THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
LITTERA SCRIPTA MANET
FEDERAL REGISTER
OF THE UNITED STATES 1934

VOLUME 17 NUMBER 124

Washington, Wednesday, June 25, 1952

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10365

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED, WHICH RELATE TO OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 426 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended (Public Law 67, 82nd Congress), it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. Except as provided in paragraph 2 hereof, the operation of those provisions of Title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, which relate to the distribution in grades, promotion by selection, temporary promotion, and discharge on second failure of selection for promotion, of officers of the Marine Corps of the grades of second lieutenant and above are hereby suspended until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the national emergency proclaimed by Proclamation No. 2914 of December 16, 1950, shall end.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 hereof, the operation of those provisions of Title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, which relate to the promotion of officers of the Marine Corps shall not be regarded as suspended in the case of any officer of the Marine Corps whose name is on this date on a promotion list as a result of selection for promotion pursuant to that Act.

3. This order supersedes Executive Order No. 10266 of June 30, 1951, so far as that order relates to the suspension of the operation of provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, for commissioned officers of the Marine Corps of the grades of captain and below.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 24, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-7034; Filed, June 24, 1952; 12:46 p. m.]

TITLE 7—AGRICULTURE

Chapter VII—Production and Marketing Administration (Agricultural Adjustment), Department of Agriculture

[Amdt. 4]

PART 713—COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

SUBPART—SELECTION AND FUNCTIONS OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION COUNTY AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEES

WHO MAY VOTE FOR COMMITTEEMEN AND DELEGATES

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, the regulations pertaining to the Selection and Functions of Production and Marketing Administration County and Community Committees, as amended (14 F. R. 5916, 15 F. R. 4262, 16 F. R. 6998, 17 F. R. 5057), are hereby amended by changing paragraph (a) of § 713.5 to read as follows:

§ 713.5 *Who may vote for committeemen and delegates.* * * *

(a) A payment or grant of conservation materials or services is or will be made with respect to the farm under the current Agricultural Conservation Program, or there is being carried out on the farm one or more of the current program practices approved for the State by the State Production and Marketing Administration committee, referred to in this subpart as the "State Committee";

(Sec. 4, 49 Stat. 164; 16 U. S. C. 590d. Interpret or apply 49 Stat. 1149, as amended; 16 U. S. C. 590h)

Done at Washington, D. C., this 20th day of June 1952. Witness my hand and the seal of the Department of Agriculture.

[SEAL] CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6944; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:54 a. m.]

CONTENTS

THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

FEDERAL REGISTER

Published daily, except Sundays, Mondays, and days following official Federal holidays, by the Federal Register Division, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act, approved July 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U. S. C., ch. 8B), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President. Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

The regulatory material appearing herein is keyed to the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published, under 50 titles, pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended June 19, 1937.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month or $15.00 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies (minimum 15¢) varies in proportion to the size of the issue. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

CONTENTS—Continued

CONTENTS—Continued

CONTENTS—Continued

CODIFICATION GUIDE

A numerical list of the parts of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in this issue. Proposed rules, as opposed to final actions, are identified as such.

[1026 (Peanuts-52)-1, Amdt. 1]

PART 729—PEANUTS

MARKETING QUOTA REGULATIONS, FOR 1952 CROP

The amendments herein are based on the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, applicable to peanuts (7 U. S. C. 1301–1376) and are made for the purpose of amending peanut marketing quota regulations for the 1952 crop relating to the marketing phase of the program. The first amendment defines the term "excess moisture" appearing in the definition of "pound". The second amendment changes the definition of "Memorandum of Sale, Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952)" by providing that such form will be used to record and report data with respect to all purchases of peanuts. The third, fourth, and fifth amendments simply delete all references in the regulations to Form MQ–94.

The regulations as originally issued provided that a Form MQ–94 would be used to report and record data with respect to the inspection and marketing of quota peanuts purchased by buyers for price support purposes. In view of the manner in which loans and purchases will be made in connection with the price support program for the 1952 crop of peanuts, it has been determined that it will not be necessary for buyers to report purchases and loans to the State Production and Marketing Administration Committees by means of Form MQ–94.

Farmers in the southernmost areas of the United States will soon begin harvesting their 1952 crops of peanuts; therefore, it is essential that the amendments contained herein be made effective as soon as possible. Accordingly, it is hereby determined and found that compliance with the notice, procedure, and effective date requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1003) is impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and the amendments contained herein shall be effective upon filing of this document with the Director, Division of the Federal Register.

The marketing quota regulations for the 1952 crop of peanuts (17 F. R. 4317) are hereby amended as follows:

1. Section 729.341 (r) is amended to read as follows:

(r) "Pound" means that quantity of farmers stock peanuts equal to one pound standard weight. If peanuts have been graded at the time of marketing, the poundage shall be the weight thereof excluding foreign material and excess moisture. (Excess moisture means moisture in excess of seven percent in the southeastern and southwestern areas or eight percent in the Virginia-Carolina area as such areas are defined in the 1951 peanut price support bulletin (16 F. R. 6851, 7200). If shelled peanuts are marketed, the poundage thereof shall be converted to the weight of farmers stock peanuts by multiplying the number of pounds of shelled peanuts by 1.5, and the result shall be the number of pounds considered as marketed under these regulations.

2. Section 729.341 (u) is amended to read as follows:

(u) "Memorandum of Sale" means Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952), used (1) to record and report data with respect to all purchases of peanuts and (2) to record and report data with respect to peanuts shelled for or by producers.

3. Section 729.341 (v) is deleted in its entirety.

4. Section 729.354 (a) is amended to read as follows:

(a) Each marketing of peanuts from a farm shall be recorded by the buyer or his representative on a marketing card issued for the farm on which the peanuts were produced, if such marketing card is presented to the buyer by the producer at the time the peanuts are marketed. Each marketing of peanuts without a marketing card shall be subject to the penalty, unless the marketing consists of shriveled, damaged, split, and broken peanut kernels which were produced in shelling not in excess of that quantity of farmers stock peanuts for a producer which the county committee determined is reasonable for seed purposes on the producer's farm for the 1952 crop. The marketing of such shriveled, damaged, split, and broken peanut kernels will be identified by a Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952), Memorandum of Sale, partially executed by a member of the county committee to show the quantity of peanuts that is reasonable for seed purposes on the producer's farm for the 1953 crop. Buyers will record and report data with respect to all peanuts purchased on Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952), Memorandum of Sale: *Provided, however,* That a person who is not engaged in the business of buying peanuts for movement into the regular channels of trade shall not be required to execute Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952), identifying purchases of peanuts from producers, if the county committee has determined that it would be administratively impracticable to require such buyer to execute forms, keep the records, and make the buyer's reports required in §§ 729.340 to 729.369, in which case the producer marketing the peanuts shall be responsible for reporting each marketing to the county committee as provided in § 729.356.

5. Section 729.362 (b) is amended to read as follows:

(b) *Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952).* Buyers shall record and report data on Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952) with respect to all peanuts purchased. The Production and Marketing Administration's copies of all Forms MQ–93—Peanuts (1952), with remittances covering the penalties due as shown on Form MQ–93—Peanuts (1952), shall be forwarded to the State committee by means of MQ–79—Peanuts (1952), Buyers Weekly Report and Transmittal to State PMA Office, not later than the end of two calendar weeks following the week in which the peanuts were marketed.

(Sec. 375, 52 Stat. 66, as amended; 7 U. S. C. 1375. Interpret or apply secs. 358, 359, 372, 373, 55 Stat. 88–90, as amended, 52 Stat. 65, as amended; 7 U. S. C. 1358, 1359, 1372, 1373)

Done at Washington, D. C. this 20th day of June 1952. Witness my hand and the seal of the Department of Agriculture.

[SEAL] CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

[F. R. Doc. 52–6945; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:54 a. m.]

Chapter VIII—Production and Marketing Administration (Sugar Branch), Department of Agriculture

Subchapter B—Sugar Requirements and Quotas

[Sugar Reg. 813, Amdt. 1]

PART 813—SUGAR QUOTAS AND PRORATIONS OF QUOTA DEFICITS

SUBPART—1952

DETERMINATION AND PRORATION OF AREA DEFICIT

Basis and purpose. This amendment is issued pursuant to the Sugar Act of

1948 for the purpose of prorating an area deficit which is hereby determined. Section 204 (a) of the act provides that the Secretary shall from time to time determine whether any domestic area, the Republic of the Philippines, or Cuba will be unable to market its quota. If he so finds with respect to the Republic of the Philippines, the quotas for Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines shall be revised by prorating to such areas an amount of sugar equal to any deficit so determined.

The Sugar Act provides that the quota for any domestic area, the Republic of the Philippines, Cuba or other foreign countries as established under the provisions of section 202 shall not be reduced by reason of any determination of a deficit and makes the proration of any such deficit a mere mathematical computation. In addition to the determination and proration of the deficit between Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with the specific requirements of section 204 (a) of the act, further proration is made among the individual countries in the "other foreign countries" group pursuant to section 204 (d). The method of proration among such "other foreign countries" used herein will not prejudice the interest of any country. None of those not sharing in the deficit determined herein has supplied raw sugar in 1949, 1950, or 1951 indicating that none of them is in a position to supply raw sugar to which entries under this proration are limited by section 204 (a). Only two of these countries have made any marketing against their existing prorations for 1952 and none has yet marketed the full amount of its existing proration. Any of these countries can qualify for additional quota in the reallocation of the September 1 quota balance by having filled their prorations in effect on that date.

In order to afford sellers of sugar in affected areas an adequate opportunity to market the additional sugar authorized by this amendment, and thereby protect the interest of consumers, it is essential that this amendment be made effective immediately. Therefore, it is hereby determined and found that compliance with the notice, procedure and effective date requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act is unnecessary, impracticable and contrary to the public interest and the amendment herein shall become effective on the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by the Sugar Act of 1948 (61 Stat. 922, 7 U. S. C. Sup. I, 1100) and the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) Sugar Regulation 813 (16 F. R. 13032) is hereby amended by adding § 813.33 and paragraph (b) to § 813.34 to read as follows:

§ 813.33 *Determination and proration of area deficits*—(a) *Deficit in quota for the Republic of the Philippines.* It is hereby determined, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 204 of the act, that for the calendar year 1952 the Republic of the Philippines will be unable by an amount of 200,000 short tons of sugar, raw value, to market the quota established for that area in § 813.32.

(b) *Proration of deficit in quota for the Republic of the Philippines.* An amount of sugar equal to the deficit determined in paragraph (a) of this section is hereby prorated, pursuant to subsection (a) of section 204 of the act, as follows:

Area:	*Additional quota in terms of short tons, raw value*
Cuba	190,000
Foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines	10,000

§ 813.34 *Proration of quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines.* * * *

(b) *Additional prorations.* An amount of sugar equal to that part of the deficit prorated to foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines under paragraph (b) of § 813.33, is hereby prorated, pursuant to subsection (d) of section 204 of the act, as follows:

Country:	*Additional proration in pounds, raw value*
Dominican Republic	5,391,700
Haiti	745,160
Mexico	4,877,000
Peru	8,986,140
Total	20,000,000

Statement of bases and considerations. In the initial quota determination for 1952 it was stated that crop estimates then current indicated that the Republic of the Philippines had a fair chance to fill its 1952 quota. Processing of the 1951–52 crop sugarcane in the Philippines is now nearing completion and the crop is estimated at 1,040,000 short tons, equivalent to 1,065,000 tons raw value. Of this about 287,000 tons raw value have been set aside for local consumption and about 36,000 tons entered the continental United States in 1951. It is expected that about an equal quantity of 1952–53 crop sugar will arrive in the U. S. in 1952. Thus the current prospect is that about 778,000 short tons, raw value, of Philippine sugar will be available to the continental U. S. in 1952, leaving a deficit of about 200,000 short tons, raw value, in the statutory quota amounting to 974,000 short tons, raw value. This deficit has been prorated to Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines on the basis of 95 percent (190,000 tons) to Cuba and 5 percent (10,000 tons) to "other foreign countries" as required by the act. The 10,000 tons of additional quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines have been prorated on the basis of their existing prorations of 1952 quota to the four countries in this group which supplied raw sugar to the United States in 1949, 1950 and 1951. This basis is the best present indication of the interest of the countries concerned in supplying raw sugar to the United States market.

After giving effect to the changes set forth in this amendment to Sugar Regulation 813, the quotas for all areas are as follows:

BASIC QUOTAS, PRORATIONS OF DEFICIT AND ADJUSTED QUOTAS FOR 1952

[Short tons, raw value]

Production area	Basic quota	Proration of deficit in quota for Philippines	Adjusted quota
Domestic beet sugar	1,800,000	----------	1,800,000
Mainland cane sugar	500,000	----------	500,000
Hawaii [1]	1,052,000	----------	1,052,000
Puerto Rico [1]	910,000	----------	910,000
Virgin Islands	6,000	----------	6,000
Philippines, Republic of [1] [3]	974,000	(200,000)	774,000
Cuba [1]	2,424,571	190,000	2,614,571
Other Foreign Countries: [2]			
Belgium	197.4	----------	197.4
Canada	378.5	----------	378.5
China and Hongkong	193.3	----------	193.3
Czechoslovakia	176.6	----------	176.6
Dominican Republic	4,473.7	2,695.8	7,169.5
Dutch East Indies	141.8	----------	141.8
Guatemala	224.6	----------	224.6
Haiti	618.3	372.6	990.9
Honduras	2,302.7	----------	2,302.7
Mexico	4,046.7	2,438.5	6,485.2
Netherlands	146.6	----------	146.6
Nicaragua	6,857.1	----------	6,857.1
Peru	7,456.2	4,493.1	11,949.3
Salvador	5,507.0	----------	5,507.0
United Kingdom	235.2	----------	235.2
Venezuela	194.5	----------	194.5
Other countries	28.8	----------	28.8
Unallotted reserve	250.0	----------	250.0
Subtotal	33,429.0	10,000.0	43,429.0
Total	7,700,000	----------	7,700,000

[1] The following quantities may be entered as direct-consumption sugar: Hawaii, 29,616 tons; Puerto Rico, 126,033; Philippines, 59,920; Cuba, 375,000.

[2] Regardless of deficit proration, by reason of sec. 204(c) of the act the Republic of the Philippines retains its basic quota.

[3] Prorations of basic quota may be filled with direct-consumption or raw sugar. Prorations of the Philippine deficit may be filled with raw sugar for processing only.

(Sec. 403, 61 Stat. 932; 7 U. S. C. Sup., 1153)

Done at Washington, D. C., this 20th day of June 1952. Witness my hand and the seal of the Department of Agriculture.

[SEAL] CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

[F R Doc 52-6952; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:55 a. m.]

TITLE 6—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

Chapter III—Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture

Subchapter B—Farm Ownership Loans

PART 311—BASIC REGULATIONS

SUBPART B—LOAN LIMITATIONS

AVERAGE VALUES OF FARMS AND INVESTMENT LIMITS; MINNESOTA, NEW JERSEY AND PUERTO RICO

For the purposes of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, average values of efficient family-type farm-management units and investment limits for the counties identified below are determined to be as herein set forth. The average values and investment limits heretofore established for said counties, which appear in the tabulations of average values and investment limits under § 311.30, Chapter III, Title 6 of the Code of Federal Regulations, are hereby superseded by the average values and investment limits set forth below for said counties.

MINNESOTA

County	Average value	Investment limit
Aitkin	$10,000	$10,000
Becker	16,000	12,000
Benton	12,000	12,000
Big Stone	24,000	12,000
Blue Earth	32,000	12,000
Brown	35,000	12,000
Carver	26,000	12,000
Cass	8,000	8,000
Chippewa	32,000	12,000
Clay	20,000	12,000
Cottonwood	35,000	12,000
Crow Wing	10,000	10,000
Dodge	28,000	12,000
Douglas	16,000	12,000
Faribault	32,000	12,000
Fillmore	18,000	12,000
Goodhue	23,000	12,000
Grant	21,000	12,000
Houston	18,000	12,000
Hubbard	9,000	9,000
Itasca	8,000	8,000
Jackson	32,000	12,000
Kandiyohi	25,000	12,000
Kittson	18,000	12,000
Le Sueur	32,000	12,000
Lincoln	30,000	12,000
Lyon	32,000	12,000
McLeod	26,000	12,000
Mahnomen	12,000	12,000
Marshall	18,000	12,000
Martin	32,000	12,000
Meeker	32,000	12,000
Mille Lacs	12,000	12,000
Morrison	12,000	12,000
Murray	32,000	12,000
Nicollet	32,000	12,000
Nobles	36,000	12,000
Norman	20,000	12,000
Olmsted	28,000	12,000
Otter Tail	20,000	12,000
Pennington	12,000	12,000
Pine	12,000	12,000
Pipestone	32,000	12,000
Polk	18,000	12,000
Pope	17,000	12,000
Red Lake	10,000	10,000
Redwood	32,000	12,000
Renville	32,000	12,000
Rice	28,000	12,000
Rock	32,000	12,000
Roseau	10,000	10,000
Sibley	27,000	12,000
Stearns	16,000	12,000
Steele	28,000	12,000
Stevens	22,000	12,000
Swift	20,000	12,000
Todd	12,000	12,000
Traverse	22,000	12,000
Wabasha	22,000	12,000
Wadena	9,500	9,500
Waseca	28,000	12,000
Watonwan	32,000	12,000
Wilkin	22,000	12,000
Winona	26,000	12,000
Wright	16,000	12,000
Yellow Medicine	32,000	12,000

NEW JERSEY

Sussex	$20,000	$12,000

PUERTO RICO

Utuado	$12,000	$12,000

(Sec. 41 (l), 60 Stat. 1066; 7 U. S. C. 1015 (l). Interprets or applies secs. 3 (a), 44 (b), 60 Stat. 1074, 1069; 7 U. S. C. 1003 (a), 1018 (b))

Issued this 19th day of June 1952.

