THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

FEDERAL REGISTER

VOLUME 21 NUMBER 32

Washington, Thursday, February 16, 1956

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10657

TRANSFERRING TO THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION UNDER THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 471), hereinafter called the Act, and particularly by section 101 thereof, and as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. There are hereby transferred to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter called the Administrator) all of the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) under sections 34 to 36, inclusive, sections 51 to 55, inclusive, section 57, sections 61 to 66, inclusive, and section 116 of the Act, with the following exceptions and qualifications:

(a) The Commission shall retain the power and duty of, and the responsibility for, (i) determining the property to be offered for disposal pursuant to section 52, the improvements to be designated as eligible for a credit under subsections 36a and 36b, and the provisions and procedures to be adopted pursuant to subsections 55b to 55e, inclusive, and (ii) removing or transferring property pursuant to subsections 52a (1) and 52a (2).

(b) The Commission shall retain such duties and responsibilities under subsection 57a as it shall specify and give notice thereof to the Administrator.

SEC. 2. There shall be transferred to the Administrator, who shall thereafter exercise full jurisdiction in connection therewith, all interests, rights, powers, duties, and responsibilities of the United States, including any interests, powers, rights, duties, and responsibilities of the Commission under the Act or any act, with respect to the following (except such interests, powers, rights, duties, and responsibilities as the Commission and the Administrator may mutually agree shall be retained by the Commission):

(a) The property designated for disposal by the Commission pursuant to section 52 of the Act, including all interests, powers, rights, duties, and responsibilities arising as a result of deeds executed by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of subsection 57a of the Act.

(b) The deeds for church land and the deed to the State of Tennessee for National Guard purposes, executed by the Commission pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, or the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

SEC. 3. The transfers specified in section 2 hereof shall be effective:

(a) As to each parcel of property offered for disposal pursuant to the provisions of section 52 of the Act on the date the Administrator executes a deed as provided in section 55, or a contract to purchase as provided in section 61, with respect to each such parcel of property; and

(b) In the case of deeds executed by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of subsection 57a of the Act, or referred to under subsection 2 (b) of this order, on the date of this order or the execution of such deeds, whichever is later.

SEC. 4. To the extent necessary or appropriate to enable him to perform or exercise the functions, duties, and responsibilities transferred to him by this order, the Administrator, and such officers or employees to whom he may delegate authority with respect to such functions, duties, and responsibilities, may perform or exercise any of the functions, duties, or responsibilities conferred upon the Commission by the Act, including, specifically, chapter 11 thereof. Any funds derived by the Commission from the disposal of property under the Act, including funds derived from the disposal of property under subsection 57a of the Act, shall be transferred to the Administrator, but shall otherwise remain subject to the provisions of section 117 and subsection 118c of the Act.

SEC. 5. The Commission and the Administrator shall keep each other currently advised as to action taken pursuant to the Act, shall consult with each other on all matters arising under the Act or this order which either agency deems to be of mutual concern, and may jointly agree upon such further measures, not inconsistent with the Act or this order, as will promote the expedi-

(Continued on next page)

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 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 cents) 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.

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 August 5, 1953. The CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of books and pocket supplements vary.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

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.

CODIFICATION GUIDE—Con.

tious and effective accomplishment of the policy and purposes of the Act.

SEC. 6. Executive Order No. 9816 of December 31, 1946, is hereby amended to the extent that it may be inconsistent with this order.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this order shall invalidate any action taken by the Commission prior to the effective date of this order, or impair or affect any outstanding obligations or contracts of the Commission, or impair any power or authority of the Commission with respect to functions not transferred by or pursuant to this order. No person affected by any action taken by either the Commission or the Administrator, or by any person acting under authority delegated to him consonant with law, shall be entitled to challenge the validity thereof or otherwise excuse his action or failure to act on the grounds that pursuant to the provisions of this order such action was within the jurisdiction of the Commission rather than the Administrator, or *vice versa*.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 14, 1956.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1285; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 12:09 p. m.]

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10658

AMENDMENT OF EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 10478[1] OF AUGUST 5, 1953, DELEGATING CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, and as President of the United States, it is ordered that Execu-

[1] 18 F. R. 4641; 3 CFR, 1953 Supp., p. 96.

tive Order No. 10478 of August 5, 1953, delegating certain authority of the President to the Secretary of Defense, be, and it is hereby, amended as follows:

1. Paragraph 1 of the said order is amended to read:

"Except as otherwise provided in paragraph 3 hereof, there is hereby delegated to the Secretary of Defense (a) the authority vested in the President by subsection 4 (a) of the act of September 9, 1950, 64 Stat. 826, as amended, to prescribe regulations with respect to the appointment, reappointment, and promotion of any person liable for induction under the act of September 9, 1950, as amended, or any member of a reserve component who has been or shall be ordered to active duty on or before July 1, 1957, as a physician, dentist, or in an allied specialist category in the armed forces (including the Public Health Service) of the United States; and (b) the authority vested in the President by subsection 4 (c) of the said act of September 9, 1950, as amended, to order to active duty in the armed forces of the United States, with or without their consent, those members of the reserve components of the armed forces of the United States who are registered under section 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended, and those persons who would be, but for such membership, liable for registration under the provisions of the said section 4 (i), as amended."

2. The first sentence of paragraph 2 of the said order is amended to read:

"Persons ordered to active duty in the armed forces of the United States pursuant to subsection 4 (c) of the said act of September 9, 1950, as amended, shall, so far as practicable, be ordered to active duty in accordance with the priorities established under subsection 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (64 Stat. 826), as amended."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 15, 1956.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1284; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 12:09 p. m.]

RULES AND REGULATIONS

TITLE 7—AGRICULTURE

Chapter I—Agricultural Marketing Service (Standards, Inspections, Marketing Practices), Department of Agriculture

PART 52—PROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES, PROCESSED PRODUCTS THEREOF AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCESSED FOOD PRODUCTS

SUBPART—U. S. STANDARDS FOR GRADES OF DEHYDRATED GRAPEFRUIT JUICE[1]

On December 8, 1955, a notice of proposed rule making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (20 F. R. 9020) regarding a proposed issuance of United States Standards for Grades of Dehydrated Grapefruit Juice.

After consideration of all relevant matters presented, including the proposal set forth in the aforesaid notice, the following United States Standards for Grades of Dehydrated Grapefruit Juice are hereby promulgated pursuant to the authority contained in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087 et seq., 7 U. S. C. 1621 et seq.).

PRODUCT DESCRIPTION, STYLES, AND GRADES

Sec.
52.3021 Product description.
52.3022 Styles of dehydrated grapefruit juice.
52.3023 Grades of dehydrated grapefruit juice.

FACTORS OF QUALITY

52.3024 Ascertaining the grade.
52.3025 Ascertaining the rating for the factors which are scored.
52.3026 Color.
52.3027 Defects.
52.3028 Flavor.

