he volunteered information that Senator McCarthy was circulating the story that he received $25,000 from [redacted] for allegedly having [redacted] lay off the late Secretary Forrestal.

He stated he checked into the background of this and ascertained that [redacted] was a very close friend of the late Secretary Forrestal, and retained [redacted] to do some work for him. When [redacted] and Winchell started making deposits, [redacted] asked if something couldn't be done to come to the defense of Winchell, and informed that he could buy Winchell and [redacted] off for $50,000 worth of [redacted] gave $50,000 and is telling people that [redacted] paid $25,000 to [redacted] and $25,000 to Winchell. After a number of several weeks, and Winchell and [redacted] continued to harass Forrestal, he called in and stated that he gave $25,000 to [redacted] and $25,000 to [redacted].

He further stated that he has ascertained that about 10 days or two weeks ago Professor Leo Szilard, the famous Atomic Scientist, had breakfast with [redacted] who offered him $50,000 to write a series of articles on Atomic Energy. The Professor related this incident to a New York lawyer, [redacted], who in turn related the story to [redacted].

James Forrestal
Office Memorandum

TO: Mr. Tolson

FROM: L. B. Nichols

DATE: 10/6/51

SUBJECT: James

Colonel Reid advised me that there had been some discussion on the Forrestal diary, which was compiled by Colonel of the New York Herald Tribune, whom young Reed does not trust. Colonel Reid told me the White House had sat on the Forrestal material and had deleted some of the more damaging documents, although Secretary Lovett had told they had deleted only six letters.

Reid further stated that the Vandenberg diary is presently being furnished Houghton Mifflin; that this would also be syndicated by the New York Herald Tribune.
March 18, 1952

Dear [Name]:

Your letter postmarked March 12, 1952, has been received.

While I would like to be of service, it is not possible for me to furnish you any data concerning the matters mentioned by you since they do not relate to a violation of any Federal law within the investigative jurisdiction of the FBI.

Inasmuch as your communication may be of interest to another governmental agency, however, I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of it to the Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, United States Treasury Department, 1300 E Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

Sincerely yours,

John Edgar Hoover
Director

Copy of incoming sent to the Bureau of Narcotics by form letter. Copy also being sent to the Secretary of the Navy.

NOTE: Correspondent is not identifiable in Busfiles.
March 9, 1952

John Edgar Hoover
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C.

James V. Forrestal

 Gentleman:

 On the Drudgee Ryan Crime Report (which is television's show out of New York) a
said he thought and would be able to prove in the near future that
James V. Forrestal was driven to insanity by placing two
grams of opium and two grams of some other narcotic
in his coffee each day for two weeks. He said this
would drive any man into wanting suicide; I wrote
but have as yet received no answer.

 Would you please tell me if there is any doubt that
Forrestal committed suicide naturally? I would also
like to know if taking these narcotics for the prescribed
length of time would cause said reaction? Please send
the reply to the above address.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
March 9, 1952

John Edgar Hoover
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C.

Gentleman:

On the Brundige News Crime Report (which is television show out New York) a said he thought and would be able to prove in the near future that James V. Forrestal was driven to insanity by placing two grams of opium and two grams of some other narcotic in his coffee each day for two weeks. He said this would drive any man into wanting suicide. I wrote but have as yet received no answer.

Would you please tell me if there is any doubt that Forrestal committed suicide naturally? I would also like to know if taking those narcotics for the prescribed length of time would cause said reaction? Please send the reply to the above address.

Yours truly,

/s/
62-74409-3f

CHANGED TO

62-117098-k5

JUL 12 1976

[Signature]