[SEAL] C. J. McCORMICK,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6895; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:49 a. m.]

TITLE 19—CUSTOMS DUTIES

Chapter I—Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury

[T. D. 53022]

PART 10—ARTICLES CONDITIONALLY FREE, SUBJECT TO A REDUCED RATE, ETC.

CREWS' EFFECTS

Section 10.22 (b), Customs Regulations of 1943 (19 CFR 10.22 (b)), as amended, provides that articles in the possession of or owned by a crew member, when written declaration and entry are required therefor, shall be described and declared on a Declaration and Entry of Crew Members for Imported Articles, Customs Form 5123.

The regulation of the Military Air Transport Service will require that its Form PT-10 be filed as an individual customs declaration by crew members of that Service. Since Form PT-10 is substantially similar to Customs Form 5123, it is believed that it may be accepted in lieu of the latter form from crew members of the Military Air Transport Service. It is also believed possible that other Services may wish to use similar forms. Section 10.22 (b), Customs Regulations of 1943, is, therefore, hereby further amended by inserting the following after "5123," in the first sentence: "or other form approved by the Commissioner of Customs,".

(Sec. 624, 46 Stat. 759; 19 U. S. C. 1624. Interprets or applies secs. 498, 584, 46 Stat 728, 748, as amended; 19 U. S. C. 1498, 1584)

[SEAL] FRANK DOW,
Commissioner of Customs.

Approved: June 18, 1952.

JOHN S. GRAHAM,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6909; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:52 a. m.]

TITLE 32A—NATIONAL DEFENSE, APPENDIX

Chapter III—Office of Price Stabilization, Economic Stabilization Agency

[Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1]

CPR 135, SR 1—SALES OF BAKERY ITEMS TO EATING AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS LOCATED IN THE METROPOLITAN NEW YORK AREA

Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, Executive Order 10161 (15 F. R. 6105), and Economic Stabilization Agency General Order No. 2 (16 F. R. 738), this Supplementary Regulation 1 to Ceiling Price Regulation 135 is hereby issued.

STATEMENT OF CONSIDERATIONS

This supplementary regulation permits New York restaurant bakers, at their option, to eliminate the discounts and differentials they are required to maintain under CPR 135 if they make the compensatory adjustments and recalculations in ceiling prices provided for under this regulation.

As under the GCPR, bakers under CPR 135 are required to maintain separate ceiling prices for each class of purchaser. Generally speaking, bakers establish their ceiling prices under CPR 135 for each class of purchaser by applying their GCPR discounts or differentials for such class to their ceiling price for their largest buying class of purchaser.

Similarly, as under section 22 of the GCPR, the term class of purchaser under CPR 135 means a purchaser or group of purchasers to whom a baker customarily sold at a price different from the price or prices at which he sold any other purchaser or group of purchasers.

Their experiences under the GCPR have demonstrated that the New York restaurant bakers will be subject to certain difficulties if they are required to calculate their ceiling prices by applying these GCPR discounts and differentials. The GCPR froze the ceiling prices of the restaurant bakers at a time when an unsystematic discount and differential structure prevailed in the industry. The discounts and differentials of these bakers bore no relationship to any functional differences between restaurant customers, such as differences in location or in volume of purchases. Nor did differences in such discounts and differentials have any cost basis. The amount of the discount or differential, if any, which a particular restaurant obtained was often solely the result of its bargaining power. One restaurant might have enjoyed a large discount, while another restaurant, similarly situated in all objective respects, might have obtained only a slight discount or no discount at all. In many instances, large and small volume buyers obtained the same discount.

Discount and differential structures and practices of this nature existed before the GCPR base period. They were the result of unusually intense competition between restaurant bakers. These bakers deal with many different labor union locals, and negotiations are not conducted on an industry-wide basis. Starting with 1948, strikes were called by various labor union locals against individual bakers at different times. Upon settlement of the strikes and the resumption of operations these bakers offered varying discounts to regain their customers. Competitors retaliated and the net effect was to increase the use of discounts.

Rectification of this discount and differential situation was not permitted under the GCPR freeze nor is it permissible under CPR 135. This supplementary regulation offers a method of doing so. Restaurant bakers may under this supplementary regulation eliminate all discounts and differentials required to be maintained under CPR 135. However, in fairness to the customers and in accordance with standards of sound price control the effective level of ceiling prices cannot be permitted to rise above the level provided for in CPR 135. Accordingly, this regulation reduces the level of CPR 135 list ceiling prices to offset the elimination of discounts and differentials. This is accomplished by a combination of pricing techniques. First, dollars-and-cents ceiling prices are fixed for number 3 and 4 loaves of bread and vienna rolls. These items account for 82 percent of the restaurant bakers' sales and are by far their most important items. Secondly, a new factor of 1.09 is applied to all other items instead of the CPR 135 factor of 1.16.

Dollars-and-cents ceiling prices are provided for the most important items for several reasons. First of all this technique is the most practicable one for insuring that the level of ceiling prices under this supplementary regulation will be no higher than the level of ceiling prices under CPR 135. Moreover, the dollars-and-cents ceiling prices elimi-

nate the possibilities of disrupting historical price differentials between items that might otherwise result if any other technique were applied. Finally, dollars-and-cents ceiling prices are by far the easiest to apply. The need for issuance of this regulation as promptly as possible, however, rendered impracticable any consideration of extending dollars-and-cents ceiling prices to the less important items. Application of the factor of 1.09, however, will produce substantially the same level of ceiling prices for these items that would have resulted from the setting of dollars-and-cents ceiling prices.

New York restaurant bakers will use as their ceiling prices for the number 3 and 4 loaves and vienna rolls the applicable dollars-and-cents ceiling prices set forth in this regulation. No reports are required for these items, but bakers who elect to establish their ceiling prices for them under this regulation must file a statement of their election to do so with the appropriate OPS District Offices. They establish their ceiling prices for all other items sold during 1949 by applying the factor of 1.09 to their 1949 prices. No reports are required for items sold during 1949. Ceiling prices for items not sold in 1949 are established by following virtually the same instructions as are set forth in CPR 135.

Generally speaking, all other pricing provisions of CPR 135 are incorporated by reference under this supplementary regulation. Among other things, however, wherever the restaurant baker uses these provisions he must apply ceiling prices established under this supplementary regulation rather than CPR 135 ceiling prices. This requirement has been added to insure that ceiling prices for new items, adjustments, and the like will result in levels which are in line with the ceiling prices and other adjustments otherwise established by this supplementary regulation.

This regulation only applies to sales to restaurants in the metropolitan New York area. Bakers subject to this supplementary regulation continue to establish their ceiling prices for non-restaurant sales under CPR 135.

FINDINGS OF THE DIRECTOR

In the judgment of the Director of Price Stabilization, the provisions of this supplementary regulation are generally fair and equitable, are necessary to effectuate the purposes of Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and comply with all the applicable requirements of that Act.

In the formulation of this supplementary regulation there has been consultation with industry representatives, including trade association representatives, to the extent practicable, and consideration has been given to their recommendations.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

Sec.

AUTHORITY: Sections 1 to 6 issued under sec. 704, 64 Stat. 816, as amended; 50 U. S. C. App. Sup. 2154. Interpret or apply Title IV, 64 Stat. 803, as amended; 50 U. S. C. App. Sup., 2101–2110, E. O. 10161, Sept. 9, 1950, 15 F. R. 6105; 3 CFR, 1950 Supp.

SEC. 1. *What this supplementary regulation does.* (a) This supplementary regulation applies to sales of bakery items to "eating and drinking establishments" located in the "metropolitan New York area".

(b) "Eating and drinking establishments" include but are not limited to restaurants, hotels, (including room service), taverns, cafes, cafeterias, soda fountains, boarding houses, catering establishments, field kitchens, lunch wagons and delicatessens. It covers establishments such as hot dog stands at athletic events even when they are only temporarily at a particular location.

(c) "Metropolitan New York area" means the following counties in the State of New York: New York, Kings, Queens, Bronx, Richmond, Rockland, Westchester, Suffolk and Nassau; and the following counties in the State of New Jersey: Bergen, Hudson, Union, and Passaic.

SEC. 2. *Election to establish ceiling prices under this regulation.* (a) If you are a baker who makes any sales described in section 1, you may if you wish, establish your ceiling prices for such sales under this supplementary regulation instead of under Ceiling Price Regulation 135.

(b) If you use this supplementary regulation: (1) you must apply it to all sales of all items to eating and drinking establishments located in the metropolitan New York area; (2) you may discontinue the discounts and differentials which you would have been required to maintain for such sales under Ceiling Price Regulation 135.

(c) If you elect to use this supplementary regulation you must file by registered mail, return receipt requested, with your District OPS Office, a report containing: (1) your name and address; and (2) a statement that you have elected to use this supplementary regulation.

SEC. 3. *Ceiling prices for number 3 and 4 loaves and for vienna rolls.* (a) Your ceiling prices for the items described in Table A are the applicable dollars-and-cents ceiling prices set forth in the same table.

TABLE A—CEILING PRICES FOR CERTAIN LOAVES AND ROLLS

Item	*Ceiling price*
No. 3 loaf of white, rye, whole wheat or pumpernickel bread	$0.40
No. 4 loaf of white, rye, whole wheat or pumpernickel bread	.53
Large vienna rolls (per dozen)	.30
Small vienna rolls (per dozen)	.22

(b) The baked weights corresponding to the items and ceiling prices on Table A are the baked weights (or, in the case of the rolls, sizes) at which you sold those items during 1949. If you did not sell an item described in Table A during 1949 your baked weight (or, in the case of the rolls, size) at the ceiling prices set forth in that table must at least be the baked weight or size, as the case may be, at which your most closely competitive baker sold the same item during 1949 to eating and drinking establishments located in the metropolitan New York area.

SEC. 4. *Ceiling Prices for other items.* (a) If you sell an item which is not described in Table A of section 3, establish your ceiling price under the first of the following provisions of this section which you are able to use:

(b) (1) Your ceiling price for a sale of an item under this regulation is your highest "list price" during 1949 for that sale multiplied by 1.09.

(2) "List price" means the price to which you applied your discounts or differentials in arriving at the amounts payable to you upon sales of items to eating and drinking establishments located in the metropolitan New York area.

(c) (1) If you are unable to calculate a ceiling price for an item under paragraph (b) of this section because you did not make a sale of the item during 1949 to any eating and drinking establishment in the metropolitan New York area, establish your ceiling price as follows:

(2) (i) If the item is a white pan bread item, establish your ceiling price by following the same directions as are set forth in section 2.2 (a) of Ceiling Price Regulation 135 except that the ceiling price borrowed by you must be a ceiling price established under this supplementary regulation.

(ii) You may begin to sell the item under paragraph (c) (2) of this section as soon as you have sent by registered mail, return receipt requested, to your District OPS Office a report containing the following information: your name and address; a statement that you are establishing your ceiling price or ceiling prices under this paragraph (c) (2) of section 4 of the supplementary regulation; a description of the item (including baked weight) for which you are establishing a ceiling price under paragraph (c) (2) of this section; the ceiling price under this supplementary regulation of your most closely competitive baker, his name and address; and your proposed ceiling price.

(3) If the item is not a white pan bread item establish your ceiling price by following the instructions set forth in section 2.3 of Ceiling Price Regulation 135 except that any ceiling price used by you for this purpose must be one that has been fixed under this supplementary regulation.

(4) If you are unable to calculate a ceiling price under any of the foregoing provisions of this section you may apply for the establishment of a ceiling price by following the same directions as are set forth in section 2.4 of Ceiling Price Regulation 135 except that:

(i) you must accompany your application with a statement that you are requesting the establishment of a ceiling price under this supplementary regulation; and

(ii) your ceiling prices and those of your most closely competitive baker, which you are required to include in your application, must be ceiling prices established under this supplementary regulation.

SEC. 5. *Application of other provisions of Ceiling Price Regulation 135.* If you wish to make any of the adjustments or calculations of ceiling prices provided for in sections 2.5–2.10 and 2.12 of Ceiling Price Regulation 135, you may do so by following the instructions set forth in those sections except as follows:

(1) You must substitute for the ceiling price mentioned in such instructions the corresponding ceiling price established under this supplementary regulation.

(2) Wherever the term "class of purchasers" or "largest buying class of purchasers" is mentioned in such instructions, substitute eating and drinking establishments located in the metropolitan New York area.

(3) Any report or application which you are required to submit under the foregoing instructions must be accompanied by a statement that you are submitting such report or application for sales of items governed by this supplementary regulation.

(4) If you use the instructions of section 2.6 of CPR 135, apply paragraph (b) of that section to the sweet goods items for which you have established your ceiling price under paragraph (b) (1) of section 4 of this supplementary regulation. Apply paragraph (c) of section 2.6 of CPR 135 to the sweet goods items for which you have established your ceiling prices under paragraph (c) (2), (c) (3) or (c) (4) of section 4 of this supplementary regulation or for which you have made adjustments in net weight.

(5) Wherever in section 2.7–2.10 of CPR 135 reference is made to section 2.1 of the same regulation, substitute section 4 (b) (1) of this supplementary regulation.

(6) You must also specify the section of Ceiling Price Regulation 135 you used in making your calculations and in filing your report or application.

SEC. 6. *General applicability of Ceiling Price Regulation 135.* All provisions of Ceiling Price Regulation 135 which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this supplementary regulation remain in full force and effect under this regulation.

Effective date. This supplementary regulation to Ceiling Price Regulation 135 becomes effective June 24, 1952.

NOTE: The record-keeping and reporting requirements of this supplementary regulation have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

ELLIS ARNALL,
Director of Price Stabilization.

JUNE 24, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-7080; Filed, June 24, 1952; 12:01 p. m.]

[Distribution Regulation 1, Revision 1, Amdt. 2]

DR 1—FAIR DISTRIBUTION OF LIVESTOCK AND MEAT

SLAUGHTER FOR FARMERS

Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, Executive Order 10161, delegation of authority by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to meat, as amended, and Economic Stabilization Agency General Order 5, Revision, this Amendment 2 to Distribution Regulation 1, Revision 1, is hereby issued.

STATEMENT OF CONSIDERATIONS

This amendment permits registration of new Class 2 slaughterers wishing to slaughter only for farmers who may have slaughtering done for them under sections 10 and 11 of Distribution Regulation 1, Revision 1.

Farmers qualifying under sections 10 or 11 of the regulation may have livestock slaughtered for them by registered Class 1 and Class 2 slaughterers. There are a number of areas in which adequate facilities are not readily available to have such slaughter performed. In such places and elsewhere much farm slaughter has been done at the farmers' premises.

Permitting registration of sanitary establishments to slaughter for farmers only will promote the proper utilization of livestock and meat in a number of ways. It will permit sanitary slaughter for farmers, and thus will move farm slaughter operations from the farmers' barnyards to adequate slaughter facilities. Since in barnyard slaughter hides and offal are often lost and proper chilling facilities are usually not available, the change will permit more complete and hygienic utilization of meat and meat products resulting from slaughter. Under this change the number of commercial slaughterers will not be increased, since registrations granted under this new subsection will be limited to slaughter for farmers only.

At the same time, and without endangering the allocation of livestock and meat into normal trade channels, a number of rural businesses will be put into a more favorable economic condition, due to the source of new revenue in farm slaughtering fees.

Conclusions. The provisions of this amendment are necessary and appropriate to promote the national defense. They do not modify the policy of the Office of Price Stabilization to maintain the fair distribution of livestock and meat; that distribution continues as far as possible among the commercial processors who participated in the distribution pattern during the base period of distribution preceding the imposition of controls.

In formulating this amendment, the Director of Price Stabilization has not consulted with industry representatives. The amendment affects only a minute fraction of the nation's slaughterers. The affected slaughterers are scattered throughout the country; no panel of industry representatives could reasonably be constituted which could represent the views of this group. Therefore, the Director finds that special circumstances have rendered consultation with industry representatives, including trade association representatives, impracticable.

In the judgment of the Director, the provisions of this amendment are generally fair and equitable, are necessary to effectuate the purposes of Title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and comply with all the applicable standards of that act.

AMENDATORY PROVISIONS

Distribution Regulation 1, Revision 1, is amended in the following respects:

1. Section 15 is amended by re-designating section 15 (b) as section 15 (c) and inserting before it a new section 15 (b) to read as follows:

(b) You may be granted registration as a new Class 2 slaughterer of livestock for Class 3 slaughterers and persons authorized under section 11 of this regulation to have livestock slaughtered for them, on such conditions as the Director of Price Stabilization may deem neccessary to further the policy of this revised regulation, if you submit a signed application stating:

(1) Your name and address (if you are a corporation, state the name and address of each person owning stock amounting to more than 10 percent of the total issued. If you are a partnership, state the name and address of each person with an interest of 10 percent or more in the partnership);

(2) That you will not slaughter livestock for anyone, including yourself, who is not authorized to have livestock slaughtered for him under Section 10 or 11 of this regulation; and

(3) A description of the sanitary facilities with which your plant is equipped. To be registered, your establishment must meet the sanitary requirements of section 15 (a).