EXPLANATIONS AND METHODS OF ANALYSES

52.3029 Definition of terms.
52.3030 Methods of analyses.

LOT CERTIFICATION TOLERANCES

52.3031 Tolerances for certification of officially drawn samples.

SCORE SHEET

52.3032 Score sheet for dehydrated grapefruit juice.

AUTHORITY: §§ 52.3021 to 52.3032 issued under sec. 205, 60 Stat. 1090, as amended; 7 U. S. C. 1624.

PRODUCT DESCRIPTION, STYLES, AND GRADES

§ 52.3021 *Product description.* Dehydrated grapefruit juice is the product obtained from the juice of clean, sound, mature fruit of the grapefruit tree (Citrus paradisi), which juice has been concentrated in accordance with good commercial practice. The concentrate is dehydrated to a moisture content of not more than 3 percent, by weight. Cold-pressed grapefruit oil, or terpeneless or partially deterpened cold-pressed grapefruit oil, incorporated in a suitable edible carrier(s) such as sorbitol, glucose, or gum acacia, may be added to the product only in such amounts as to provide a proper grapefruit flavor to the reconstituted product. The product thus prepared is packaged in hermetically sealed containers with a proper desiccant to reduce the moisture content to approximately 1 percent, by weight, so as to assure preservation of the product. The sulfur dioxide content of the dehydrated grapefruit juice is not more than 250 p. p. m.

§ 52.3022 *Styles of dehydrated grapefruit juice.* (a) Style I (unsweetened) contains no added sweetening ingredient except as may be necessary to provide a carrier for grapefruit oil. The reconstituted juice of this style contains not less than 15 ounces (avoirdupois) of grapefruit solids per one gallon.

(b) Style II (sweetened) contains nutritive sweetening ingredients in excess of any amounts necessary to provide a carrier for grapefruit oil. Reconstituted juice of this style contains not less than 14 ounces (avoirdupois) of grapefruit solids per one gallon.

§ 52.3023 *Grades of dehydrated grapefruit juice.* (a) "U. S. Grade A" or "U. S. Fancy" is the quality of dehydrated grapefruit juice that has a porous open structure free from lumps or other signs of caking and which dissolves readily in water to produce a grapefruit juice that is reasonably characteristic in appearance to fresh grapefruit juice. The reconstituted juice possesses a very good color; is practically free from defects; possesses a good flavor; and scores not less than 85 points when scored in accordance with the scoring system outlined in this subpart.

(b) "U. S. Grade B" or "U. S. Choice" is the quality of dehydrated grapefruit juice that has a reasonably porous open structure free from lumps and which dissolves reasonably readily in water to produce a grapefruit juice that is fairly characteristic in appearance to fresh grapefruit juice. The reconstituted juice possesses a good color; is reasonably free from defects; possesses a reasonably good flavor; and scores not less than 70 points when scored in accordance with the scoring system outlined in this subpart.

(c) "Substandard" is the quality of dehydrated grapefruit juice that fails to meet the requirement of U. S. Grade B or U. S. Choice.

FACTORS OF QUALITY

§ 52.3024 *Ascertaining the grade*—(a) *General.* In addition to considering other requirements outlined in the standards, the following quality factors are evaluated:

(1) *Factors not rated by score points.*
(i) Physical condition.
(ii) Faculty of dissolving in water.

(2) *Factors rated by score points.* The relative importance of each factor which is scored is expressed numerically on the scale of 100. The maximum number of points that may be given each such factor is:

Factors:	Points
Color	40
Defects	20
Flavor	40
Total score	100

§ 52.3025 *Ascertaining the rating for the factors which are scored.* The essential variations within each factor which is scored are so described that the value

[1] Compliance with these standards does not excuse failure to comply with the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

may be ascertained for such factors and expressed numerically. The numerical range within each factor which is scored is inclusive. (For example: "17 to 20 points" means 17, 18, 19, or 20 points.) The rating is ascertained immediately after the product has been reconstituted.

§ 52.3026 *Color*—(a) *(A) classification.* Dehydrated grapefruit juice of which the reconstituted juice possesses a very good color may be given a score of 34 to 40 points. "Very good color" means that the color is bright and typical of fresh grapefruit juice.

(b) *(B) classification.* If the reconstituted juice possesses a good color a score of 28 to 33 points may be given. Dehydrated grapefruit juice that falls into this classification shall not be grade above U. S. Grade B or U. S. Choice regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule). "Good color" means that the color is typical of fresh grapefruit puice, which may be slightly dull but is not off-color.

(c) *(SStd.) classification.* If the reconstituted juice fails to meet the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section a score of 0 to 27 points may be given and the product shall not be graded above Substandard regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule).

§ 52.3027 *Defects*—(a) *General.* The factor of defects refers to the degree of freedom from seeds or portions thereof, pulp, dark specks, improperly reconstituted material, or other defects that affect the appearance or drinking quality of the reconstituted juice.

(b) *(A) classification.* Dehydrated grapefruit juice of which the reconstituted juice is practically free from defects may be given a score of 17 to 20 points. "Practically free from defects" means that the appearance and drinking quality of the juice is not affected by defects.

(c) *(B) classification.* If the reconstituted juice is only reasonably free from defects a score of 14 to 16 points may be given. Dehydrated grapefruit juice that falls into this classification shall not be graded above U. S. Grade B or U. S. Choice regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule). "Reasonably free from defects" means that the appearance and drinking quality of the juice is not materially affected by defects.

(d) *(SStd.) classification.* Dehydrated grapefruit juice that fails to meet the requirements of paragraph (c) of this section may be given a score of 0 to 13 points and shall not be graded above Substandard regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule).

§ 52.3028 *Flavor*—(a) *(A) classification.* Dehydrated grapefruit juice of which the reconstituted juice possesses a good flavor may be given a score of 34 to 40 points. "Good flavor" means that the flavor is a fine, distinct grapefruit juice flavor typical of properly processed canned grapefruit juice; is definitely free from terpenic, caramelized, oxidized, and rancid flavors; is free from off flavors; and the reconstituted juice meets the following requirements for the respective style:

(1) Recoverable oil—not less than 0.006 nor more than 0.012 milliliter per 100 ml.

(2) Acid—not less than 0.85 gram per 100 ml.

(3) Brix—acid ratio for the respective styles:

(i) Style I (unsweetened)—not less than 8 to 1 nor more than 14 to 1;

(ii) Style II (sweetened)—not less than 11 to 1 nor more than 14 to 1.

(b) *(B) classification.* If the reconstituted juice possesses a reasonably good flavor a score of 28 to 33 points may be given. Dehydrated grapefruit juice that falls into this classification shall not be graded above U. S. Grade B or U. S. Choice regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule). "Reasonably good flavor" means that the flavor is reasonably typical of properly processed canned grapefruit juice which is free from abnormal and off-flavors of any kind; and the reconstituted juice meets the following requirements for the respective style:

(1) Recoverable oil—not less than 0.004 nor more than 0.020 ml. per 100 ml.

(2) Acid—not less than 0.70 gram per 100 ml.

(3) Brix-acid ratio for the respective styles:

(i) Style I (unsweetened)—not less than 7 to 1 nor more than 14 to 1;

(ii) Style II (sweetened)—not less than 11 to 1 nor more than 14 to 1.

(c) *(SStd.) classification.* Dehydrated grapefruit juice that fails to meet the requirements of paragraph (b) of this section may be given a score of 0 to 27 points and shall not be graded above U. S. Grade B or U. S. Choice regardless of the total score for the product (this is a limiting rule).

EXPLANATIONS AND METHODS OF ANALYSES

§ 52.3029 *Definition of terms.* (a) "Reconstituted juice" means the product obtained by dissolving an entire package of dehydrated grapefruit juice in water to make the volume of grapefruit juice specified in directions for preparation.

(b) "Dissolves readily" means that (1) the product dissolves readily in the prescribed amount of cold water with only a reasonable amount of stirring, (2) the fruit particles rehydrate readily and (3) there is no material separation of colloidal or suspended matter.

(c) "Dissolves reasonably readily" means that (1) the product may require considerable stirring to dissolve the solids, (2) fruit particles may rehydrate only reasonably readily, and (3) there is no material separation of colloidal or suspended matter.

(d) "Acid" means the percent, by weight, of acid (calculated as anhydrous citric acid) in the reconstituted grapefruit juice and is determined by titration with standard sodium hydroxide solution using phenolphthalein as indicator.

(e) The "Brix" of the reconstituted juice means the degree Brix as determined by the Brix hydrometer calibrated at 20 degrees centigrade (68 degrees Fahrenheit) and to which any applicable temperature correction has been applied.

§ 52.3030 *Methods of analyses.* (a) "Recoverable oil" is determined by the following method:

(1) *Equipment.* Oil separatory trap similar to either of those illustrated in Figure 1 [1] and Figure 2.[1]

Gas burner or hot plate.
Ringstand and clamps.
Rubber tubing.
Three-liter narrow-neck flask.

(2) *Procedure.* Place exactly 2 liters of the reconstituted juice in the 3-liter flask and insert the separatory trap. Close the stopcock, place distilled water in the graduated tube, run cold water through the condenser from bottom to top, and bring the mixture to a boil. Continue boiling for one hour at the rate of approximately 50 drops per minute. By means of the stopcock, lower the oil into the graduated portion of the separatory trap, remove the trap from the flask; allow it to cool, and record the amount of oil recovered. The number of milliliters of oil recovered divided by 20 is equivalent to the number of milliliters of oil per 100 ml. of the reconstituted juice.

(b) The "moisture content" of the dehydrated grapefruit juice is determined as follows:

(1) A 3- to 5-gram sample is weighed into an aluminum weighing dish 1½ to 2 inches in diameter, having a tight-fitting cover. The samples are dried in a vacuum oven for 30 hours at a temperature of 60 degrees centigrade (140 degrees Fahrenheit) and a pressure not exceeding 100 mm of mercury. During the drying period air is passed through M_2SO_4 and admitted through the release cock at the rate of approximately 2 bubbles per second. At the end of the drying period the dishes are removed from the oven, the covers are placed on immediately and the dishes allowed to cool in a desiccator prior to final weighing. Sampling and weighing is carried out as rapidly as possible under low humidity conditions. The moisture content of the dehydrated grapefruit juice may be determined by any other method which gives equivalent results.

(c) The "sulfur dioxide" content of the dehydrated grapefruit juice is determined by the Monier-Williams method for total sulfurous acid in foods in accordance with the Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, using a 50-gram sample of the dehydrated grapefruit juice.

LOT CERTIFICATION TOLERANCES

§ 52.3031 *Tolerances for certification of officially drawn samples.* (a) When certifying samples that have been officially drawn and which represent a specific lot of dehydrated grapefruit juice the grade for such lot will be determined by averaging the total scores of the containers comprising the sample, if, (1) such containers meet all of the applicable grade requirements of the factors of quality that are not rated by score points; (2) all containers comprising the sample meet all applicable standards of quality promulgated under the Federal

[1] Filed as part of the original document.

Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and in effect at the time of the aforesaid certification; and (3) with respect to those factors which are rated by score points:

(i) Not more than one-sixth of the containers fails to meet the grade indicated by the average of such total scores;

(ii) None of the containers falls more than four points below the minimum score for the grade indicated by the average of such total scores;

(iii) None of the containers falls more than one grade below the grade indicated by the average of such total scores; and

(iv) The average score of all containers for any factor subject to a limiting rule is within the score range of that factor for the grade indicated by the average of the total scores of the containers comprising the sample.

SCORE SHEET

§ 52.3032 *Score sheet for dehydrated grapefruit juice.*

Size and kind of container	------
Container mark or identification	------
Style	------
Label (including dilution factor)	------
Net weight	------
Moisture content	------
Brix of the reconstituted juice	------
Anhydrous citric acid	------
SO_2 concentration	------
Brix-acid ratio	------
Recoverable oil (ml./100 ml.)	------
Reconstitutes properly (Yes) (No)	------

Factors		Score points
Color	40	(A) 34-40 (B) ¹ 28-33 (SStd.) ¹ 0-27
Defects	20	(A) 17-20 (B) ¹ 14-16 (SStd.) ¹ 0-13
Flavor	40	(A) 34-40 (B) ¹ 28-33 (SStd) ¹ 0-27
Total score	100	

Grade	------

¹ Indicates limiting rule.

Effective time. The United States Standards for Grades of Dehydrated Grapefruit Juice (which is the first issue) contained in this subpart shall become effective 30 days after publication hereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Dated: February 10, 1956.

[SEAL] ROY W. LENNARTSON,
Deputy Administrator,
Marketing Services.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1207; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:49 a. m.]

TITLE 6—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT

Chapter III—Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture

Subchapter F—Security Servicing and Liquidations

[Administration Letter 452 (462)]

PART 371—OPERATING LOANS

SUBPART A—GENERAL SECURITY SERVICING

RELEASES OF LIENS ON WOOL AND MOHAIR MARKETED BY CONSIGNMENT

Part 371 of Title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, is hereby amended to add a new § 371.7a to provide the procedure and authority for releases by County Supervisors of liens on wool or mohair when producers who are borrowers from the Farmers Home Administration market their wool or mohair by consignment through a broker, and to read as follows:

§ 371.7a *Procedure and authority for executing releases of liens on wool and mohair marketed by consignment*—(a) *General.* This section provides the procedure and authority for releases by County Supervisors of liens on wool or mohair when producers who are borrowers from the Farmers Home Administration market their wool or mohair by consignment through a company, corporation, or marketing association acting, as a broker.