If you are registered under the provisions of this section, you must submit to the Office of Price Stabilization District Office where you are registered, within ten days after the end of each calendar month, all statements furnished you during that month by Class 3 and Section 11 slaughterers pursuant to sections 10 (b) or 11 (b). Compliance with this requirement is a condition of continuing registration.

(Sec. 704, 64 Stat. 816, as amended, 50 U. S. C. App. Sup. 2154)

Effective date: This amendment shall become effective on June 23, 1952.

NOTE: The reporting requirements of this amendment have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.

ELLIS ARNALL,
Director of Price Stabilization.

JUNE 23, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-7005; Filed, June 23, 1952; 4:49 p. m.]

[General Overriding Regulation 14, Amendment 17]

GOR 14—EXEMPTED AND SUSPENDED SERVICES

ARMORED CAR SERVICES

Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, Executive Order 10161, and Economic Stabilization Agency General Order No. 2, this amendment to General Overriding Regulation 14 is hereby issued.

STATEMENT OF CONSIDERATIONS

This amendment to General Overriding Regulation 14 adds to the list of services exempted from ceiling price regulation the rates and charges of armored car companies for the transportation and guarding of money, securities and other valuables.

As stated in the statement of considerations accompanying General Overriding Regulation 14, the services exempted by it are those which the Congress has exempted or those which have little or no significance upon the cost of living, or which cannot practically be controlled. Armored car service is important to banks and others handling large sums of money, securities and other easily disposable valuables. However, in terms of cost it is a relatively insignificant item to them and it has virtually no effect upon the general level of prices or upon the cost of living. Furthermore, the principal value of the armored car service is found not in the transportation as such, but in the protective custody afforded during transportation. As a practical matter the purchaser of armored car service pays for the personal service of guards, the furnishing of which has already been exempted from price control by subparagraph (67) of section 3 (a) of GOR 14. Finally, this guard service and transportation is so highly individualized that there are no readily definable classes of purchasers or patterns of rates or charges upon which to establish or adjust ceiling prices. The administrative burden of attempting to maintain fair and equitable price control without such a pattern far outweighs the benefit to be derived from the maintenance of control. Accordingly these services are added to the list of exempted services in GOR 14.

Prior to the formulation of this amendment, consultation was had with industry representatives, including trade association representatives, and consideration has been given to their recommendations.

It is the judgment of the Director that the exemption herein will not defeat or impair the stabilization program or the objectives of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

AMENDATORY PROVISIONS

General Overriding Regulation 14, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of paragraph (a) of section 3 a new subparagraph (103), as follows:

(103) Transportation by armored motor vehicles of money, securities and valuable articles and guarding services incident thereto.

(Sec. 704, 64 Stat. 816, as amended; 50 U. S. C. App. Sup. 2154)

Effective date. This amendment 17 to General Overriding Regulation 14 shall become effective June 24, 1952.

ELLIS ARNALL,
Director of Price Stabilization.

JUNE 24, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-7032; Filed, June 24, 1952; 12:01 p. m.]

Chapter IV—Salary and Wage Stabilization, Economic Stabilization Agency

Subchapter B—Wage Stabilization Board

[General Wage Regulations 6 and 8, Revised, and Resolution 71, Interpretations]

INTERPRETATIONS TO GENERAL WAGE REGULATIONS 6 AND 8, REVISED, AND RESOLUTION 71

PIECE AND INCENTIVE RATES

Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 816, as amended by Pub. Law 96, 82d Cong., Executive Order 10161 (15 F. R. 6105), Executive Order 10233 (16 F. R. 3503), and General Order No. 3, Economic Stabilization Administrator (16 F. R. 739)), the following interpretations to General Wage Regulation 6 (16 F. R. 1951), General Wage Regulation 8, Revised (51 F. R. 12808), and Resolution No. 71 are hereby issued.

NATHAN P. FEINSINGER,
Chairman.

HOW YOU MAY ADJUST PIECE AND INCENTIVE RATES WITHOUT PRIOR BOARD APPROVAL UNDER GENERAL WAGE REGULATIONS 6 AND 8, REVISED

This interpretation is intended to assist you in determining whether adjustments to employees paid on a piece rate, or other type of incentive wage system are permissible, on a self-administering basis, under the provisions of General Wage Regulations 6 and 8, Revised, and Resolution No. 71 of the Wage Stabilization Board. It contains illustrations and explanations of proper calculations in a variety of situations; only a few of which are likely to be necessary for your purposes. Paragraph headings indicate the particular type of problem covered in each paragraph.

All of the explanations and examples are based upon the simple principle (applicable to units which include piece or incentive employees) that you may raise your piece and base incentive rates by a direct application of the percentages permissible under Regulations 6 and 8, Revised, to such rates. As long as the increases are made on a uniform percentage basis to all rates, the problem is simple. The calculations become more complex, however, when non-uniform adjustments are involved; particularly where the appropriate unit includes both time and incentive employees. These problems are discussed below, and form the bulk of this interpretation.

(1) *Certain general principles.* (a) This interpretation relates solely to adjustments in the earnings of incentive workers resulting from general and cost-of-living increases. It is not intended to limit variations in earnings which result from increased productivity under the normal operation of an existing incentive system. Similarly, increases in earnings since the base pay period resulting solely from increased productivity do not have to be offset as general increases under General Wage Regulation 6.

(b) Employees paid on a piece rate or incentive basis may constitute a separate appropriate employee unit, or may be combined with employees paid on a time basis in a single appropriate employee unit, whichever is best adapted to preserve existing contractual or historical relationships.

(c) This interpretation refers only to general and cost-of-living increases. It is not intended to govern the establishment of rates for new or changed jobs or operations, or other adjustments governed by General Wage Regulation 15; nor does it apply to changes in an incentive system, as such. If the rates for new or changed jobs or operations since the base pay period were established in accordance with the principles of General Wage Regulation 15, general and cost-of-living increases permissible under General Wage Regulations 6 and 8 may be applied to such rates.

(d) The methods set forth below are not intended to exhaust proper ways of applying the increases permissible under General Wage Regulations 6 and 8. Persons desiring to increase their piece or incentive rates by methods which vary from those enumerated below should file a petition on Form WS-100 for prior Board approval.

(e) Wherever, in this interpretation, reference is made to payrolls, these are to be taken exclusive of any premium pay for overtime, but inclusive of the payment at straight time for all hours worked. (Thus, assume a total payroll of $1,050 for 1,000 hours of work of which 100 hours were paid at the overtime rate of time and one-half, or $1.50. The overtime premium pay which equals $50 (100 hours × 50 cents) shall be excluded from the payroll. In other words, the total payroll shall be given as $1,000 and hours of work as 1,000 hours.)

GENERAL WAGE REGULATION 6

(2) *Resolution No. 71.* Resolution No. 71, adopted by the Wage Stabilization Board on December 4, 1951, sets forth the standards for applying increases permissible under General Wage Regulation 6 to piece rates and to the base rates of incentive jobs. The Resolution, as interpreted herein, supersedes all prior inconsistent instructions and interpretations of the Wage Stabilization Board with respect to piece and incentive rates. (Par. 3, General Instructions, Use of Form WS-6a; Interpretation No. 6-27, I. B. 4; Nos. 6-69 and 6-73, I. B. 10.)

RAISING THE RATES

(3) *Uniform percentage application.* Resolution No. 71 is designed to permit the direct application of the ten percent in situations where piece or incentive employees are involved. Calculations under this Resolution are thus carried

in the form of percentages rather than cents per hour. Where piece work or incentive employees are involved, and it is desired to apply the appropriate percentage to their rates, you are not required to use the straight-time hourly earnings during the base pay period. Thus, if no general increases have been granted in the unit since the base pay period, and it is desired to apply the 10 percent uniformly to all jobs, each such piece rate or job rate can simply be increased by 10 percent.

(E. g., 10 cents per item to 11 cents per item; $2 per dozen pieces to $2.20 per dozen pieces; $1.50 per hour to $1.65 per hour.)

(4) *How to calculate the net effect of increases granted in varying percentages.* Under Resolution No. 71, the 10 percent may be applied to each rate (as described above), or the percentages applied to different jobs may vary, provided that the average increase does not exceed 10 percent as calculated below. You may not, however, apply a general increase to the piece rates applicable to a given job classification unequally, without prior Board approval.

(E. g., if you have "pressers" and "sewers" paid on a piece rate basis, you may increase all the "pressers" rates by a given percentage and all the "sewers" rates by a different percentage provided that the over-all increase for the unit does not exceed 10 percent. You may not, however, raise the "presser rate" for garment "A" by 5 percent and garment "B" by 15 percent, except with the prior approval of the Board.)

Where an increase is given in varying percentages as between jobs, the calculation of the net effect of such increases requires several computations. The following method shall be used for calculating the net effect of each general increase granted since January 15, 1950, or which is currently proposed:

(a) Choose the payroll of the unit for the period immediately preceding the date of the increase (e. g., $10,000).

(b) Recompute this payroll to include the particular increase. In other words, you calculate what the earnings during that same payroll period would have been if the new rates were in effect during that period (e. g., $10,200).

(c) Subtract the actual payroll "a" (exclusive of the increases) from the recomputed payroll "b" (including increases). This difference will represent the actual dollar and cent increase on the total payroll (e. g., $10,200—$10,000=$200).

(d) The ratio between this amount "c" and the actual payroll "a" will give the net effect of each wage increase expressed as a percentage

(E. g., $\frac{\$200}{\$10,000}$=0.02 or 2 percent)

(5) *How to determine the effect of past increases where more than one has been granted.* The calculation of the total effect of several past increases is based on compounding of prior percentages of increases into a single, combined percentage. To do this, first determine the percentage of each individual increase as shown in paragraphs (3) or (4) above. Write percentages of each increase as a decimal number (e. g., 2 percent should be written as 0.02). Then add 1.00 to each such figure (e. g., 1.02) and calculate the product of the resultant numbers (e. g., if there were two prior increases, one of 2 percent, the other of 3 percent, multiply 1.02×1.03=1.0506). The product so secured less 1.00 will give the total effect of past increases as a compounded percentage (e. g., 1.0506—1.00=0.0506 or 5.06 percent of increase).

(6) *How to determine the percentage that you may distribute.* To determine the percentage of increase which you may distribute without the Board's approval under General Wage Regulation 6 compute the ratio between 1.10 and the compounded percentage (expressed in decimal form) of past increase plus 1.00 as calculated in (5) above, and subtract 1.00 from such ratio.

(E. g., if past increases were 5.06 percent, the percentage of increase that can be given to the unit is $\frac{1.10}{1.0506}-1.00=0.047$ or 4.7 percent. That means that whatever proposed increases are made in all piece or base rates, the total effect of the proposed increase, as calculated in the manner described in (4) above, cannot exceed 4.7 percent).

(7) *The percentage side payments (paragraphs A (2) and B (2) of Resolution 71).* In certain circumstances it may be desirable to leave the piece rates or base rates unchanged, and to add the permissible percentage of increase to the earnings calculated on the basis of the rates in existence prior to the increase. Such a practice may be followed under Resolution No. 71 provided that the percentage is permissible in accordance with the calculations described above.

(E. g., if a 5-percent increase is permissible, and an employee earns $40 in one week on old piece or incentive rates, you may pay him an additional 5 percent of $40 during that week or $2.00, making his total earnings $42.00 for that week. If during the following week he earns $39 at old piece or incentive rates, you may pay him an additional 5 percent of $39 during that week or $1.85, making total earnings of $40.85 for that week.)

PAYING THE INCREASE AS A CENTS PER HOUR SIDE PAYMENT

(8) *Calculating the allowable cents per hour amount.* An employer and Union, if any, may determine to distribute the permissible increase under General Wage Regulation 6 to employees in the unit as a cents per hour side payment to be included in each regular pay envelope rather than to incorporate it into the piece rates or base rates of incentive jobs. In such case, the 10 percent allowance is based upon the total straight-time earnings, including incentive earnings, during the base pay period (the payroll period ending on or after January 15, 1950). Since all affected employees would receive the payment of this adjustment in the form of an hourly payment, and no adjustments in the piece or base rates are involved, the provisions of Resolution No. 71 would only become applicable if you desire to discontinue the payment in the manner described in paragraphs A (3) and B (3) of the Resolution, and paragraph (9) below.

An allowable cents per hour increase thus calculated (on the basis of total straight-time earnings, including incentive earnings in the base pay period) cannot be incorporated directly into the piece rates or base rates, unless done in accordance with paragraph (9) below, or with prior Board approval.

(9) *Discontinuing a cents per hour side payment and raising the rates.* If a permissible cents per hour increase instituted since the base pay period has been paid as a cents per hour side payment, it is permissible to discontinue such cents per hour side payment, to ignore such increase for offsetting purposes under General Wage Regulation 6 and to make a direct application of the permissible percentage to the piece rates or base rates. The permissible percentage should be calculated in the same manner as described in paragraphs (3)–(6) above (ignoring side payments to be discontinued).

(E. g., on April 1, 1951, a 15 cents per hour increase was granted under General Wage Regulation 6, which was paid as a cents per hour side payment. Last week pieceworkers earned an average of $60 on piece rates, plus an additional increment of $6 representing 15 cents per hour for 40 hours of work. If it is desired, you may now discontinue the 15 cents per hour side payment, and raise the piece rates by ten percent, so that the average earnings for last week's payroll under the new piece rates would still be $66).

WHERE THE APPROPRIATE EMPLOYEE UNIT INCLUDES BOTH TIME AND INCENTIVE EMPLOYEES

The examples described above have all related to a unit containing only piece or incentive workers. As indicated in paragraph 1 (b), however, it may have been the practice to treat these employees as being in the same employee unit as employees paid on a time basis. Where such is the case, it is permissible to apply the principles of Resolution No. 71 (increasing the rates on a percentage basis) to the entire unit. The following paragraphs are designed to illustrate the proper method of making the calculations under General Wage Regulation 6 and Resolution No. 71 in such situation.

(10) *How to determine the percentage which you may distribute to the unit as a whole (time and pieceworkers).* (a) The calculation of total effect of all past increases to all employees in the unit (both time and incentive) should be made in the same manner as described in paragraphs (3)–(5) above; the calculation of the permissible percentage for the entire unit in the same manner described in paragraph (6).

(b) If you are discontinuing a cents per hour side payment, the amount of such payment should not be included in the calculations.

(11) *How to determine whether a negotiated increase exceeds the percentage permissible for the unit as a whole—* (a) *Across the board percentagewise.* Under the authority of Resolution No. 71, you may apply the permissible percentage on an across the board basis to all rates, hourly job rates as well as piece or incentive base rates, where a unit is composed of both time and incentive employees. In such case the percentage applied should not exceed the amount determined in accordance with paragraph (10) above.

(b) *Where the increase is negotiated in cents per hour to time employees; and percentagewise to pieceworkers.* If such an increase is negotiated by the parties, the effect of the proposed increases over the entire unit should be calculated on the basis of the preceding payroll period in the same manner as heretofore described.

(E. g., suppose that the total payroll is $10,000 of which $4,500 was paid to time workers and $5,500 to incentive or piece workers. If the time workers are to receive an increase of 5 cents per hour and piece workers an increase of 4 percent, first calculate the total wage increase which each group will receive. In the case of time workers, the total increase would equal the amount of hourly increase, or 5 cents, multiplied by the number of hours they worked during that preceding week; if the total hours amounted to 3,000, the total increase to time workers would then be $3,000 \times \$0.05 = \$150$. In the case of piece or incentive workers the increase would be equal to 4 percent of their payroll, i. e., 4 percent of $5,500 or $220. The total increase to all workers would then be the total of increases to the two groups ($150 plus $220 equals $370). The total effect of the increase is a ratio of $370 to the payroll before the increase or $\frac{\$370.00}{\$10,000.00} = 0.0370$ or 3.70 percent.)

If this percentage does not exceed the percentage calculated in paragraph (10) above, the proposed wage increases may be paid without the Board's approval.

(c) *Where the increase is negotiated in cents per hour to all employees (including pieceworkers) to be incorporated into the piece or base rates.* If you negotiate your increase in terms of cents per hour for everybody in the unit and you want to incorporate the increase into the piece rates or base rates of incentive employees, you must make two calculations: First, to determine whether the increase exceeds the permissible percentage for the unit as a whole; second, to determine the percentage by which the piece rates or base rates are to be raised. The first problem is considered here; the second in paragraph (12) below.

(E. g., assume the facts in subparagraph (b) above, a total payroll of $10,000; $4,500 to time and $5,500 to pieceworkers. If the total hours worked by time workers was 3,000, and the total hours worked by pieceworkers was 2,750, the total payroll with the proposed 5 cents per hour increase would be $10,000 plus $287.50 or $10,287.50.)

The ratio of the total payroll increase ($287.50) to the total payroll for both groups ($10,000.00) will give you the total effect of the increase for the entire unit, which figure may not exceed the percentage determined in paragraph 10 above

(E. g., $\frac{\$287.50}{\$10,000.00} = 2.875$ percent)

(12) *How to determine the percentage by which piece or base rates are to be raised.* In the example under paragraph 11 (c) the increase was negotiated in terms of cents per hour for all workers in the unit, including incentive workers; and we indicated the method to use in determining whether the negotiated amount (expressed as a percentage) exceeded the permissible percentage for the unit as a whole and could be put into effect under Resolution No. 71 without prior Board approval. Having determined that the increase is permissible, it is necessary to convert the cents per hour amount into a percentage to be applied to the piece rates, or base rates, as the case may be. The calculation of such percentage is made as follows:

(a) Calculate the total dollars and cents increase negotiated for incentive employees only based upon the hours worked in the preceding payroll period in the same manner described above (e. g., 5¢ per hour times 2,750 hours equals $137.50).

(b) Calculate a ratio between the total amount of the increase ($137.50), and the payroll of the incentive employees before the increase ($5,500).

(E. g., $\frac{\$137.50}{\$5,500} = 2.5$ percent)

This percentage (2.5 percent) represents the increase which may be incorporated into the piece or base rates under the example used in paragraph 11 (c).

(13) *The same method of calculation applies where you wish to distcontinue a cents per hour side payment and raise the rates.* If you wish to raise the piece or base rates by a percentage equivalent to the side payment to be discontinued, you calculate a ratio between the total amount of the side payment during the preceding payroll period, and the total payroll of piece or incentive employees during that same period (exclusive, however, of the side payment).

(E. g., if the total payroll of incentive employees was $5,500, and the total side payment to such employees was $250, the percentage equivalent would be $\frac{\$250}{\$5,250}$ or 4.76 percent).

The piece or base rates may, therefore, be increased by 4.76%, provided that the effect of the increase for the unit as a whole does not exceed the permissible percentage as calculated in the manner described in paragraph (10) above. To determine the effect of the increase over the entire unit you calculate a ratio between the total increase to be made ($250) and the total payroll for the entire unit (but exclusive of the side payment $10,000−$250=$9,750).

(E. g., $\frac{\$250}{\$9,750} = 2.56$ percent)

(14) Examples 10–13 all speak in terms of applying a given percentage to the piece or base rates. Actually these adjustments may be made on a nonuniform basis, subject to the limitations discussed above. If it is desired to make such nonuniform adjustments, the calculation of whether the effect of the increases exceeds the permissible percentage should be made in the same manner as described in paragraph 4 above.

GENERAL WAGE REGULATION 8, REVISED

RAISING THE RATES

(15) When a cost-of-living increase is to be made in accordance with the provisions of General Wage Regulation 8, Revised, you may apply the increase on an across-the-board percentage basis so that each piece rate or base rate reflects a percentage increase equal to the percentage change in the index since the index base date.

(E. g., a base rate which was $1.00 on the base date may be raised to $1.02 when the index rises 2 percent above the base index. If another subsequent change brings the index up to 3 percent above the base index, the rate may be increased to $1.03.)

(16) Where it is desired to grant the remaining percentage allowable under General Wage Regulation 6 at the same time as an increase under General Wage Regulation 8, Revised, the allowable percentages under each of these regulations may be combined by compounding these percentages.

(E. g., if 2 percent is still allowable under General Wage Regulation 6, and 2.8 percent is allowable under General Wage Regulation 8, Revised, the allowable percentage would be calculated by multiplying 1.02 by 1.028 and subtracting 1.00 from the product (e. g., $(1.02 \times 1.028) - 1.00 = 1.04856 - 1.00 = 0.04856$, or 4.856 percent).)

(17) You may also apply the cost-of-living increase to the hourly base rates of incentive jobs on an across-the-board cents per hour amount basis. In such case the effect of such increase cannot exceed the percentage change in the index since the index base date. The effect of such increase is determined by comparing the payrolls with and without the increase in the same manner as described in paragraph (4) above. If prior cost-of-living increases have been made under General Wage Regulation 8, Revised, the computations should conform to paragraphs (5) and (6) also.

(18) It should be noted that the method described in paragraphs (15), (16) and (17) may not, under certain circumstances allow an incorporation of the adjustment into the piece or base rates in the manner described in Example No. 5 under the answer to Question No. 9, on page 8, Questions and Answers under General Wage Regulation 8, Revised. That answer is hereby withdrawn, and adjustments hereinafter instituted must conform to the method set forth above.

(19) *Percentage side payment.* Instead of actually adjusting the individual piece or base rates, the percentage increase may be distributed as a separate item on the payroll calculated by applying the permissible percentage to the incentive earnings during each pay period.

(20) *Cents per hour side payment.* You may also pay the cost-of-living adjustment as an hourly side payment, and not incorporate it into the piece or base rates. In such case the calculation of the hourly amount to be distributed should be made in accordance with the Questions and Answers to General Wage Regulation 8, Revised. If and when it is desired to change the method of paying this cost-of-living increase from a side hourly payment and to incorporate it into the piece or base rate, the hourly side payment may be discontinued and the piece or base rates raised in accordance with paragraphs (15), (16) and (17) above.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6989; Filed, June 23, 1952; 11:47 a. m.]

TITLE 47—TELECOMMUNICATION

Chapter I—Federal Communications Commission

PART 2—FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS AND RADIO TREATY MATTERS; GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

LIST, FOR INFORMATION ONLY, OF TREATIES, AGREEMENTS AND ARRANGEMENTS

At a session of the Federal Communications Commission held at its offices in Washington, D. C., on the 11th day of June 1952;

The Commission having under consideration the Appendix to Part 2 of its rules and regulations; and

It appearing, that the proposed changes are not substantive and do not in any way affect the requirements of any of the Commission's rules and regulations, that said changes consist of the addition and deletion of information;

It is ordered, That, effective immediately, Appendix A to Part 2 of the Commission's rules and regulations is amended as set forth below.

(Sec. 303, 48 Stat. 1082, as amended; 47 U. S. C. 303)

Released: June 12, 1952.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

1. Amend paragraph 1 of Appendix A relating to TS 938 to read as follows:

1937	TS 938...	Inter-American Radio Communications Convention between the United States of America and Other Powers. Signed at Habana, Dec. 13, 1937. (First Inter-American Conference).

2. Delete from paragraph 1 the entry relating to the:

1945	.....	"Inter-American Telecommunications Convention between the United States of America and Other Powers. (Third Inter-American Conference). Signed at Rio de Janeiro, Sept. 27, 1945."

3. Add the parenthetical phrase "(Not available at the Government Printing Office)" after the subject description of each of the agreements listed below:

1912..	TS 581	1938.	TS 949
1926..	TS 724-A	1938.	EAS 136
1929..	TS 777-A	1939.	EAS 143
1934..	EAS 62	1940.	EAS 196
1937..	EAS 109	1944.	EAS 400
1937..	EAS 962	1947.	TIAS 1725
1937..	TS 938	1932.	TS 867
1937..	EAS 200	1948.	TIAS 1802

[F. R. Doc. 52-6899; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:51 a. m.]

PART 9—AERONAUTICAL SERVICES

ELIGIBILITY OF LICENSEE

At a session of the Federal Communications Commission held at its offices in Washington, D. C., on the 11th day of June 1952;

The Commission having under consideration the matter of amending § 9.612 of its rules and regulations governing Aeronautical Services to permit subsidiaries of manufacturers of aircraft or major aircraft components to be licensees of flight test stations; and

It appearing, that a subsidiary corporation, even though it specializes in communications, is precluded under § 9.612 from obtaining a license for a flight test station and performing such communication service for its parent company unless the subsidiary itself manufactures either aircraft or major aircraft components; and

It further appearing, that the said § 9.612 should be amended in a manner which would make eligible for a flight test station license either a parent corporation or its subsidiary if either corporation is engaged in the manufacture of aircraft or major aircraft components; and

It further appearing, that a change of this nature would expedite the employment of flight test radio in the production of material essential to national defense and, therefore, a public rule making proceeding thereon would be contrary to the public interest, and that for the same reason and since it relieves a restriction this amendment should be made effective immediately;

It further appearing, that the authority for this amendment is contained in sections 4 (i) and 303 (r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

It is ordered, That effective immediately § 9.612 of the Commission's rules and regulations governing Aeronautical Services is amended to read as follows:

§ 9.612 *Eligibility of licensee.* A flight test station license may be granted only for use by either,

(1) Manufacturers of aircraft or major aircraft components, or

(2) A parent corporation or its subsidiary if either corporation is a manufacturer of aircraft or major aircraft components.

(Sec. 4, 48 Stat. 1066 as amended; 47 U. S. C. 154. Interprets or applies sec. 303, 48 Stat. 1082; 47 U. S. C. 303)

Released: June 11, 1952.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6900; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:51 a. m.]

TITLE 49—TRANSPORTATION

Chapter I—Interstate Commerce Commission

Subchapter B—Carriers by Motor Vehicle

PART 193—PARTS AND ACCESSORIES NECESSARY FOR SAFE OPERATION

EDITORIAL NOTE: Federal Register Document 52-5382, appearing at page 4423 of the issue for Thursday, May 15, 1952, has been corrected as follows:

In the double-saddle-mount diagram to illustrate § 193.17, the description "(Red Tail Lamp Required on Rear of First Saddle-Mounted Vehicle)" has been deleted.

PROPOSED RULE MAKING

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[14 CFR Parts 40, 41, 42, 45, 61]

ADMINISTRATOR

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO PERMIT AIR CARRIERS UNDER CONTRACT TO MILITARY SERVICES TO DEVIATE FROM CERTAIN PARTS OF CIVIL AIR REGULATIONS

Pursuant to authority delegated by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Bureau of Safety Regulation, notice is hereby given that the Bureau will propose to the Board an extension of the authority granted by Special Regulation SR-367 as hereinafter set forth.

Interested persons may participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in duplicate to the Civil Aeronautics Board, attention: Bureau of Safety Regulation, Washington 25, D. C. In order to insure their consideration by the Board before taking further action on the proposed rule, communications must be received by July 10, 1952. Copies of such communications will be available after July 14, 1952, for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section of the Board, Room 5412, Commerce Building, Washington, D. C.

Some time ago the Air Transport Association (ATA) on behalf of several scheduled air carriers under contract to the military services requested that authority be granted to such carriers to permit them to deviate from certain provisions of Parts 40, 41, 42, 45, and 61 of the Civil Air Regulations, under which they were then required to operate, in order to permit such carriers to accomplish expeditiously the mission assigned them by the military services. ATA stated that, in view of the type of operations that these carriers had been requested to perform, certain provisions of those parts imposed an undue burden upon the air carriers involved. It appeared that several difficulties encountered in complying with current regulations resulted from the fact that some of the air carriers were acting in the capacity of prime contractors with the military services, while others were acting as subcontractors and were merely furnishing aircraft and/or flight crews to another air carrier for use in operations conducted pursuant to the military contracts. It should be noted that Parts 40, 41, 42, 45, and 61 were designed to be applicable to scheduled and irregular

air carrier operations performed under normal operating conditions. The Board believed that the type of operation which air carriers were expected to perform in executing their obligations under military contracts was a specialized type of operation different in many respects from the normal type of air carrier operation envisaged by the then current Civil Air Regulations relating to air carrier operations. For those reasons, the Board, on July 28, 1950, adopted Special Civil Air Regulations SR–349 which delegated authority to the Administrator to permit air carriers under contract to the military services to deviate from certain parts of the Civil Air Regulations in performing such contracts, such authority to terminate on August 1, 1951. This authority was extended to August 1, 1952, by SR–367.

Since the military requirements, as a result of which Special Civil Air Regulations SR–349 and SR–367 were promulgated, continue to exist, and since no serious objection to the regulation has been raised during nearly 2 years of operations under it, the Board believes the Civil Air Regulations applicable to air carriers should continue to be adjusted to the type of operation to be conducted under military contracts to the extent that the Administrator finds that deviation from those regulations is necessary or desirable for the expeditious conduct of such operations. Accordingly, the Board concludes that the provisions of SR–367 should be immediately extended for one year to maintain the delegated authority in the Administrator without lapse.

The Board considers it necessary to continue to limit the operations conducted pursuant to any deviation granted by the Administrator to those operations conducted pursuant to military contracts and to require that all operations conducted in accordance with such deviations be conducted in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe in granting the deviation. It is anticipated that the Administrator will continue, as part of the procedure in issuing a deviation of major importance, to coordinate his decision with the Board and the appropriate military authorities.

Accordingly, it is proposed to extend the authorization granted by Special Regulation SR–367 to August 1, 1953, as follows:

1. Contrary provisions of the Civil Air Regulations notwithstanding, the Administrator may, upon application by an air carrier, authorize an air carrier under contract to the military services, or an air carrier furnishing civil aircraft and/or flight crews to another air carrier for use in operations conducted pursuant to a contract with the military services, to deviate from the applicable provisions of Parts 40, 41, 42, 45, and 61 to the extent that he finds upon investigation a deviation from those regulations is necessary or desirable for the expeditious conduct of such operations.

2. Any authority granted by the Administrator pursuant to this regulation shall be limited to those operations conducted pursuant to military contracts and shall not be applicable to any other type of operation.

3. The Administrator shall, in any authorization granted pursuant to this regulation, specify the terms and conditions under which the air carrier may deviate from the currently prescribed regulations, and each carrier shall, in the conduct of operations pursuant to military contracts, comply with such terms and conditions.

This regulation shall terminate August 1, 1953, unless sooner superseded or rescinded.

This regulation is proposed under the authority of Title VI of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. The proposal may be changed in the light of comments received in response to this notice of proposed rule making.

(Sec. 205, 52 Stat. 984; 49 U. S. C. 425. Interpret or apply secs. 601–610, 52 Stat. 1007–1012; 49 U. S. C. 551–560)

Dated: June 19, 1952, at Washington, D. C.

By the Bureau of Safety Regulation.

[SEAL] JOHN M. CHAMBERLAIN,
Director.

[F. R. Doc. 52–6910; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:52 a. m.]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[47 CFR Part 13]

[Docket No. 10217]

COMMERCIAL RADIO OPERATORS

OPERATING AUTHORITY

1. Notice is hereby given of proposed rule making in the above entitled matter.

2. A proposed amendment to Part 13 of the Commission's rules is set forth below. This amendment relates to the grade of operator required at certain coast stations. If the change in § 13.61 of the rules governing Commercial Radio Operators is adopted as proposed, persons holding restricted radiotelephone operator permits would be authorized to engage in the normal operation of certain VHF coast stations.

3. This amendment is issued under authority of sections 4 (i), 303 (l) and 303 (r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

4. Any interested party who is of the opinion that the proposed rules should not be adopted in the form set forth herein may file with the Commission on or before August 11, 1952, a written statement or brief, setting forth his comments. At the same time, any person who favors the Rules as set forth may file a statement in support thereof. The Commission will consider all comments, briefs and statements presented before taking final action in the matter. If any comments are received which appear to warrant the Commission in holding an oral argument before final action is taken, notice of the time and place of such oral argument will be given such interested parties.

5. In accordance with the provisions of § 1.764 of the Commission's rules, an original and fourteen copies of all statements, briefs or comments shall be furnished the Commission.

Adopted: June 11, 1952.

Released: June 11, 1952.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

Section 13.61 (h) of the rules governing Commercial Radio Operators is proposed to be amended to read as follows:

§ 13.61 *Operating authority.* • • •

(h) *Restricted radiotelephone operator permit.* Any station except:

(1) Stations transmitting television, or

(2) Stations transmitting telegraphy by any type of the Morse Code, or

(3) Any of the various classes of broadcast stations other than remote pickup and ST broadcast stations, or

(4) Ship stations licensed to use telephony for communication with Class I coast stations on frequencies between 4000 kc and 30 Mc, or

(5) Public coast stations other than in the territory of Alaska licensed to operate on any frequency designated by the Commission primarily for distress, safety or calling purposes, or

(6) Coast stations other than in the territory of Alaska while employing a frequency below 30 Mc, or

(7) Coast stations at which the power in the antenna of the unmodulated carrier wave is authorized to exceed 250 watts;

(8) At a ship radar station the holder of this class of license may not supervise or be responsible for the performance of any adjustments or tests during or coincident with the installation, servicing or maintenance of the radar equipment while it is radiating energy: *Provided*, That nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to prevent any person holding such a license from making replacements of fuses or of receiving type tubes;

Provided, That, with respect to any station which the holder of this class of license may operate, such operator is prohibited from making any adjustments that may result in improper transmitter operation, the equipment is so designed that the stability of the frequencies of the transmitter is maintained by the transmitter itself within the limits of tolerance specified by the station license, and none of the operations necessary to be performed during the course of normal rendition of the service of the station may cause off-frequency operation or result in any unauthorized radiation, and any needed adjustments of the transmitter that may affect the proper operation of the station are regularly made by or under the immediate supervision and responsibility of a person holding a first- or second-class commercial radio operator license, either radiotelephone or radiotelegraph as may be appropriate for the class of station involved, who shall be responsible for the proper functioning of the station equipment.

[F. R. Doc. 52–6901; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:51 a. m.]

NOTICES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

ALASKA

AIR NAVIGATION SITE WITHDRAWAL NO. 100; REVOCATION

JUNE 17, 1952.