(b) *Policy.* Liens on wool and mohair may be released in instances when the security property is marketed by consignment, provided all of the following conditions are met:

(1) The producer assigns to the Farmers Home Administration the proceeds of any advances made, or to be made, on the wool or mohair by the broker, less necessary costs involved in shipping, handling, processing, and marketing.

(2) The producer assigns to the Farmers Home Administration the proceeds of the sale of the wool or mohair, less any remaining costs involved in shipping, handling, processing, and marketing, and less the amount of any advance made by the broker against the wool or mohair, including interest.

(3) The producer and broker agree that the net proceeds of any advances on, or sale of, the wool or mohair will be paid by checks made payable jointly to the producer and the Farmers Home Administration.

(c) *Authority.* Pursuant to the policy set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, County Supervisors are hereby authorized to execute releases of the Government's lien on wool and mohair on Form FHA-911, "Assignment, Acceptance, and Release." Since Form FHA-911 does not constitute a binding agreement until executed by all parties in interest, including the producer and the broker as well as the Government, the County Supervisor may execute it before it is signed by the other parties. Form FHA-911 will be executed in an original and two copies. The original will be given to the broker, and a copy will be delivered to the borrower.

(R. S. 161, 5 U. S. C. 22; sec. 41 (1), 60 Stat. 1066, 7 U. S. C. 1015 (1); sec. 6 (3), 50 Stat. 870, 16 U. S. C. 590w (3). Interprets or applies sec. 21, 50 Stat. 524, sec. 4, 60 Stat. 1071, sec. 2, 65 Stat. 197, 7 U. S. C. 1007; sec. 1, 63 Stat. 43, 67 Stat. 558, 12 U. S. C. 1148a-1 (a); sec. 1 (a), 64 Stat. 414, 12 U. S. C. 1148a-1 (a); sec. 2, 63 Stat. 44, sec. 1, 67 Stat. 150, sec. 1, 69 Stat. 263, 12 U. S. C. 1148a-2 (a); sec. 1, 67 Stat. 149, sec. 2, 69 Stat. 263, 12 U. S. C. 1148a-2 (b); sec. 1, 67 Stat. 149, 69 Stat. 366, 12 U. S. C. 1148a-2 (c); sec. 2 (a) (2), 60 Stat. 1062, 7 U. S. C. 1001, note; 68 Stat. 999, 69 Stat. 223, sec. 3, 69 Stat. 263, 12 U. S. C. 1148a-1, note; 62 Stat. 1038, 63 Stat. 82)

Dated: February 10, 1956.

[SEAL] R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator,
Farmers Home Administration.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1201; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:49 a. m.]

Chapter V—Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture

Subchapter B—Export and Domestic Consumption Programs

[Amdt. 1]

PART 518—FRUITS AND BERRIES, DRIED AND PROCESSED

SUBPART A—DATE DIVERSION PAYMENT PROGRAM WMD 29a (1955 MARKETING SEASON)

ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENT; ELIGIBLE DATES

Section 518.522 (b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

(b) *Eligible dates.* Dates diverted under this program shall: (1) have been produced in the United States; (2) be whole or pitted; (3) be of the Deglet Noor variety; and (4) be not less than U. S. Grade C or U. S. Grade C (Dry) of the United States Standards for Grades of Dates, effective August 26, 1955.

(Sec. 32, 49 Stat. 774, as amended; 7 U. S. C. 612c)

Issued this 13th day of February 1956, to become effective February 15, 1956.

[SEAL] S. R. SMITH,
Representative of the
Secretary of Agriculture.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1198; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:47 a. m.]

TITLE 16—COMMERCIAL PRACTICES

Chapter I—Federal Trade Commission

[Docket 6184]

PART 13—DIGEST OF CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS

ORLOFF COMPANY, INC., ET AL.

Subpart—*Aiding, assisting and abetting unfair or unlawful act or practice:* § 13.290 *Aiding, assisting and abetting unfair or unlawful act or practice.* Subpart—*Furnishing means and instrumentalities of misrepresentation or deception:* § 13.1055 *Furnishing means and instrumentalities of misrepresentation or deception.* Subpart—*Misbranding or mislabeling:* § 13.1280 *Price.* Subpart—*Misrepresenting oneself and goods*—Prices: § 13.1805 *Exaggerated as regular and customary;* § 13.1810 *Fictitious marking.*

(Sec. 6, 38 Stat. 721; 15 U. S. C. 46. Interpret or apply sec. 5, 38 Stat. 719, as amended; 15 U. S. C. 45) [Cease and desist order, The Orloff Company, Inc., et al., Philadelphia, Pa., Docket 6184, January 27, 1956]

In the Matter of The Orloff Company, Inc., a Corporation, and Michael Orloff, Hyman J. Orloff and Harry Orloff, Individually and as Officers of Said Corporation

This proceeding was heard by a hearing examiner on the complaint of the Commission—charging distributors of "Geneva" brand watches with furnishing retailers with means to misrepresent the customary retail price by affixing to the watches price tags printed with fictitious and excessive prices—respondents' answer, and a stipulation between counsel as to the facts.

On this basis, the hearing examiner made his initial decision, including findings and order to cease and desist; the Commission denied respondents' appeal therefrom, and on January 27, 1956, issued its "Final Order" as follows:

This matter having been heard by the Commission upon respondents' appeal from the hearing examiner's initial decision, and briefs and oral argument of counsel in support thereof and in opposition thereto; and

The Commission having rendered its decision denying respondents' appeal and affirming the initial decision:

It is ordered, That the respondents herein shall, within sixty (60) days after service upon them of this order, file with the Commission a report in writing setting forth in detail the manner and form in which they have complied with the order to cease and desist.

The order to cease and desist is as follows:

It is ordered, That respondents, The Orloff Company, Inc., a corporation, and its officers, Michael Orloff, Hyman J. Orloff and Harry Orloff, individually and as officers of said corporation and respondents' agents, representatives and employees, directly or through any corporate or other device, in connection with the offering for sale, sale and distribution of watches in commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, do forthwith cease and desist from:

(1) Representing in any manner that certain amounts are the regular and usual retail prices of merchandise when such amounts are in excess of the prices at which such merchandise is usually and regularly sold at retail by the class of retailers selling such merchandise.

(2) Putting any plan into operation whereby retailers or others may misrepresent the regular and usual retail prices of merchandise.

Issued: January 27, 1956.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ROBERT M. PARRISH, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 56-1206; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:49 a. m.]