By virtue of the authority contained in section 4 of the act of May 24, 1928 (45 Stat. 729; 49 U. S. C. 214), and pursuant to section 2.22 (a) (2) of Delegation Order No. 427, of August 16, 1950 (15 F. R. 5641), it is ordered as follows:

Air Navigation Site Withdrawal No. 100, dated October 14, 1935, as amended June 14, 1939, covering a tract of unsurveyed land described by metes and bounds, containing approximately 32.14 acres, near Circle Hot Springs, Alaska, is hereby revoked, effective as of the date of this order.

The lands released from Air Navigation Site Withdrawal No. 100, by this order are included in the application of the Division of Aeronautics, Territory of Alaska, Fairbanks 09328, under section 16 of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 179; 49 U. S. C. 1115), for the development of the Circle Hot Springs Airport and therefore not subject to other disposal.

LOWELL M. PUCKETT,
Regional Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6876; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:45 a. m.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Production and Marketing Administration

SPENCER LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE

DEPOSTING OF STOCKYARD

It has been ascertained that the Spencer Live Stock Exchange, Spencer, West Virginia, originally posted on August 12, 1937, as being subject to the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181 et seq.), no longer comes within the definition of a stockyard under said act. The owner of such stockyard has ceased operating a public market at the place at Spencer, West Virginia, originally posted and is now operating a public market at a new location at Spencer, West Virginia. Therefore, notice is given to the owner of such stockyard and to the public that the stockyard originally posted on August 12, 1937, is no longer subject to the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

Notice of public rule making has not preceded promulgation of the foregoing rule since it is found that the giving of such notice would prevent the due and timely administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act and would, therefore, be impractical. There is no legal warrant or justification for not deposting promptly a stockyard which is no longer a stockyard within the definition contained in said act.

The foregoing rule is in the nature of a rule granting an exemption or relieving a restriction and, therefore, may be made effective in less than 30 days after publication thereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER. This notice shall become effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(42 Stat. 159, as amended; 7 U. S. C. 181 et seq.)

Done at Washington, D. C., this 19th day of June 1952.

[SEAL] H. E. REED,
Director, Livestock Branch, Production and Marketing Administration.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6896; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:50 a. m.]

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

Office of Price Stabilization

[Delegation of Authority 60, Supplement 1]

DIRECTOR OF THE REGIONAL OFFICE REGION II, NEW YORK, N. Y.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 135, SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATION 1—SALES OF BAKERY ITEMS TO EATING AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS LOCATED IN THE METROPOLITAN NEW YORK AREA

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of Price Stabilization, pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 798, 803; 65 Stat. 131), Executive Order 10161 (15 F. R. 6105), and Economic Stabilization Agency General Order No. 2, as amended (16 F. R. 738, 11626), this Supplement 1 to Delegation of Authority 60 is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby delegated to the Director of the Regional Office, Region II, Office of Price Stabilization:

(a) To receive reports under section 2 (c) of Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1.

(b) To fix ceiling prices upon application under paragraph (c) (4) of section 4 of Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1.

(c) To adjust ceiling prices under section 5 of Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1.

2. The authority hereby delegated may be redelegated to the Directors of the District Offices, Region II, Office of Price Stabilization.

3. All authority heretofore delegated by Delegation of Authority 60 under provisions of Ceiling Price Regulation 135 which are not inconsistent with the provisions of Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1, continue to apply under this Supplement 1 to Delegation of Authority 60. This includes the authority to:

(a) Request further information concerning any ceiling price reported pursuant to the provisions of Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1, or concerning any application for a ceiling price made pursuant to the provisions of Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1.

(b) Disapprove or reduce, at any time, ceiling prices determined, reported, or proposed under Ceiling Price Regulation 135, Supplementary Regulation 1.

This delegation of authority shall take effect on June 24, 1952.

ELLIS ARNALL,
Director of Price Stabilization.

JUNE 24, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-7031; Filed, June 24, 1952; 12:01 p. m.]

[Region I, Redelegation of Authority No. 1, Amdt. 1 to Revision 1]

DIRECTORS OF DESIGNATED DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION I, BOSTON, MASS.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTIONS 39a AND 39c OF CPR 7, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. 1, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, Amendment 1 (17 F. R. 4961) this amendment to Redelegation of Authority No. 1, Revision 1 (17 F. R. 703) is hereby issued.

Paragraph 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 1, Revision 1, is amended to read as follows:

Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Boston, Masachusetts; Springfield, Massachusetts; Providence, Rhode Island; and Manchester, New Hampshire, District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region I to act under sections 39a, 39b, 39c, 39d, 39e, 39f, and 39g of Ceiling Price Regulation 7, as amended.

This amendment to Redelegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, shall take effect as of June 11, 1952.

JOSEPH M. MCDONOUGH,
Director of Regional Office No. 1.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6921; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:52 p. m.]

[Region Redelegation of Authority No. 5, Amdt. 1 to Revision 1]

DIRECTOR OF HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT, DISTRICT OFFICE, REGION I, BOSTON, MASS.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTIONS 39a AND 39c OF CPR 7, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. 1, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, Amendment 1 (17 F. R. 4961) this amendment to Redelegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1 (17 F. R. 704) is hereby issued.

Paragraph 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, is amended to read as follows:

Authority is hereby redelegated to the Director of the Hartford, Connecticut District Office of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region I to act under sections 39a, 39b, 39c, 39d, 39e, 39f, and 39g of Ceiling Price Regulation 7, as amended.

This amendment to Redelegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, shall take effect as of June 11, 1952.

JOSEPH M. MCDONOUGH,
Director of Regional Office No. 1.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6922; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:52 p. m.]

[Region I, Redelegation of Authority No. 9, Amdt. 1 to Revision 1]

DIRECTORS OF DESIGNATED DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION I, BOSTON, MASS.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTIONS 39A AND 39C OF CPR 7, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. 1, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, Amendment 1 (17 F. R. 4961) this amendment to Redelegation of Authority No. 9, Revision 1 (17 F. R. 704) is hereby issued.

Paragraph 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 9, Revision 1, is amended to read as follows:

Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Portland, Maine and Montpelier, Vermont, District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region I to act under sections 39a, 39b, 39c, 39d, 39e, 39f, and 39g of Ceiling Price Regulation 7, as amended.

This amendment to Redelegation of Authority No. 9, Revision 1, shall take effect as of June 11, 1952.

JOSEPH M. MCDONOUGH,
Director of Regional Office No. 1.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6923; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:52 p. m.]

[Region III, Redelegation of Authority No. 24, Amdt. 2]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION III, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 101, AS AMENDED; AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTION 4 (d)

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. III, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 38, Amendment 2 (17 F. R. 5045), this amendment to Redelegation of Authority No. 24, Amended, is hereby issued.

Redelegation of Authority No. 24 as amended is hereby amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

3. Authority is hereby redelegated to each of the District Directors of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region III to act under section 4 (d) of CPR 101, as amended.

This Amendment 2 to Redelegation of Authority No. 24, Amended, shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

JOSEPH J. MCBRYAN,
Director of Regional Office No. III.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6941; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:55 p. m.]

[Region III, Redelegation of Authority No.36]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION III, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ORDERS ESTABLISHING PRICE FACTORS, EXCHANGE ALLOWANCES, PRICE DIFFERENTIALS, PRICE DETERMINING METHODS, UNDER CPR 139

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. III, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 64 (17 F. R. 3617), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to each of the District Directors of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region III to issue orders establishing price factors, exchange allowances, and price differentials under section 27, exchange allowances under section 26 (c), price determining methods under section 34, and price factors and price differentials under section 46 of Ceiling Price Regulation No. 139.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

JOSEPH J. MCBRYAN,
Director of Regional Office No. III.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6942; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:55 p. m.]

[Region III, Redelegation of Authority No. 37]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION III, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 24, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. III, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 68 (17 F. R. 4961), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to each of the District Directors of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region III to act under sections 15, 21 (a), 21 (b), 42 (a), 42 (b), 46 (c), 49A (b), 49A (c), 49B (a), 49B (b), and 50 (u) of CPR 24, as amended.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

JOSEPH J. MCBRYAN,
Director of Regional Office No. III.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6943; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:55 p. m.]

[Region V, Redelegation of Authority No. 29, Correction]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION V, ATLANTA, GA.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 134—CEILING PRICES FOR EATING AND DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of the Office of Price Stabilization, Region V, pursuant to Delegation of Authority 61 (17 F. R. 3258) this correction of Redelegation of Authority No. 29 is hereby issued.

Due to a typographical error, section 4 (a) (6) in Item 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 29, issued April 18, 1952, was designated to read section 4 (a) (d). Accordingly, section 4 (a) (d) in Item 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 29 is corrected to read section 4 (a) (6).

GEORGE D. PATTERSON, Jr.,
Director of Regional Office V.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6939; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:55 p. m.]

[Region V, Redelegation of Authority No. 36, Revocation]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION V, ATLANTA, GA.

REVOCATION OF REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY NO. 36 TO ACT UNDER SECTION 6 OF CEILING PRICE REGULATION 31

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of the Office of Price Stabilization, Region V, pursuant to Delegation of Authority 66, (17 F. R. 4193) this Revocation of Redelegation of Authority No. 36 is hereby issued.

Preamble. Redelegation of Authority No. 33, effective May 16, 1952, redelegates the same authority as that set forth in Redelegation of Authority No. 36. Since this is a duplicate redelegation, and in order to avoid any confusion as to which Redelegation of Authority should be used in taking action under Section 6 of Ceiling Price Regulation 31, this revocation of Redelegation of Authority No. 36 is being issued.

Revocatory provisions. Redelegation of Authority No. 36 is hereby revoked.

This revocation shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

GEORGE D. PATTERSON, Jr.,
Director of Regional Office V.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6940; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:55 p. m.]

[Region VI, Redelegation of Authority No. 2, Revision 1, Amdt. 1]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION VI, CLEVELAND, OHIO

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTIONS 39A AND 39C OF CPR 7, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization No. VI, pursuant to

Delegation of Authority No. 5 Revised (17 F. R. 98) and Delegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, Amendment 1 (17 F. R. 4961), this amendment to Redelegation of Authority 2, Revision 1 (17 F. R. 672), is hereby issued.

Paragraph 1 of Redelegation of Authority 5, Revision 1, is amended to read as follows:

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Louisville, Kentucky; and Toledo, Ohio, District Offices of Price Stabilization to act under sections 39a , 39b, 39c, 39d, 39e, 39f and 39g of Ceiling Price Regulation No. 7, as amended.

This amendment shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

SYDNEY A. HESSE,
Director of Regional Office No. VI.

JUNE 20, 1952

[F. R. Doc. 52-6933; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:54 p. m.]

[Region VI, Redelegation of Authority No. 15, Amdt. 2]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION VI, CLEVELAND, OHIO

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 101, AS AMENDED; AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTION 4 (d)

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. VI, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 38 (16 F. R. 12299), Delegation of Authority No. 38, Amendment 1 (17 F. R. 1784), and Delegation of Authority No. 38, Amendment 2 (17 F. R. 5045), this Amendment 2 to Redelegation of Authority No. 15 (16 F. R. 12745), is hereby issued.

Redelegation of Authority No. 15, as amended, is amended by inserting a new paragraph 3 to read as follows;

3. Authority to act under section 4 (d) of CPR 101, as amended. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Louisville, Kentucky; and Toledo, Ohio, District Offices of Price Stabilization to act under section 4 (d) of CPR 101 as amended.

This Amendment 2 to Redelegation of Authority No. 15 shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

SYDNEY A. HESSE,
Director of Regional Office No. VI.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6934; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:54 p. m.]

[Region VI, Redelegation of Authority No. 36]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION VI, CLEVELAND, OHIO

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 24, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. VI, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 68 (17 F. R. 4961), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Detroit, Michigan; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Louisville, Kentucky; and Toledo, Ohio, District Offices of Price Stabilization, to act under sections 15, 21 (a), 21 (b), 42 (a), 42 (b), 46 (c), 49A (b), 49A (c), 49B (a), 49B (b), and 50 (u) of CPR 24, as amended.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

SYDNEY A. HESSE,
Director of Regional Office No. VI.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6935; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:54 p. m.]

[Region VII, Redelegation of Authority No. 6, Amdt. 1 to Revision 1]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION VII, CHICAGO, ILL.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTIONS 39a AND 39c OF CPR 7, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. VII, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 5, Amendment 1 to Revision 1 (17 F. R. 4961), this Amendment 1 to Redelegation of Authority No. 6, Revision 1 (17 F. R. 620) is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Chicago, Indianapolis, Green Bay, Milwaukee, Peoria, and Springfield District Offices of Price Stabilization to act under sections 39a, 39b, 39c, 39d, 39e, 39f, and 39g of Ceiling Price Regulation 7, as amended.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect on June 21, 1952.

HYMAN RASKIN,
Director of Regional Office No. VII.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6929; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:53 p. m.]

[Region IX, Redelegation of Authority No. 3, Amdt. 1 to Revision 1]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION IX, KANSAS CITY, MO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTIONS 39a AND 39c OF CPR 7, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Acting Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, pursuant to the provisions of Delegation of Authority No. 5, Revision 1, Amendment 1, dated May 29, 1952 (17 F. R. 4961), this Amendment 1 to Redelegation of Authority No. 3, Revision 1 (17 F. R. 673), is hereby issued.

The second paragraph of Redelegation of Authority No. 3, Revision 1, is amended to read as follows:

Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, to act under sections 39a, 39b, 39c, 39d, 39e, 39f and 39g of Ceiling Price Regulation 7, as amended.

This Amendment 1 to Redelegation of Authority No. 3, Revision 1, shall take effect as of June 6, 1952.

M. A. BROOKS,
Acting Regional Director, Region IX.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6924; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:52 p. m.]

[Region IX, Redelegation of Authority No. 32, Revision 1]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION IX, KANSAS CITY, MO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO PROCESS REPORTS AND APPLICATIONS FOR CEILING PRICES IN CONFORMITY WITH THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM UNDER GOR 26

By virtue of the authority vested in the Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, pursuant to the provisions of Delegation of Authority No. 58, Revision 1, dated May 5, 1952 (17 F. R. 4192), this Revision 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 32 (17 F. R. 3563), is hereby issued.

Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX:

(a) To process reports filed pursuant to Section 4 of GOR 26 and to approve or disapprove such reports including the ceiling prices stated therein or request further information pertaining thereto, and

(b) To process applications for ceiling prices submitted by applicants whose main places of business are located within their district pursuant to section 3 (b) (3) of GOR 26, and to approve or disapprove the proposed ceiling prices, establish different ceiling prices, or request further information concerning the applications.

This Revision 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 32 shall take effect as of June 6, 1952.

M. A. BROOKS,
Acting Regional Director, Region IX.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6925; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:52 p. m.]

[Region IX, Redelegation of Authority No. 37]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION IX, KANSAS CITY, MO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ORDERS ESTABLISHING PRICE FACTORS, EXCHANGE ALLOWANCES, PRICE DIFFERENTIALS, PRICE DETERMINING METHODS, UNDER CPR 139

By virtue of the authority vested in the Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, pursuant to the provisions of Delegation of Au-

thority No. 64, dated April 22, 1952 (17 F. R. 3617), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, to issue orders establishing price factors, exchange allowances, and price differentials under section 27, exchange allowances under section 26 (c), price determining methods under section 34, and price factors and price differentials under section 46 of Ceiling Price Regulation 139.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 6, 1952.

M. A. BROOKS,
Acting Regional Director, Region IX.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6926; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:52 p. m.]

[Region IX, Redelegation of Authority No. 38]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES REGION IX, KANSAS CITY, MO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTION 6 OF CPR 31

By virtue of the authority vested in the Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, pursuant to the provisions of Delegation of Authority No. 66, dated May 5, 1952 (17 F. R. 4193), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, to receive and examine reports filed under the provisions of section 6 of Ceiling Price Regulation 31; to ascertain whether such reports conform to requirements of Ceiling Price Regulation 31; and to take all steps necessary to assure that such reports are corrected in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of Ceiling Price Regulation 31.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 6, 1952.

M. A. BROOKS,
Acting Regional Director Region IX.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6927; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:53 p. m.]

[Region IX, Redelegation of Authority No. 39]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION IX, KANSAS CITY, MO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 24, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in the Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, pursuant to the provisions of Delegation of Authority No. 68 dated May 29, 1952 (17 F. R. 4961), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization, Region IX, to act under sections 15, 21 (a), 21 (b), 42 (a), 42 (b), 46 (c), 49A (b), 49A (c), 49B (a), 49B (b), 50 (u) of CPR 24, as amended.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 6, 1952.

M. A. BROOKS,
Acting Regional Director, Region IX.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6928; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:53 p. m.]

[Region X, Redelegation of Authority No. 15, Amdt. 2]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION X, DALLAS, TEX.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 101, AS AMENDED; AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTION 4 (d)

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. X, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 38, Amendment 2 (17 F. R. 5045), this Amendment 2 to Region X Redelegation of Authority No. 15 is hereby issued.

Region X Redelegation of Authority No. 15 is amended by adding a new paragraph 4 to read as follows:

4. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Little Rock, Arkansas; Tulsa, Oklahoma; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Shreveport, Louisiana; New Orleans, Louisiana; Lubbock, Texas; Fort Worth, Texas; Dallas, Texas; Houston, Texas; and San Antonio, Texas, District Offices of Price Stabilization to act under Section 4 (d) of CPR 101, as amended.