TITLE 19—CUSTOMS DUTIES

Chapter I—Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury

[T. D. 54028]

PART 8—LIABILITY FOR DUTIES; ENTRY OF IMPORTED MERCHANDISE

PART 20—DISPOSITION OF UNCLAIMED AND ABANDONED MERCHANDISE

DESIGNATION OF MERCHANDISE TO BE EXAMINED AND SALE OF ARTICLES SUBJECT TO INTERNAL-REVENUE TAX

A. On the basis of a number of reports from field offices concerning the designation of packages of imported merchandise for examination, the Bureau has decided that the requirement of the designation of examination packages by marks and numbers, if any, should be modified so as to permit collectors to designate examination packages otherwise than by the marks and numbers on the packages. Such modification of the Customs Regulations will enable a collector in his discretion to designate examination packages by minimum percentages of packages or quantities and save most of the time and work which would be required to locate the examination packages on the dock if their selection were on the basis of marks and numbers. However, the designation of examination packages shall be made by the marks and numbers thereon when such course of action is necessary or advisable to detect violations or attempted violations of the law, or regulations or for any other proper purpose.

1. Accordingly § 8.22 of the Customs Regulations is amended as follows:

a. By deleting ", by marks and numbers, if any," in the first sentence.

b. By inserting the following immediately after the first sentence: "The designation of packages for examination shall be by marks and numbers or, whether or not the packages bear marks and numbers, by minimum percentages of packages or quantities, as may be determined by the collector."

c. By deleting the fifth sentence.

(R. S. 161, 251, sec. 624, 46 Stat. 759; 5 U. S. C. 22, 19 U. S. C. 66, 1624. Interprets or applies sec. 499, 46 Stat. 728, as amended; 19 U. S. C. 1499)

B. Under section 5753 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U. S. C. 5753), which superseded section 2190 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, relating to the disposition of abandoned, condemned, or forfeited tobacco, snuff, cigars, or cigarettes, none of these articles shall be sold for domestic consumption if they will not bring a price equal to the tax due and payable thereon *and the expenses incident to the sale thereof.* The wording in italics in the preceding sentence constitutes an addition to the law. To bring the Customs Regulations into conformity with this change in the law, the following changes are made in Part 20:

1. Section 20.4 is amended as follows:

a. By deleting the period at the end of the first sentence and adding the following: "and, in the case of tobacco 'articles' and 'tobacco materials,' as defined in 26 U. S. C. 5702 (j), (k),[*] only if they will bring an amount sufficient to pay the expenses of sale as well as the internal-revenue tax."

b. By amending the second sentence to read: "If such articles cannot be sold for domestic consumption in accordance with the foregoing conditions, they shall be destroyed unless they can be advantageously sold for export from continuous customs custody or unless the Bureau has authorized other disposition to be made under the law.[*]"

2. Part 20 is amended by adding a footnote reading as follows:

[*] "(a) Manufactured tobacco.

"'Manufactured tobacco' means all tobacco, other than cigars and cigarettes, prepared, processed, manipulated, or packaged for consumption by smoking or for use in the mouth or nose. * * *." 26 U. S. C. 5702 (a).

"(j) Articles.

"'Articles' means manufactured tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, and cigarette papers and tubes.

"(k) Tobacco materials.

"'Tobacco materials' means tobacco in process, leaf tobacco, and tobacco scraps, cuttings, clippings, siftings, dust, stems, and waste." 26 U. S. C. 5702 (j), (k).

(R. S. 161, 251, sec. 624, 46 Stat. 759; 5 U. S. C. 22, 19 U. S. C. 66, 1624. Interprets or applies sec. 492, 46 Stat. 727, sec. 5753, 68A Stat. 716; 19 U. S. C. 1492; 26 U. S. C. 5753)

[SEAL] RALPH KELLY, *Commissioner of Customs.*

Approved: January 30, 1956.

DAVID W. KENDALL, *Acting Secretary of the Treasury.*

[F. R. Doc. 56-1205; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:49 a. m.]

[T. D. 54021]

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

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

Correction

In F. R. Doc. 56-1067, appearing at page 929 of the issue for Friday, February 10, 1956, the text of Item 1 should read as follows:

1. Section 10.31 (f) is amended by adding the following new sentence after the first sentence: "A term bond on customs Form 7563-A, may also be given."

TITLE 32—NATIONAL DEFENSE

Chapter V—Department of the Army

Subchapter A—Aid of Civil Authorities and Public Relations

PART 512—PRISONERS

CLEMENCY

Section 512.1 is revised to read as follows:

§ 512.1 *Clemency*—(a) *Authority to mitigate, remit, and suspend sentences.* (1) Any commanding officer of a sentenced or unsentenced prisoner who has the authority to appoint a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, or any superior military authority, may mitigate, remit, or suspend, in whole or in part, any unexecuted portion of a sentence (including all uncollected forfeitures) adjudged by a court-martial, other than a sentence extending to death or dismissal or affecting a general officer, with the following exception: only the Secretary of the Army or other person designated by him may mitigate, remit, or suspend the unexecuted portions of sentences of sentenced prisoners confined in United States disciplinary barracks or in institutions under the control of the Attorney General.

(2) As an exception to Article 74 (a), Uniform Code of Military Justice, the President has delegated to the Secretary of the Army the authority as to persons convicted by military tribunals under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army to remit or suspend any part or

amount of the unexecuted portion of any sentence extending to death which, as approved by the President, has been commuted to a lesser punishment (Executive Order 10498, Nov. 4, 1953, 18 F. R. 7003).

(3) After being informed of the decision of the Board of Review in a case referred to it, The Judge Advocate General may, prior to taking the action prescribed in paragraph 100c (1), Manual for Courts-Martial, 1951 (16 F. R. 1303) mitigate, remit, or suspend in whole or in part any unexecuted portion of a sentence other than a sentence extending to death or dismissal or affecting a general officer (including all uncollected forfeitures) adjudged by a court-martial.

(4) Under the provisions of Article 74 (b), Uniform Code of Military Justice, only the Secretary of the Army may authorize, for good cause, substitution of an administrative form of discharge for a discharge or dismissal executed in accordance with the sentence of a court-martial.

(b) *Policy.* So far as may be consistent with the maintenance of military discipline and the preservation of good order, commanders will exercise their authority to mitigate, remit, or suspend unexecuted portions of court-martial sentences when they deem that such action is merited and will result in restoration to duty or otherwise contribute to the rehabilitation of the prisoner. A prisoner's civilian, military, and confinement record will be considered in determining his suitability for clemency.

(c) *Responsibility for required clemency consideration.* Each prisoner will be considered for clemency in accordance with paragraph (d) of this section, by the authorities designated as follows:

(1) *Guardhouses and stockades.* Prisoners confined in the foregoing facilities will be considered for clemency by the commander exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the prisoners.