This redelegation of authority, as amended, shall take effect on June 23, 1952.

ALFRED L. SEELYE,
Director of Regional Office, No. X.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6930; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:53 p. m.]

[Region X, Redelegation of Authority No. 86]

DIRECTORS OF DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION X, DALLAS, TEX.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 24, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, No. X, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 68 (17 F. R. 4961) this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Directors of the Little Rock, Arkansas; Tulsa, Oklahoma; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Shreveport, Louisiana; New Orleans, Louisiana; Lubbock, Texas; Fort Worth, Texas; Dallas, Texas; Houston, Texas; and San Antonio, Texas, District Offices of Price Stabilization, to act under sections 15, 21 (a), 21 (b), 42 (a), 42 (b), 46 (c), 49A (b), 49A (c), 49B (a), 49B (b), and 50 (u) of CPR 24, as amended.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 19, 1952.

ALFRED L. SEELYE,
Director of Regional Office, No. X.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6931; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:53 p. m.]

[Region XI, Redelegation of Authority No. 21, Amdt. 2]

DIRECTORS OF ALL DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION XI, DENVER, COLO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 101, AS AMENDED: AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTION 4 (d), WHOLESALE VEAL

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region XI, pursuant to Delegation of Authority 38 (16 F. R. 12299), Delegation of Authority 38, Amendment 1 (17 F. R. 1784), and Delegation of Authority 38, Amendment 2 (17 F. R. 5045), this Amendment 2 to Redelegation of Authority No. 21 is hereby issued.

Redelegation of Authority No. 21, as amended, is further amended by adding a new paragraph 3 to read as follows:

(3) *Authority to act under section 4 (d) of CPR 101, as amended.* Authority is hereby redelegated to each of the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region XI, to act under section 4 (d) of CPR 101, as amended.

This Amendment 2 to Redelegation of Authority No. 21 shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

GEORGE F. ROCK,
Regional Director, Region XI.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6936; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:54 p. m.]

[Region XI, Redelegation of Authority No. 27, Amdt. 1]

DIRECTORS OF ALL DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION XI, DENVER, COLO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER SECTION 39 OF CPR 7, AS AMENDED, RETAIL CEILING PRICES FOR CERTAIN CONSUMER GOODS

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region XI, pursuant to Delegation of Authority No. 5 as revised and amended (16 F. R. 3672, 16 F. R. 11128, 17 F. R. 98, 17 F. R. 4961), this Amendment 1 to Redelegation of Authority No. 27 is hereby issued.

Paragraph 1 of Redelegation of Authority No. 27 is amended to read as follows:

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to each of the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region XI to act under sections 39a, 39b, 39c, 39d, 39e, 39f, and 39g of Ceiling Price Regulation 7, as amended.

This Amendment 1 to Redelegation of Authority No. 27 shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

GEORGE F. ROCK,
Regional Director, Region XI.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6937; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:54 p. m].

[Region XI, Redelegation of Authority No. 44]

DIRECTORS OF ALL DISTRICT OFFICES, REGION XI, DENVER, COLO.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO ACT UNDER CPR 24, AS AMENDED, WHOLESALE BEEF

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Director of the Regional Office of Price Stabilization, Region XI, pursuant to Delegation of Authority 68 (17 F. R. 4961), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to each of the Directors of the District Offices of the Office of Price Stabilization in Region XI, to act under sections 15, 21 (a), 21 (b), 42 (a), 42 (b), 46 (c), 49A (b), 49A (c), 49B (a), 49B (b) and 50 (u) of CPR 24, as amended.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect as of June 16, 1952.

GEORGE F. ROCK,
Regional Director, Region XI.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6938; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:54 p. m.]

[Region XIV, Redelegation of Authority No. 4, Revision 1]

TERRITORIAL DIRECTORS, REGION XIV, WASHINGTON, D. C.

REDELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO APPROVE, DISAPPROVE, REVISE, OR ISSUE ORDERS ESTABLISHING CEILING PRICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 3 (d) AND 4 OF CPR 9, REVISION 1

By virtue of the authority vested in the Director of Region XIV of the Office of Price Stabilization, by Office of Price Stabilization Delegation of Authority No. 7, Revised (16 F. R. 10752), this redelegation of authority is hereby issued.

1. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Territorial Directors of the Office of Price Stabilization for Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, respectively, to establish ceiling prices on commodities in accordance with section 3 (d) of Ceiling Price Regulation 9, Revision 1.

2. Authority is hereby redelegated to the Territorial Directors of the Office of Price Stabilization for Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, respectively, to disapprove or revise the ceiling prices reported or proposed, in accordance with section 4 of Ceiling Price Regulation 9, Revision 1.

This redelegation of authority shall take effect on June 21, 1952.

EDWIN S. VILLMOARE,
Acting Regional Director.

JUNE 20, 1952.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6932; Filed, June 20, 1952; 4:54 p. m.]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Docket No. 10218]

WILLIAM C. MOSS (KSEY)

ORDER DESIGNATING APPLICATION FOR HEARING ON STATED ISSUES

In re application of William C. Moss (KSEY), Seymour, Texas, for modification of license; Docket No. 10218, File No. BML-1473.

At a session of the Federal Communications Commission held at its offices in Washington, D. C., on the 11th day of June 1952;

The Commission having under consideration the above-entitled application requesting a modification of license to increase power from 100 w to 250 w, unlimited time on 1230 kc at Station KSEY, Seymour, Texas.

It appearing, that the applicant is legally, technically, financially and otherwise qualified to operate Station KSEY as proposed, but that the application may involve interference with one or more existing stations.

It is ordered, That, pursuant to Section 309 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the said application is designated for hearing at a time and place to be specified by subsequent order, upon the following issues:

1. To determine the areas and populations which may be expected to gain or lose primary service from the operation of Station KSEY as proposed, and the availability of other primary service to such areas and populations.

2. To determine whether the operation of Station KSEY as proposed would involve objectionable interference with Stations KPAT, Pampa, Texas, KWTX, Waco, Texas, or with any other existing broadcast stations, and, if so, the nature and extent thereof, the areas and populations affected thereby, and the availability of other primary service to such areas and populations.

3. To determine whether the operation of Station KSEY as proposed would involve objectionable interference with the services proposed in any other pending applications for broadcast facilities, and, if so, the nature and extent thereof, the areas and populations affected thereby, and the availability of other primary service to such areas and populations.

4. To determine whether the installation and operation of Station KSEY as proposed would be in compliance with the Commission's rules and Standards of Good Engineering Practice Concerning Standard Broadcast Stations.

It is further ordered, That J. C. Daniels, licensee of Station KPAT, Pampa, Texas, and KWTX Broadcasting Company, licensee of Station KWTX, Waco, Texas, are made parties to this proceeding.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
[SEAL] T. J. SLOWIE,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6898; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:50 a. m.]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket No. E-6438]

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER CO.

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

JUNE 18, 1952.

Take notice that on June 16, 1952, an application was filed with the Federal Power Commission, pursuant to section 203 of the Federal Power Act, by Virgina Electric and Power Company (hereinafter called "Virginia Company"), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Virginia and doing business in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolinia, with its principal business office at Richmond, Virginia, seeking an order authorizing the acquisition, by purchase, of the outstanding shares of Capital Stock of Hydro-Electric Corporation of Virginia (hereinafter called "Hydro Corporation"). Virginia Company proposes to purchase the outstanding shares of Capital Stock of Hydro Corporation, consisting of 1,500 shares of Preferred Stock, and 4,000 shares of Common Stock. Virginia Company proposes immediately thereafter to cause the dissolution of Hydro Corporation and its subsidiary, Meadow Creek Corporation, and to assume the labilities of Hydro Corporation and Meadow Creek Corporation; the consideration for the Preferred and Common Stock of Hydro Corporation to be acquired, the application states, is $550,000 in cash. Virginia Company proposes to acquire and consolidate the assets of Hydro Corporation. The principal asset of Hydro Corporation is a 7,500 kw hydro station (Cushaw), on the James River, near Snowden, Virginia; all as more fully appears in the application on file with the Commission.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should, on or before the 7th day of July 1952, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., a petition or protest in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice and procedure. The application is on file with the Commission and available for public inspection.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6893; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:49 a. m.]

[Docket Nos. ID-1036, ID-1177]

CHANDLER W. JONES AND E. M. SIMPSON

NOTICE OF ORDERS AUTHORIZING APPLICANTS TO HOLD CERTAIN POSITIONS

JUNE 19, 1952.

In the matters of Chandler W. Jones, Docket No. ID-1036; E. M. Simpson, Docket No. ID-1177.

Notice is hereby given that on June 18, 1952, the Federal Power Commission issued its orders entered June 17, 1952, authorizing applicants to hold certain positions pursuant to section 305 (b) of the Federal Power Act in the above-entitled matters.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6891; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:48 a. m.]

[Docket No. IT-5519]

BONNEVILLE PROJECT, COLUMBIA RIVER, OREGON-WASHINGTON

NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR CONFIRMATION AND APPROVAL OF REVISION OF GENERAL RATE SCHEDULE PROVISIONS

JUNE 18, 1952.

Notice is hereby given that the Administrator of the Bonneville Project has filed with the Federal Power Commission for confirmation and approval, pursuant to the provisions of the Bonneville Act (50 Stat. 731), as amended, a proposed revision of § 2.2 in its General Rate Schedule Provisions applicable to the sale of wholesale power.

The proposed § 2.2, defining measured demand provides that:

Except where deliveries are scheduled as hereinafter provided, the purchaser's measured demand for any class of power, for any point of delivery, and for any period, shall be the largest of the thirty-minute integrated demands at which such class of power is delivered to the purchaser at such point during such period.

If the contractual arrangements provide for the delivery of more than one class of power to the purchaser at any point of delivery, the total thirty-minute integrated demands at such point will be determined from measurements as specified in the contract, or estimated where metering or other data are not available for such determination. The portion of each of such demands assignable to each class of power will be determined according to the terms of the contract.

If the flow of electric energy to the purchaser at any point or points of delivery cannot be adequately controlled because the purchaser's system is interconnected with one or more systems which are also interconnected with the Government's system, the purchaser's measured demand for each class of power, for such point or points, and for any period, shall be the largest of the hourly amounts of such class of power which are scheduled for delivery to the purchaser at such point or points during such period.

Any person desiring to comment or to make representations with respect to the foregoing should submit the same on or before July 18, 1952, to the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6894; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:49 a. m.]

[Project Nos. 777, 943, 1096, 1223, 1292]

PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT CO.

NOTICE OF ORDERS DISMISSING INCOMPLETE APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF TRANSFER OF LICENSE

JUNE 19, 1952.

Notice is hereby given that on June 18, 1952, the Federal Power Commission issued its orders entered June 17, 1952, dismissing incomplete application for approval of transfer of license in the above-entitled matters.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6892; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:49 a. m.]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[4th Sec. Application 27171]

SCRAP LEATHER FROM HUNTSVILLE, ALA., TO CARROLLVILLE, WIS.

APPLICATION FOR RELIEF

JUNE 20, 1952.

The Commission is in receipt of the above-entitled and numbered application for relief from the long-and-short-haul provision of section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Filed by: R. E. Boyle, Jr., Agent, for carriers parties to Agent C. W. Boin's tariff I. C. C. No. A-816.

Commodities involved: Scrap leather, having value only for fertilizer purposes, carloads.

From: Huntsville, Ala.

To: Carrollville, Wis.

Grounds for relief: Competition with rail carriers and circuitous routes.

Schedules filed containing proposed rates: C. W. Boin, Agent, I. C. C. No. A-816, Supp. 78.

Any interested person desiring the Commission to hold a hearing upon such application shall request the Commission in writing so to do within 15 days from the date of this notice. As provided by the general rules of practice of the Commission, Rule 73, persons other than applicants should fairly disclose their interest, and the position they intend to take at the hearing with respect to the application. Otherwise the Commission, in its discretion, may proceed to investigate and determine the matters involved in such application without further or formal hearing. If because of an emergency a grant of temporary relief is found to be necessary before the expiration of the 15-day period, a hearing, upon a request filed within that period, may be held subsequently.

By the Commission, Division 2.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6888; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:48 a. m.]

[No. 31050]

SO. PAC.-MO. PAC. INCREASED PASSENGER FARES

NOTICE OF HEARING

JUNE 19, 1952.

By petition dated April 30, 1952, the common carriers operating within western territory, listed in the appendix set forth below, request this Commission to authorize them to increase their interstate basic passenger fares for transportation in coaches and in sleeping and parlor cars as follows:

1. Increase the basic one-way fares for transportation in sleeping and parlor cars by 10 percent. The basic fare so increased will approximate 3.85 cents a mile.

2. Increase the basic one-way fares for transportation in coaches by 10 percent. The basic fare so increased will approximate 2.75 cents a mile.

3. Dispose of fractions with respect to one-way fares as follows: when total increased fares result in a fraction of a cent, fractions of less than 0.5 cent shall be dropped, and fractions of 0.5 cent or greater shall be increased to the next whole cent.

4. Increase the minimum one-way fare (now 15 cents) to 20 cents.

5. File and publish the increased one-way fares herein sought on short notice, to-wit, five days, by simple form of tariff publication.

6. If petitioners are authorized to increase their basic one-way fares as herein sought, they seek authority to publish on short notice:

(a) Round-trip station-to-station fares for transportation in standard sleeping and parlor cars of 166⅔ percent of the proposed one-way fare of 3.85 cents a mile.

(b) Round-trip station-to-station fares for transportation in coaches of 180 percent of the proposed one-way fare of 2.75 cents a mile.

7. Increase interline fares between stations on the lines of petitioners, on the one hand, and stations on the lines of connecting railroads, on the other hand, to the extent necessary to reflect the increases herein sought on the lines of petitioners.

8. Increase excess baggage charges by applying the present excess baggage scale to the increased one-way basic fares for transportation in sleeping and parlor cars.

The Commission is asked to modify its orders of December 6, 1920, in No. 11775, Arkansas Rates and Fares, 59 I. C. C. 471, of January 27, 1951, in No. 11829, Nebraska Rates, Fares, and Charges, 69 I. C. C. 644, and of December 18, 1942, in No. 28846, Increases in Texas Rates, Fares, and Charges, 253 I. C. C. 723, so as to authorize petitioners to establish increases in their intrastate fares and charges within the States of Arkansas, Nebraska, and Texas, corresponding to the increases sought herein in their interstate fares and charges, or such increases as may be authorized, and such other relief under section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act as may be necessary to enable petitioners to make effec-

tive in those States the rates proposed in their petition.

The Commission is further asked to grant such relief from the provisions of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act as may be necessary to permit the establishment and maintenance of the increased fares, and to modify all outstanding orders to the extent necessary to permit them to be made effective.

This petition has been docketed as No. 31050, So. Pac.-Mo. Pac. Increased Passenger Fares and is assigned for public hearing July 16, 1952, 9:30 a. m., U. S. standard time (or 9:30 a. m., local daylight saving time, if that time is observed) at the Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Hearing Examiner Aubrey T. Palmer.

A copy of this notice has, on the date hereof, been sent by regular mail to the said petitioners, the Governors and the rate regulatory authorities of the States traversed by petitioners, and at the same time copies have also been deposited in the office of the Secretary of the Commission at Washington, D. C., and filed with the Director, Division of the Federal Register, Washington, D. C.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] W. P. BARTEL, *Secretary.*

LIST OF PETITIONERS

Missouri Pacific Lines comprising:
- Missouri Pacific Railroad Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- Missouri Pacific Railroad Corporation in Nebraska (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- Asherton and Gulf Railway Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- Houston and Brazos Valley Railway Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- International-Great Northern Railroad Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- New Iberia & Northern Railroad Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- Rio Grande City Railway Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- San Antonio, Uvalde & Gulf Railroad Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),
- The St. Louis, Brownsville and Mexico Railway Company (Guy A. Thompson, Trustee),

Northwestern Pacific Railroad Company.
Pacific Electric Railway Company.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company of Texas.
San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railway Company.
Southern Pacific Company.
The Texas and Pacific Railway Company,
- Abilene & Southern Railway Company,
- The Denison and Pacific Suburban Railway Company,
- Texas-New Mexico Railway Company,
- The Weatherford, Mineral Wells and Northwestern Railway Company.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6890; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:48 a. m.]

[Rev. S. O. 562, Taylor's I. C. C. Order 2-A]

LONG ISLAND RAIL ROAD CO.

REROUTING OR DIVERSION OF TRAFFIC

Upon further consideration of Taylor's I. C. C. Order No. 2, and good cause appearing therefor:

It is ordered, That:

(a) Taylor's I. C. C. Order No. 2 be, and it is hereby vacated and set aside.

(b) Effective date: This order shall become effective 11:59 p. m., June 18, 1952.

It is further ordered, That this order shall be served upon the Association of American Railroads, Car Service Division, as agent of all railroads subscribing to the car service and per diem agreement under the terms of that agreement and by filing it with the Director, Division of the Federal Register.