(2) *Hospitals.* Prisoners in hospitals who are carried on the rolls of disciplinary barracks will be considered for clemency in accordance with subparagraph (3) of this paragraph. All other prisoners in hospitals, including those prisoners who are designated for confinement in a disciplinary barracks or Federal institution but who are hospitalized prior to arrival at such institutions, except for persons to whom paragraph (a) (2) of this section applies, will be given clemency consideration by the commander exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the prisoners.

(3) *Disciplinary barracks and Federal institutions.* Each prisoner serving a sentence in a disciplinary barracks or Federal penal or correctional institution or released on parole or conditionally released from such institutions, and each prisoner in a hospital who is carried on the rolls of a disciplinary barracks, will be considered for clemency by the Secretary of the Army. Commandants of disciplinary barracks and wardens of Federal penal and correctional institutions are responsible for furnishing The Provost Marshal General, Department of the Army, case histories of Army prisoners, together with their recommendations concerning restoration to duty and clemency.

(d) *Time of clemency consideration.* (1) Prisoners sentenced to dismissal, dishonorable or bad conduct discharge, and confinement will be considered for clemency by the authority specified in paragraph (c) of this section, as follows:

(i) In cases in which the sentence to confinement is less than 8 months, as soon as practicable.

(ii) In cases in which the sentence to confinement is 8 months or more and less than 2 years, not earlier than 4 months nor later than 6 months from the date the sentence to confinement became effective, and annually thereafter.

(iii) In cases in which the confinement is 2 years or more, not earlier than 6 months nor later than 8 months from the date the sentence to confinement became effective, and annually thereafter.

(iv) In any case at any time prior to completion of the sentence, upon recommendation for cause.

NOTE: The date on which initial clemency consideration is due will be extended by any period during which credit is not given for serving a sentence.

(2) In addition to the considerations for clemency otherwise required, written application for a special clemency consideration, setting forth a basis for the application and containing sufficient grounds for further clemency consideration, may be made by the prisoner or in behalf of the prisoner, and forwarded through channels to the appropriate convening authority having court-martial jurisdiction if the prisoner is confined in a place other than a disciplinary barracks or Federal penal or correctional institution. If the prisoner is confined in a disciplinary barracks or Federal penal or correctional institution, such application will be forwarded to The Provost Marshal General, Department of the Army.

(3) A prisoner released on parole from a disciplinary barracks will be considered annually for clemency until expiration of his sentence as reduced by abatements if the sentence was adjudged prior to May 31, 1951, and without credit for abatements if the sentence was adjudged on or After May 31, 1951.

(4) A prisoner released on parole or conditionally released from a Federal penal or correctional institution will be considered annually for clemency until expiration of the full term of his sentence or sentences without credit for abatements.

[AR 633-10, January 20, 1956] (Sec. 2, 38 Stat. 1085, as amended; 10 U. S. C. 1453. Interprets or applies secs. 1, 2, 38 Stat. 1074, 1075, 1085, 1086; 10 U. S. C. 1455, 1457, 1457a, 1457b)

[SEAL] HERBERT M. JONES,
Major General, U. S. Army,
Acting The Adjutant General.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1183; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:45 a. m.]

TITLE 36—PARKS, FORESTS, AND MEMORIALS

Chapter I—National Park Service, Department of the Interior

PART 20—SPECIAL REGULATIONS

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK; CLOSED WATERS

Section 20.45 *Everglades National Park,* is amended by substituting the following for the present subparagraph (3) of paragraph (b) *Closed waters.*

(3) The following described area bordering the Seven Mile Road (also known as the Humble Oil Well Road) from Tamiami Trail South, is closed to fishing: Township 54 South, range 36 east, sections 19, 30 and 31; township 55 south, range 36 east, sections 6, 7, 18, 19 and 30.

(Sec. 3, 39 Stat. 535, as amended; 16 U. S. C. 3)

Issued this 16th day of January 1956.

[SEAL] GEORGE W. FRY,
Acting Superintendent,
Everglades National Park.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1189; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:46 a. m.]

TITLE 43—PUBLIC LANDS: INTERIOR

Chapter I—Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior

Appendix—Public Land Orders

[Public Land Order 1265]

[Colorado 010775]

COLORADO

WITHDRAWING PUBLIC LANDS FOR USE IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF RADIO TRANSMISSION FACILITIES

By virtue of the authority vested in the President and pursuant to Executive Order No. 10355 of May 26, 1952, it is ordered as follows:

Subject to valid existing rights, the following-described public lands in Colorado are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws, including the mining and the mineral-leasing laws, and reserved under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration for use in connection with the construction and operation of radio transmission facilities:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

T. 1 N., R. 72 W.,
Sec. 21, lots 1, 7, NE¼NE¼, and NE¼SE¼.

The areas described aggregate 109.99 acres.

The use of the lands by the General Services Administration shall be subject to existing withdrawals for national forest purposes.

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1186; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:45 a. m.]

TITLE 50—WILDLIFE

Chapter I—Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior

PART 6—MIGRATORY BIRDS AND CERTAIN GAME MAMMALS

ORDER PERMITTING KILLING OF WIDGEON DUCKS ON OR OVER AGRICULTURAL AREAS IN IMPERIAL COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Pursuant to authority conferred upon me by order of the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 13, 1956 (21 F. R. 336), I have determined that the number of widgeon now present and likely to continue to be present in Imperial County, California, is such as to constitute a serious threat to agricultural crops through depredations by these birds. Accordingly, an emergency is found to exist, and to protect crops threatened by such birds the killing of such widgeon as are found damaging crops in said county is hereby permitted beginning this date, and continuing until formally terminated, but in no event beyond May 30, 1956; such killing to be conducted in compliance with applicable State law and subject to terms, conditions, and restrictions as follows:

1. Widgeon may be killed only on or over agricultural areas in Imperial County when causing or about to cause serious injuries to agricultural crops in said county.

2. Such birds may be killed only by the owners, operators, tenants, or sharecroppers of lands upon which depredations are being committed or threatened and by other persons when duly authorized in writing by such landowners, operators, tenants, or sharecroppers, or when possessing permits issued by United States Game Management Agents or United States Deputy Game Wardens.

3. Widgeon may be taken only by shooting with a shotgun not larger than No. 10 gauge fired from the shoulder.

4. Such birds as are killed hereunder may be used for food within the State of California, but they may not be sold, offered for sale, bartered or shipped for purposes of sale or barter, or be wantonly wasted or destroyed.

(Sec. 3, 40 Stat. 755, as amended, 16 U. S. C. 704. Interprets or applies E. O. 10250, 16 F. R. 5385, 3 CFR, 1951 Supp.)

Since this order is an emergency measure, notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable and it shall become effective immediately (60 Stat. 237; 5 U. S. C. 1001 et seq.).

Issued at Washington, D. C., and dated February 10, 1956.

JOHN L. FARLEY,
Director.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1185; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:45 a. m.]

PROPOSED RULE MAKING

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

[7 CFR Part 921]

[Docket No. AO-222-A6]

MILK IN OZARKS MARKETING AREA

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TENTATIVE MARKETING AGREEMENT AND TO ORDER, AS AMENDED

Pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.), and in accordance with the applicable rules of practice and procedure, as amended (7 CFR, Part 900), notice is hereby given of a public hearing to be held in the Greene County Court House, Springfield, Missouri, beginning at 10: 00 a. m., February 24, 1956.

The public hearing is for the purpose of receiving evidence with respect to proposed amendments hereinafter set forth, or appropriate modifications thereof, to the tentative marketing agreement heretofore approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and to the order, as amended, regulating the handling of milk in the Ozarks marketing area. The proposed amendments have not received the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

By the Producers Creamery Company:

1. Delete that portion of § 921.51 (a) which reads "and for the months of April, May and June, the price for Class I milk shall be the basic formula price for the preceding month plus 63 cents" and substitute therefor "and for the months of April, May and June, the price for Class I milk shall be the St. Louis Class I price for such month under Order No. 3, as amended, regulating the handling of milk in the St. Louis marketing area, minus 10 cents".

By the Greene County Milk Producers Association:

2. Delete § 921.51 (b) (1) (2) and (3) and substitute therefor the following:

(b) *Class II milk.* During all months of the year, the price for Class II milk shall be the basic formula price.

The Greene County Milk Producers Association desires to concur in and recommend an amendment to the level of Class I prices identical to that proposed by the Producers Creamery Company.

By Dairy Division, Agricultural Marketing Service:

3. Make such changes as may be required to make the entire marketing agreement and order conform with any amendments thereto that may result from this hearing.

Copies of this notice of hearing and of the order now in effect may be procured from the Market Administrator, 602 Chouteau Building, 4030 Chouteau Avenue, St. Louis 10, Missouri, or from the Hearing Clerk, Room 112, Administration Building, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C., or may be there inspected.

Dated: February 10, 1956.

[SEAL] ROY W. LENNARTSON,
Deputy Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1199; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:48 a. m.]

[7 CFR Part 941]

[Docket No. AO-101-A20]

MILK IN CHICAGO, ILL., MARKETING AREA

DECISION WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED MARKETING AGREEMENT AND PROPOSED ORDER AMENDING ORDER, AS AMENDED

Pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing proceedings to formulate marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR Part 900), a public hearing was conducted at Chicago, Illinois, on July 5–8, 1955, pursuant to notice thereof which was issued on June 14, 1955 (20 F. R. 4256) and June 28, 1955 (20 F. R. 4690).

Upon the basis of the evidence introduced at the hearing and the record thereof, the Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, on November 29, 1955 (20 F. R. 8854), filed with the Hearing Clerk, United States Department of Agriculture, his recommended decision, and notice of opportunity to file written exception thereto.

The material issues on the record of the hearing were:

1. Whether Kankakee, Will County, and Lake County, all in Illinois, or portions thereof, should be added to the marketing area;

2. Class I differentials;

3. General changes in accounting for milk, including use of a skim milk and butterfat system of accounting;

4. Special classification and price for milk used in the manufacture of American Cheese;

5. Revision of differential to producers with respect to milk received in the marketing area;

6. Revision of the base-excess method of paying producers, including changes in the calculation of bases, changes in base rules, and calculation of base and excess prices;

7. Allocation of class utilization to own farm production;

8. Application of the 70-cent differential added in the case of bulk Class I and Class II milk moved outside the surplus milk manufacturing area;

9. Pool plant approval on the basis of shipments to plants distributing in the marketing area; and

10. Establishment of order prices at locations where milk is transferred from

the tank truck in which it was picked up at the producer's farm to another tank truck.

A decision issued December 22, 1955 (20 F. R. 10060) dealt with parts of issue No. 6, specifically, bases assigned for the months of March, April, May and June, 1956 to producers who relinquish earned bases, or who have not earned a base, and base rules. The remainder of issue No. 6 and the other issues are dealt with in this decision.

Findings and conclusions. The following findings and conclusions on the material issues are based upon evidence contained in the record of the hearing:

1. *Marketing area.* No change should be made in the marketing area. Proposals were made to add Kankakee County, Will County, and Lake County, all in Illinois, or parts thereof, to the marketing area. Parts of Will County and Lake County are now in the marketing area.

At the hearing, the proposals were supported only with respect to Crete Township in Will County, and the portion of Lake County not now in the marketing area.

It was testified, with respect to both of these areas for which inclusion was asked, that no additional milk would be regulated under the order. The reason given, in each case, for the additional area, was to include the proponent's plant in the marketing area, thus enabling the plant to pay the higher price applicable to milk received in the marketing area . It was explained that these operators experienced difficulty in holding producers in competition with plants in the marketing area.

Inasmuch as the difficulty brought out in testimony was only a matter of competition between regulated handlers for producers, this is not a basis for expanding the area of regulation. The additions to the marketing area are denied.

2. *Class I price differentials.* No change should be made in the Class I differentials.

Proposals were made by producer associations to change the Class I price differentials in a manner which would raise the average level and reduce the seasonal range. One proposal was to make the differentials $1.10 in the months of August through November, and 90 cents in other months. Another proposal would establish a constant differential of $1.00 year around.

Testimony in support of these proposals was generally based on the following factors: reduced need for seasonal differentials because of the effect of the base-excess plan; increased costs of milk production; and the desire to lessen market problems producers feel to be associated with frequent changes in the Class I price.

Class I differentials now in the order are $1.10 per hundredweight for August through November, 90 cents for December through February, 70 cents for March through June, and 90 cents in July. The average of these differentials for the year is 90 cents. The effective level of the differentials is modified, however, by a supply-demand adjustment.

It is apparent that the proposal for a $1.00 differential a year around would raise the annual level by 10 cents per hundredweight. The proposal to have a 90-cent differential for December through July would raise the annual average 6⅔ cents.

An examination of supply and demand conditions does not show a need for an increase in the general level of the Class I price differentials in addition to what has occurred as the result of the automatic price adjustments based on the supply-demand ratio, and what may be expected similarly on the basis of any further changes in supply and demand. Since the beginning of the year, the supply-demand price adjustment has increased from a minus 24 cents per hundredweight to a minus 4 cents in November. (Official notice is taken in this connection of data published by the market administrator.)

The record shows that during the first five months of 1955, the volume of Class I sales had increased about 5 percent over a year earlier. In the same period, receipts from producers were down more than 6 percent. Effective August 1, this year the supply-demand ratio calculation was changed so that it would be more responsive to recent changes in supply and disposition. As a result, producers' prices are already affected by the improvement in utilization which has occurred this year.