Issued at Washington, D. C., June 18, 1952.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
CHARLES W. TAYLOR, *Agent.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6889; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:48 a. m.]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 31-576]

NORTHERN NATURAL GAS CO. AND PEOPLES NATURAL GAS CO.

ORDER PERMITTING WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FILED

JUNE 19, 1952.

Northern Natural Gas Company ("Northern"), a public utility holding company, having filed on September 25, 1950, an application, and amendments thereto, pursuant to section 3 (a) (3) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 ("act") for an order exempting it and its subsidiary company from the provisions of said act; and

Northern, on June 6, 1952, having notified the Commission that on June 2, 1952, its public utility subsidiary, Peoples Natural Gas Company, was liquidated and dissolved and that Northern no longer has any subsidiary companies which are public utility companies within the meaning of said act; and

Northern having requested permission to withdraw the aforesaid application filed pursuant to section 3 (a) (3) of the act; and

It appearing that Northern is no longer a public utility holding company and that its application for exemption has become moot, and the Commission deeming it appropriate to grant the aforesaid request of Northern:

It is ordered, That the request of Northern to withdraw its pending application filed pursuant to section 3 (a) (3) of the act be, and the same hereby is, granted.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6878; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:45 a. m.]

[File No. 31-589]

MEADOW RIVER LUMBER CO.

ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION

JUNE 19, 1952.

The Meadow River Lumber Company ("Meadow River") having filed an application pursuant to section 3 (a) (3) (A) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 requesting on behalf of itself and its subsidiaries, as such, exemption from the provisions of the act applicable to them by reason of the ownership by Meadow River of the outstanding common stock of Sewell Valley Utilities Company, a public-utility company; and

Due notice having been given of the filing of said application and a hearing not having been requested of or ordered by the Commission; and

The Commission having examined the application and the statements contained therein and having found that Meadow River is only incidentally a holding company, being primarily engaged in a business other than that of a public-utility company and not deriving, directly or indirectly, any material part of its income from one or more companies the principal business of which is that of a public-utility company; and further finding that granting the requested exemption will not be detrimental to the public interest and the interests of investors and consumers;

It is ordered, Pursuant to section 3 (a) (3) (A) of the act, that the application of Meadow River for exemption of itself as a holding company and its subsidiaries, as such, be, and the same hereby is, granted, said company and its subsidiaries remaining subject, however, to section 9 (a) (2) of the act.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6886; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:47 a. m.]

[File No. 31-590]

EDWARDS MANUFACTURING CO.

ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION

JUNE 19, 1952.

The Edwards Manufacturing Company ("Edwards") having filed an application pursuant to section 3 (a) (3) (A) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 requesting an exemption from the provisions of the act on behalf of itself and its subsidiaries, as such, applicable to them by reason of the ownership by Edwards of the outstanding common stock of the Edwards Power Company, a public-utility company; and

Due notice having been given of the filing of said application and a hearing not having been requested of or ordered by the Commission; and

The Commission having examined the application and the statements contained therein and having found that Edwards is only incidentally a holding

company, being primarily engaged in a business other than that of a public-utility company and not deriving, directly or indirectly, any material part of its income from one or more companies the principal business of which is that of a public-utility company; and further finding that granting the requested exemption will not be detrimental to the public interest and the interests of investors and consumers;

It is ordered, Pursuant to section 3 (a) (3) (A) of the act, that the application of Edwards for exemption of itself as a holding company and its subsidiaries, as such, be, and the same hereby is, granted, said company and its subsidiaries remaining subject, however, to section 9 (a) (2) of the act.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6884; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:47 a. m.]

[File No. 31-594]

ARTHUR TARBET, TRUSTEE

NOTICE OF FILING OF APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION

JUNE 19, 1952.

Notice is hereby given that Arthur Tarbet, Trustee of the C. A. Leonard Trust, has filed an application with this Commission requesting exemption on behalf of himself, as Trustee, and the Trust from the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 pursuant to section 3 (a) (1) of the act.

Notice is further given that any interested person may, not later than July 11, 1952, at 5:30 p. m., e. d. s. t., request the Commission in writing that a hearing be held on such matter, stating the nature of his interest, the reason for such request and the issues, if any, of fact or law raised by said application proposed to be notified if the Commission should order a hearing thereon. Any such request should be addressed: Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 425 Second Street NW., Washington 25, D. C. Said application may be granted at any time after July 11, 1952.

All interested persons are referred to said application which is on file in the office of this Commission for a statement of the facts contained therein, which are summarized as follows:

Applicant is the trustee of the C. A. Leonard Trust which was created under the will of the late C. A. Leonard. Applicant maintains his office in Blackwell, Oklahoma, and the business of the Trust is carried on in the State of Oklahoma. The Trust is engaged in the production and sale of oil, the production, purchase and sale of natural gas at retail, and the ownership of two farms. During the 12 months ended April 30, 1952, gross income of the Trust amounted to $78,610 from the sale of oil and $17,664 from the sale of natural gas. During the calendar year 1951, the Trust received gross income of $635 from the operations of the two farms.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6885; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:47 a. m.]

[File Nos. 30-169, 70-2823]

NORTHERN NATURAL GAS CO. ET AL

ORDER DECLARING THAT COMPANY HAS CEASED TO BE HOLDING COMPANY

JUNE 19, 1952.

In the matter of Northern Natural Gas Company, Peoples Natural Gas Company, File No. 70-2823; Northern Natural Gas Company, File No. 30-169.

The Commission having heretofore, after public hearings held with respect thereto, adopted and published its findings and opinion and order dated May 20, 1952 (Holding Company Act Release No. 11260), with respect to the acquisition by Northern Natural Gas Company ("Northern"), a registered holding company, of all the assets and the assumption of all the liabilities of Peoples Natural Gas Company ("Peoples"); Northern having also in connection therewith requested that the Commission find and declare, pursuant to section 5 (d) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, that Northern has ceased to be a holding company;

In connection with the aforesaid findings and opinion, the Commission having stated, among other things, that it appeared to it that upon the consummation of the proposed transactions such an order under section 5 (d) of the act would be appropriate upon the renewal by Northern of its request; Northern now having renewed this request and in connection therewith stating that as at the close of business on May 31, 1952, Northern acquired the assets and assumed the liabilities of Peoples, the only public utility subsidiary of Northern, that Northern transferred to Peoples all the latter's issued and outstanding common stock which stock was thereupon canceled by Peoples, and that on June 2, 1952, Peoples was dissolved in accordance with section 39 of the General Corporation Law of the State of Delaware, the state of Peoples' incorporation; this filing further stating that on May 26, 1952 the Board of Directors of Northern resolved to recommend to Northern's stockholders that at the next meeting of such stockholders the Certificate of Incorporation of Northern be amended so as to require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the outstanding voting stock to modify the provision therein relating to cumulative voting;

The Commission now finding that Northern has ceased to be a holding company:

It is ordered and declared, Pursuant to section 5 (d) of the act that Northern has ceased to be a holding company and subject to the following terms and conditions its registration under the act has ceased to be in effect:

(1) That at the first meeting of stockholders of Northern (or any adjournments thereof) following the date of this order, Northern submit to the stockholders for their approval and recommend the adoption of an amendment to the Certificate of Incorporation as described in the above mentioned resolution adopted May 26, 1952;

(2) That in connection with the solicitation of proxies for such first meeting (or any adjournments thereof) Northern shall not utilize any solicitation material unless, at least 10 days prior to the use thereof, Northern has submitted to this Commission a copy of said material and the Commission has notified Northern that it has no objection to the use of said material; and

(3) That Northern report promptly, after its occurrence, the result of the stockholders' vote on the proposed amendment to its Certificate of Incorporation.

It is further ordered, That this order shall become effective forthwith upon issuance.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6879; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:46 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2857]

COLUMBIA GAS SYSTEM, INC., AND UNITED FUEL GAS CO.

ORDER AUTHORIZING CASH CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION AND FORGIVENESS OF OPEN ACCOUNT ADVANCES BY PARENT COMPANY, AND ISSUANCE AND SALE OF PROMISSORY NOTES BY SUBSIDIARY TO PARENT

JUNE 19, 1952.

The Columbia Gas System, Inc. ("Columbia"), a registered holding company, and United Fuel Gas Company ("United Fuel"), a subsidiary company of Columbia, having filed a joint application-declaration and an amendment thereto with this Commission pursuant to sections 6 (b), 9, 10, and 12 (b) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, and Rule U-45 promulgated thereunder, with respect to the following transactions:

Columbia will make a cash capital contribution to United Fuel in the amount of $3,000,000. Columbia will increase its investment in the common stock of United Fuel by $2,999,918.94 and will charge $81.06 (the amount of the contribution which is applicable to the minority interest) to operating expense. United Fuel proposes to credit $3,000,000 to its capital surplus.

United Fuel proposes to issue and sell, at par, to Columbia $10,800,000 principal amount of 3⅝ percent Installment Promissory Notes. These Notes will be registered and dated from the date of their issue. The principal amounts thereof will be due in equal annual installments on February 15 of each of the years 1954 through 1978. Interest will be payable semi-annually on February 15 and August 15.

The joint application-declaration states that such funds are required by United Fuel to finance its 1952 construction program and to purchase "cushion"

gas in connection with its gas storage program. In this connection it is stated that in providing the funds to United Fuel, Columbia will first make capital contributions when and as funds are required by United Fuel up to a maximum amount of $3,000,000, and thereafter, if additional funds are required, Columbia will purchase 3⅝ Percent Installment Notes from United Fuel up to a maximum amount of $10,800,000. None of the proposed transactions will be consummated subsequent to March 31, 1953.

Columbia also proposes to make a capital contribution to United Fuel by forgiving $6,000,000 principal amount of 2¾ percent open account advances owing to Columbia and due June 1, 1952. Columbia proposes to increase its investment in the common stock of United Fuel by $5,999,837.88 and will charge $162.12 (the amount of the contribution which is applicable to the minority interest) to operating expense. United Fuel proposes to credit $6,000,000 to its capital surplus.

Appropriate notice of said joint application-declaration having been given in the form and manner prescribed by Rule U-23 promulgated pursuant to said act, and the Commission not having received a request for a hearing with respect to said joint application-declaration, as amended, within the period specified or otherwise, and not having ordered a hearing thereon; and

The Public Service Commission of West Virginia having issued an order authorizing the issuance and sale by United Fuel of its 3⅝ Percent Installment Notes; and

The Commission finding with respect to said joint application-declaration, as amended, that the requirements of the applicable provisions of the act and rules thereunder are satisfied and that no adverse findings are necessary thereunder, and deeming it appropriate in the public interest and in the interest of investors and consumers that said joint application-declaration, as amended, be granted and permitted to become effective:

It is ordered, Pursuant to Rule U-23 and the applicable provisions of the act, that said joint application-declaration, as amended, be, and the same hereby is, granted and permitted to become effective forthwith, subject to the terms and conditions prescribed in Rule U-24.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6881; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:46 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2858]

COLUMBIA GAS SYSTEM, INC., AND CENTRAL KENTUCKY NATURAL GAS CO.

ORDER AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE AND SALE OF COMMON STOCK AND PROMISSORY NOTES BY SUBSIDIARY AND ACQUISITION THEREOF BY PARENT COMPANY

JUNE 19, 1952.

The Columbia Gas System, Inc. ("Columbia"), a registered holding company, and its subsidiary Central Kentucky Natural Gas Company ("Central Kentucky"), having filed a joint application and an amendment thereto with this Commission pursuant to sections 6 (b), 9 and 10 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 with respect to the following proposed transactions:

Central Kentucky proposes to issue and sell and Columbia proposes to acquire, for $600,000 in cash, 24,000 shares of common stock, par value $25 per share. Central Kentucky also proposes to issue and sell and Columbia proposes to acquire $575,000 principal amount of 3⅝ Percent Installment Promissory Notes. Said Notes would be registered and the principal amounts thereof would be payable in twenty-five equal annual installments on February 15 of each of the years 1954 to 1978, inclusive. Interest on the unpaid principal amount thereof would be payable semi-annually on February 15 and August 15.

Columbia states that in providing Central Kentucky with $1,175,000 of new money, it would first purchase common stock, at par, when and as funds are required, up to a maximum amount of 24,000 shares. Thereafter, Columbia would purchase 3⅝ percent notes of Central Kentucky, as funds are needed, up to a maximum principal amount of $575,000. It is further stated that Central Kentucky would not issue or sell any such common stock or 3⅝ percent notes subsequent to March 31, 1953.

The joint applicants represent that the proceeds from the sale of the additional common stock and 3⅝ percent notes would be used by Central Kentucky for the purpose of financing its scheduled 1952 construction program.

Appropriate notice of said joint application having been given in the form and manner prescribed by Rule U-23 promulgated pursuant to said act, and the Commission not having received a request for a hearing with respect to said joint application, as amended, within the period specified or otherwise, and not having ordered a hearing thereon; and

The Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky having issued an order authorizing the proposed issuance and sale of the said common stock and notes by Central Kentucky; and

The Commission finding with respect to said joint application, as amended, that the requirements of the applicable provisions of the act and rules thereunder are satisfied and that no adverse findings are necessary thereunder, and deeming it appropriate in the public interest and in the interest of investors and consumers that said joint application, as amended, be granted, effective forthwith:

It is ordered, Pursuant to Rule U-23 and the applicable provisions of the act, that said joint application, as amended, be, and the same hereby is, granted, effective forthwith, subject to the terms and conditions prescribed in Rule U-24.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6880; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:46 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2861]

COLUMBIA GAS SYSTEM, INC., AND OHIO FUEL GAS CO.

ORDER AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE AND SALE OF COMMON STOCK AND INSTALLMENT PROMISSORY NOTES BY SUBSIDIARY AND ACQUISITION THEREOF BY PARENT COMPANY

JUNE 19, 1952.

The Columbia Gas System, Inc. ("Columbia"), a registered holding company, and its subsidiary the Ohio Fuel Gas Company ("Ohio Fuel"), having filed a joint application and an amendment thereto with the Commission pursuant to sections 6 (b), 9 and 10 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 with respect to the following proposed transactions:

Ohio Fuel proposes to issue and sell and Columbia proposes to acquire 117,843 shares of common stock, par value $45 per share ($5,302,935) and a maximum of $14,697,065 principal amount of 3⅝ Percent Installment Promissory Notes. Ohio Fuel represents that the proceeds, in the amount of $20,000,000, to be derived from the sale of such securities, would be used to finance, in part, its 1952 construction program estimated to cost $20,764,543 and the purchase of "cushion" gas in connection with its gas storage program in the estimated amount of $1,600,000. Columbia proposes first to purchase common stock, at par, when and as funds are required, up to a maximum amount of 117,843 shares, and thereafter to purchase 3⅝ percent notes of Ohio Fuel, as funds are needed, up to a maximum principal amount of $14,697,065. It is further stated that Ohio Fuel would not issue or sell any such common stock or 3⅝ percent notes subsequent to March 31, 1953.

In addition, it is proposed that Ohio Fuel's outstanding 2¾ percent open account loans in the principal amount of $8,500,000, owing to Columbia and repayable on June 1, 1952, be funded into long-term securities. Ohio Fuel proposes to issue and Columbia proposes to acquire, at par, $8,500,000 principal amount of 3⅝ percent notes as payment and liquidation of the aforementioned open account loans.

The 3⅝ percent notes to be issued by Ohio Fuel would be registered and the principal amounts thereof would be payable in twenty-five equal annual installments on February 15 of each of the years 1954 to 1978, inclusive. Interest on the unpaid principal amount of said notes would be payable semiannually on February 15 and August 15.

Appropriate notice of said joint application having been given in the form and manner prescribed by Rule U-23 promulgated pursuant to said act, and the Commission not having received a request for a hearing with respect to said joint application, as amended, within the period specified or otherwise, and not having ordered a hearing thereon; and

The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Ohio having issued an order authorizing the proposed issuance and sale of the common stock and notes by Ohio Fuel; and

The Commission finding with respect to said joint application, as amended,

that the requirements of the applicable provisions of the act and the rules thereunder are satisfied and that no adverse findings are necessary thereunder, and deeming it appropriate in the public interest and in the interest of investors and consumers that said joint application, as amended, be granted, effective forthwith:

It is ordered, Pursuant to Rule U-23 and the applicable provisions of the act, that said joint application, as amended, be, and the same hereby is granted, effective forthwith, subject to the terms and conditions prescribed in Rule U-24.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6882; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:46 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2863]

SOUTHERN CO. ET AL.

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER RELEASING JURISDICTION OVER RESULTS OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING FOR UNDERWRITING OF COMMON STOCK RIGHTS OFFERING AND OVER FEES AND EXPENSES

JUNE 19, 1952.

In the matter of the Southern Company, Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, File No. 70-2863.

The Southern Company ("Southern"), a registered holding company, and two of its public utility subsidiary companies, Alabama Power Company and Georgia Power Company, having filed a joint application-declaration, with amendments thereto, proposing, among other things, to offer to its stockholders rights to subscribe for the purchase of 1,004,510 additional shares of its $5 par value common stock on the basis of one additional share for each sixteen shares of common stock now held, and also proposing to offer such shares as are not subscribed for by its stockholders to underwriters, pursuant to the competitive bidding requirements of Rule U-50, at the subscription price to be determined by Southern, the underwriters' bids to specify an aggregate amount of compensation to be paid for their commitments; and

The Commission by order dated June 4, 1952, having granted and permitted to become effective the joint application-declaration, as amended, subject to the condition, among others, that the proposed issuance and sale of common stock shall not be consummated until the results of the competitive bidding, pursuant to Rule U-50, shall have been made a matter of record in this proceeding and a further order shall have been entered with respect thereto, and jurisdiction having been reserved therein over the payment of fees and expenses to be incurred in connection with the proposed transactions; and

Southern, on June 19, 1952, having filed a further amendment to said joint application-declaration in which it is stated that Southern has designated a subscription price of $12.75 per share for the additional shares of its common stock, has invited bids, pursuant to Rule U-50, with respect to the compensation to be paid the underwriters for purchasing, at the subscription price of $12.75 per share, the common stock not taken by subscription and has received the following bids:

Bidding group headed by—	Amount of compensation		Aggregate net proceeds to company [1]
	Per share	Aggregate	
Lehman Bros.	$0.097	$97,437.47	$12,456,937.53
The First Boston Corp.	.115	115,518.65	12,440,856.35
Union Securities Corp. and Equitable Securities Corp.	.1175	118,029.93	12,438,345.07
Morgan Stanley & Co.	.1595	160,219.34	12,396,155.66
Kidder, Peabody & Co.			
Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Beane			

[1] After deducting amount of compensation bid only.

The amendment having further stated that Southern has accepted the bid of Lehman Brothers, as set forth above; and

The record having been completed with respect to the fees and expenses to be incurred in connection with the proposed transactions, which are estimated as set forth below:

Federal original issue tax	$9,240
Filing fee, Securities and Exchange Commission	1,492
Listing on New York Stock Exchange	2,500
Charges of transfer agent and registrar	28,000
Charges of subscription agent	109,000
Cost of stock certificates and warrants	11,520
Blue Sky expense	2,000
Mailing expense	23,000
Printing and preparation of Form U-1, registration statement, financial statements, prospectus, competitive bidding papers, letters to stockholders, etc.	50,000
Fees of counsel	10,000
Expenses of counsel	200
Fees of accountants	5,050
Services of Southern Services, Inc.	7,000
Miscellaneous	10,000
Total	269,002

It appearing that Southern requested various financial institutions to submit proposals with respect to their charges for acting as subscription agent in connection with the proposed issuance and sale of Common Stock, that five bids were received, and that Southern accepted the bid of Chemical Bank & Trust Company in the amount of $109,000; and

It further appearing that the proposed fee of Reid & Priest, counsel for the underwriters, which is to be paid by said underwriters, is $6,000; and

The Commission having examined said amendment and having considered the record herein and finding no basis for imposing terms and conditions with respect to the price to be received for said stock, the compensation to be paid to the underwriters, or otherwise; and it appearing to the Commission that the fees and expenses are not unreasonable provided they do not exceed the amounts estimated, and it appearing appropriate to the Commission that the jurisdiction heretofore reserved over the subscription price per share, the results of competitive bidding, and over the fees and expenses incurred in connection with the proposed transactions be released:

It is ordered, That the joint application-declaration, as further amended, be granted and permitted to become effective forthwith, and that the jurisdiction heretofore reserved over the subscription price, the results of competitive bidding, and over the fees and expenses incurred in connection with the proposed transactions, be, and the same hereby is, released, subject to the terms and conditions prescribed in Rule U-24.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6877; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:45 a. m.]

[File No. 70-2878]

AMERICAN GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER

JUNE 19, 1952.

American Gas and Electric Company ("American"), a registered holding company, having filed a declaration, and an amendment thereto, pursuant to the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 ("act") and Rule U-50 promulgated thereunder wherein American proposed to issue and sell $20,000,000 principal amount of -- percent Sinking Fund Debentures due 1977 and 170,000 shares of $10 par value common stock; and

The Commission having, by order dated June 5, 1952, permitted said declaration, as amended, to become effective, subject to the condition, among other things, that the proposed issue and sale of said debentures and common stock not be consummated until the results of the competitive bidding had been made a matter of record in this proceeding, and a further order shall have been entered by this Commission in the light of the record so completed, and the Commission having also reserved jurisdiction over the payment of fees and expenses of all counsel; and

American having, on June 19, 1952, filed a further amendment to said declaration in which it is stated that it has offered such debentures and common stock for sale pursuant to the competitive bidding requirements of Rule U-50 and has received the following bids:

FOR THE DEBENTURES

Bidder	Price to company	Interest rate	Cost to company
Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc.	*Percent* 100.20	*Percent* 3¼	*Percent* 3.3631
The First Boston Corp.	100.189	3⅜	3.3638
Blyth & Co., Inc., and Goldman Sachs & Co.	100.16	3⅜	3.3655
Union Securities Corp.	102.027	3½	3.3793
Harriman Ripley & Co., Inc.	101.956	3½	3.3834
Salomon Bros. & Hutzler	101.877	3½	3.3881
Kuhn, Loeb & Co.	101.75	3½	3.3956

FOR THE COMMON STOCK

Bidder	Price to company
	Per share
The First Boston Corp.	$58.563
Union Securities Corp.	58.31
Blyth & Co., Inc., and Goldman Sachs & Co.	57.03

Said amendment stating that American has accepted the bid of Halsey, Stuart & Co., Inc. for the debentures and the bid of The First Boston Corporation for the common stock, as set out above, and that the debentures will be offered for sale to the public at a price of 100.75 percent of the principal amount, resulting in an underwriters' spread of 0.55 percent of the principal amount, and that the common stock will be offered to the public at a price of $60.25 per share, resulting in an underwriters' spread of $1.687 per share; and

The Commission having examined said amendment and having considered the record herein and finding no basis for imposing terms and conditions with respect to the issue and sale of said debentures and common stock, and the underwriters' spreads and their allocations:

It is hereby ordered, That the jurisdiction heretofore reserved in connection with the issue and sale of said debentures and common stock be, and the same hereby is, released and the said declaration, as further amended, be, and the same hereby is, permitted to become effective forthwith, subject, however, to the terms and conditions prescribed in Rule U-24.

It is further ordered, That the jurisdiction heretofore reserved over the payment of the fees and expenses of all counsel be, and the same hereby is, continued.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ORVAL L. DUBOIS, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6883; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:47 a. m.]

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

[Investigation 4]

EDIBLE TREE NUTS

NOTICE OF HEARING

The United States Tariff Commission, on the 19th day of June 1952, ordered a public hearing in the above entitled investigation to be held on the 28th day of July 1952 at 10 a. m., e. d. s. t., in the Hearing Room, Tariff Commission Building, Eighth and E Streets NW., Washington, D. C. The purpose of the hearing is to receive information and views from interested parties as to programs of the United States Department of Agriculture which will be in operation for the crop year 1952–53 with respect to almonds, filberts, walnuts, or pecans, and on the question as to what action, if any, should be taken under section 22 with respect to imports of almonds, filberts, walnuts, Brazil nuts, or cashews.

The Tariff Commission investigation relating to imports of almonds, filberts, walnuts, Brazil nuts, and cashews was instituted under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act on April 13, 1950. The Commission made an interim report on the investigation to the President on November 24, 1950. At that time the Commission found no basis for the imposition of restrictions under section 22 on imports of any of the commodities covered by the investigation. The investigation was continued, however, and, after a public hearing held in September 1951, the Commission made another report to the President. On December 10, 1951, the President issued a proclamation giving effect to the Commission's recommendation in the latter report. The proclamation imposed a fee, in addition to the duties imposed under the Tariff Act of 1930, of 10 cents per pound on imports of shelled almonds and blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period October 1, 1951 to September 30, 1952, inclusive, in excess of an aggregate quantity of 4,500,000 pounds and provided that, of the imports not subject to the additional fee, not more than 500,000 pounds might consist of blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds.

In the 1951 report the Commission advised the President that it was continuing the investigation and would keep in close touch with developments with respect to the Department of Agriculture's programs for tree nuts and of the marketing conditions for these commodities, and that it would report to the President regarding any later action which may be found to be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

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

I hereby certify that the above hearing was ordered by the United States Tariff Commission on the 19th day of June 1952.

[SEAL] DONN N. BENT, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 52-6919; Filed, June 24, 1952; 8:54 a. m.]

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of Alien Property

[Vesting Order 18899]

ALBERT BENZ ET AL.

In re: Securities owned by Albert Benz, also known as Albert Bens, and others. F-28-31848, F-28-31841.

Under the authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. and Sup. 1-40); Public Law 181, 82d Cong., 65 Stat. 451; Executive Order 9193, as amended by Executive Order 9567 (3 CFR 1943 Cum. Supp.; 3 CFR 1945 Supp.); Executive Order 9788 (3 CFR 1946 Supp.) and Executive Order 9989 (3 CFR 1946 Supp.) and Executive Order 9989 (3 CFR 1948 Supp), and pursuant to law, after investigation, it is hereby found:

1. That the persons who own the property described in Exhibits A and C attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof, and who, if individuals, there is reasonable cause to believe on or since December 11, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, were residents of Germany, and which, if partnerships, corporations, associations or other business organizations, there is reasonable cause to believe on or since December 11, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, were organized under the laws of and had their principal places of business in Germany, are, and prior to January 1, 1947 were, nationals of a designated enemy country (Germany);

2. That the personal representatives, heirs, next of kin, legatees and distributees of Mary Noss, deceased and of Carl Schreiner, deceased, who there is reasonable cause to believe on or since December 11, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, were residents of Germany, are, and prior to January 1, 1947, were, nationals of a designated enemy country (Germany);

3. That the person referred to in subparagraphs 5 (d) and (e) hereof, whose name is unknown and who, if an individual, there is reasonable cause to believe, on or since December 11, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, was a resident of Germany, and which, if a partnership, corporation, association or other business organization, there is reasonable cause to believe on or since December 11, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, was organized under the laws of and had its principal place of business in Germany is, and prior to January 1, 1947, was, a national of a designated enemy country (Germany);

4. That Albert Benz, also known as Albert Bens, who there is reasonable cause to believe, on or since December 11, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, was a resident of Germany, is and prior to January 1, 1947, was, a national of a designated enemy country (Germany);

5. That the property described as follows:

a. Those certain bonds described in the aforesaid Exhibit A, owned by the persons listed in said Exhibit, and presently in the custody of the Attorney General of the United States, in the safekeeping accounts listed opposite each such name, together with any and all rights thereunder and thereto,

b. Those certain bonds described in Exhibit B attached hereto and by refer-

ence made a part hereof, owned by the persons referred to in said Exhibit, and presently in the custody of the Attorney General of the United States, in the safekeeping accounts listed opposite each such name, together with any and all rights thereunder and thereto,

c. Those certain coupons described and detached from the bonds identified in the aforesaid Exhibit C, owned by the persons listed in said Exhibit, and presently in the custody of the Attorney General of the United States in the safekeeping accounts listed opposite each such name, together with any and all rights thereunder and thereto,

d. Four (4) coupons, detached from Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts Funding 3 Percent Bonds, numbered 01053 and 02353, said coupons dated July 1, 1940, and January 1, 1941, of the face value of RM 3.00 each, owned by the person referred to in subparagraph 3, hereof, and presently in the custody of the Attorney General of the United States in a safekeeping account, numbered 66-200064, together with any and all rights thereunder and thereto,

e. Nineteen (19) coupons, detached from the I. G. Farbenindustrie A. G., bonds listed below, said coupons numbered and of the face value set forth opposite each such number:

Bond No.	Coupon No.	Face value of coupon
443876	17/19	RM 600.00
526178	18/19	400.00
368704	18	1,000.00
368720	18	1,000.00
496511	18	1,000.00
503744	18	1,000.00
503745	18	1,000.00
002193	17/19	300.00
008563	17/19	300.00
011080	17/19	300.00

owned by the person referred to in subparagraph 3 hereof, and presently in the custody of the Attorney General of the United States in a safekeeping account numbered 66-200064, together with any and all rights thereunder and thereto, and

f. One (1) Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts 3 percent Dollar Bond, dated July 1, 1936, due January 1, 1946, numbered C-087903, of $100.00 face value, owned by Albert Benz, also known as Albert Bens, said bond presently in the custody of the Attorney General of the United States in a safekeeping account numbered 28-100111, together with any and all rights thereunder and thereto,

is property which is and prior to January 1, 1947, was within the United States owned or controlled by, payable or deliverable to, held on behalf of or on account of, or owing to, or which is evidence of ownership or control by the persons referred to in subparagraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 hereof, the aforesaid nationals of a designated enemy country (Germany);

and it is hereby determined:

6. That the national interest of the United States requires that the persons referred to be treated as persons who are and prior to January 1, 1947, were nationals of a designated enemy country (Germany).

All determinations and all action required by law, including appropriate consultation and certification, having been made and taken, and, it being deemed necessary in the national interest,

There is hereby vested in the Attorney General of the United States the property described above, to be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States.

The terms "national" and "designated enemy country" as used herein shall have the meanings prescribed in section 10 of Executive Order 9193, as amended.

Executed at Washington, D. C., on June 18, 1952.

For the Attorney General.

[SEAL] HAROLD I. BAYNTON,
Assistant Attorney General,
Director, Office of Alien Property.

EXHIBIT A—BONDS

Name of owner	Description	Face value	Account No.	OAP File No.
Fredk. Canestrille and/or Hanna Canestrelli.	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series A, dated Sept. 1, 1935, due Jan. 1, 1945.	4 @ RM 200.00 each	66-200027	F-28-31811
	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series B, dated July 1, 1936, due Jan. 1, 1946.	4 @ RM 500.00 each 6 @ RM 200.00 each	66-200027	
	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series C, dated Sept. 1, 1936, due Jan. 1, 1946.	8 @ RM 200.00 each	66-200027	
Christopher Lambert	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series A, dated Sept. 1, 1935, due Jan. 1, 1945.	1 @ RM 500.00	66-200043	F-28-31843
	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series B, dated July 1, 1936, due Jan. 1, 1946.	1 @ RM 1,000.00 1 @ RM 200.00 2 @ RM 500.00 each	66-200043	
	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series C, dated Sept. 1, 1936, due Jan. 1, 1946.	1 @ RM 1,000.00	66-200043	
Gustav Mahn	German External Loan of 1924 (Dawes) 7 percent gold bonds, dated Oct. 15, 1924, due Oct. 15, 1949.	26 @ $1,000.00 each	28-200052	F-28-31845
Theodore Tiedemann	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, new series, dated Mar. 1, 1937, due July 1, 1947.	4 @ RM 1,000.00 each 5 @ RM 200.00 each	66-200060	D-28-9805
Wally Weber (Miss)	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, new series, dated Mar. 1, 1937, due July 1, 1947.	4 @ RM 1,000.00 each 5 @ RM 200.00 each	66-200060	F-28-31842
Rudolf Knapp	Conversion Office for Foreign Debts, 3 percent series A bonds, dated Sept. 1, 1935, due Jan. 1, 1945.	5 @ RM 1000 each	66-200040	F-28-31863
	Conversion Office for Foreign Depts, 3 percent series B bonds, dated July 1, 1936, due Jan. 1, 1946.	4 @ RM 1000 each	66-200040	
	Conversion Office for Foreign Debts, 3 percent series C bonds, dated Sept. 1, 1936, due Jan. 1, 1946.	6 @ RM 1000 each	66-200040	

EXHIBIT B—BONDS

Name of owner	Description	Number	Face value	Account No.	OAP File No.
Personal representatives, heirs, next of kin, legatees and distributees of Mary Noss, deceased.	City of Duisburg, German external gold, 7 percent serial bonds, dated Nov. 1, 1925.	2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2159, 2189.	6 @ $1,000.00 each	28-100021	D-28-9415
Personal representatives, heirs, next of kin, legatees and distributees of Carl Schreiner, deceased.	Housing & Realty Improvement Co., Berlin, first (closed) mortgage 20-year sinking fund, 7 percent gold bonds, due Nov. 15, 1946.	M209, M210, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 523, 524, 746, 1251, 1301, 1302, 1314.	14 @ $1,000.00 each	66-200052	F-28-31633

EXHIBIT C—COUPONS

Name of owner	Description of detached coupons		Detached from bond (description of bond)	Account No.	OAP File No.
	Date	Value of coupons			
Walter Schellenberg	3-1-41 3-1-41	50 @ RM 3.00 each 34 @ RM 15.00 each 2 @ RM 7.50 each	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series B, dated June 1, 1936, due June 1, 1946.	28-200050	F-28-12048-C-1.
Otto Mantius	7-1-41	30 @ RM 3.00 each 6 @ RM 7.50 each	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series A, dated Sept. 1, 1935, due Jan. 1, 1945.	66-200065	F-28-31846.
Do	7-1-41	15 @ RM 15.00 each	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series B, dated June 1, 1936, due June 1, 1946.	66-200065	
Do	7-1-41	6 @ RM 15.00 each	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts, 3 percent bonds, series C.	66-200065	
William V. N. Garrison.	10-15-37 4-15-38 10-15-38	2 @ $35.00 each 2 @ $35.00 each 2 @ $35.00 each	German External Loan of 1924 (Dawes) 7 percent gold bonds, dated Oct. 15, 1924, due Oct. 15, 1949.	66-200069	F-28-31887.

[F. R. Doc. 52-6863; Filed, June 23, 1952; 8:58 a. m.]