Even with the changes in utilization already noted, data and testimony in the record indicate the market will continue to have an adequate supply under present price formulas. Accordingly, it is concluded no change should be made in the annual level of the Class I differentials.

Producer testimony on Class I differentials favored reducing the amount of seasonal variation in the differentials. It was contended that, with the base and excess plan in effect, a more moderate variation in the differentials would be appropriate. Handlers contended, however, that some seasonal variation is important so that they can maintain their competitive position with respect to sales in nearby markets.

In the recommended decision it was concluded that the differential for the entire December-July period should be 80 cents per hundredweight. This would reduce the amount of seasonal price variation without changing the annual level.

Producers indicated in their exceptions, however, that such a change would be unacceptable, because it would not result in any increase in returns, and might result in some decrease. Producer and handler exceptions also reflected concern that the seasonal pattern proposed in the recommended decision involved changes of 30 cents per hundredweight twice yearly, which would not accommodate the customary practice of changing retail prices ½ cent per quart for each 20-cent change in producer prices.

In view of the substantial opposition to the differentials proposed in the recommended decision, it is concluded that such new differentials should not be adopted.

3. *Accounting.* No change should be made on the basis of this record in the system of accounting for milk.

Proposals were made on the record to change entirely or partially the order accounting system, from the present milk equivalent method, to a method which accounts for skim milk and butterfat separately.

It is apparent on the record that most interests in the milk trade are generally satisfied with the present system of accounting. Only one handler advocated a complete revision of the accounting system. One producer group proposed separate accounting for butterfat and nonfat solids in ice cream. The same group, however, as well as handlers of most of the milk, opposed a general change in the accounting system at this time. The change with respect to ice cream was also opposed by handlers. Apparently resistance to a complete change to butterfat and skim milk accounting arises largely from uncertainty among the trade as to what the effects would be on the cost of products.

It is apparent from the testimony that the problem involves appropriate pricing as well as accounting for the butterfat and nonfat components of these products. It is not feasible to accomplish this purpose without a change in accounting with respect to all utilizations. A partial change would unduly complicate the accounting. The same is true with respect to proposed changes in methods of reconciliation.

Under the circumstances, it is concluded no change should be made in the accounting system at this time.

4. *Cheese price formula.* Milk used in the manufacture of American Cheese should continue to be classified and priced the same as other uses in Class IV.

A proposal made by producer groups would establish a special class and price for milk used in American Cheese. The proposed formula price is the same as proposed at a previous hearing, June 1–4, 7–11, and 14–15, 1954. The proposal as made on the June 1954 record was denied in a decision issued November 23, 1954 (19 F. R. 7693).

The formula would establish a per hundredweight price for milk on the basis of the following calculations: 9.745 x the price of State Brand Cheddar Cheese on the Plymouth Exchange, plus 0.3 x the price of Grade A (92-score) butter at Chicago, less 46.8 cents.

A supplementary proposal was that this formula should also serve as an alternative for the basic formula price.

The immediate effect of using the proposed formula would be a reduced value for part of what is now Class IV milk. In 1953 it would have averaged eight cents lower, in 1954, about 14 cents lower, and in March 1955, 16 cents lower than the Class IV price. In some prior periods it would have yielded a higher price than the Class IV price.

Proponents of the new price formula argued that this price relationship would be reasonable, since they claimed that cheese factories are not able to pay as much as butter-powder operations

under current conditions, including the effect of the price support program. However, much evidence in the record was in disagreement with this contention.

Data as to prices paid by cheese factories and creameries in the United States since the beginning of 1948 show that at times the cheese factories have overpaid the creameries, and at other times the reverse has been true. In general, the paying prices of the two types of operations have moved upward or downward together, with only a small percentage of difference.

On a regional basis, prices paid by cheese factories in the East North Central States (Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio) have averaged as high as, or higher than, prices paid by creameries, in each of the four years 1950–54. Other data in the record showed, for a group of cheese plants in Wisconsin, paying prices at the same level in recent months as the Class IV price.

Besides the immediate effect the proposed formula would have in reducing the value of all producer milk, there would be a tendency to encourage additional manufacturing operations to enter the pool. This would reduce the uniform price to all producers. In view of these disadvantages to producers in general, there is a question as to what need would be served by establishing a separate price for milk used in American Cheese at a generally lower level than the present Class IV formula price.

Under a class utilization pricing system, a surplus price serves to assure producers a market for milk in excess of the regular requirements of the market. Such a price should not be lower than needed to accomplish this purpose, for otherwise producer returns are unnecessarily reduced. This record does not show the need for the proposed lower price.

5. *Differential in marketing area.* No change should be made in the location differential applied to milk received in the marketing area.

The differential, as now effective, is 10 cents per hundredweight over the 70-mile zone price, and applies to milk which moves directly from farms to plants in the marketing area. Of this 10-cent differential, four cents is a charge against the plant receiving the milk, and the other six cents is, in effect, a payment out of the market-wide pool.

A handler proposed that the part of the differential paid out of the pool should be eliminated. This is the same as a proposal made at a hearing in June 1954, and denied in the decision previously referred to herein, issued November 23, 1954.

It was argued at this hearing that the inner-market differential is not in accord with uniform pricing insofar as part of it is paid out of the pool. Testimony failed to show, however, that the differential is incompatible with uniform pricing of milk, according to the location of the plant where the milk is received, as provided in the Act.

Testimony on this proposal did not indicate that the situation had changed significantly from conditions shown in the June 1954 hearing, except with respect to milk picked up at farms in tank trucks and delivered to the marketing area without being received at a plant outside the marketing area. It was argued that this method of milk procurement was not anticipated at the time the differential was established, and has made the differential work differently from the way intended.

Record data show that bulk tank procurement of milk at the farm has continued to develop. A relatively new phase of this development has been the practice of reloading the milk from several trucks into a larger truck for movement to the marketing area. This method of milk assembly has extended the distance of the bulk movement of milk from farms to area plants. Such milk, under the terms of the order, is entitled to the inner-market differential. In another part of this decision it is concluded that the order should establish the price for such milk at the point of assembly; i. e., the point at which the milk is reloaded from several tank trucks into the truck which delivers the milk to the marketing area. Evidence did not show that there had been any significant change in milk received at plants in the marketing area, aside from milk which had been reloaded as described above.

The exceptions on this matter dealt with the effect of the inner-market differential on relationships between handlers and between producers, but did not go to the problem of an appropriate amount for the differential. The primary consideration in arriving at appropriate location differentials is the relative value of milk at various locations. Record evidence did not show that the amount of the present differential is inappropriate in this respect. Elimination of part of the differential as proposed by handlers necessarily raises the problem of whether the present charge to handlers constitutes an appropriate differential for paying producers. This problem was not dealt with on the record.

It is concluded that no change should be made in the inner-market differential on this record.

6. *Base-excess plan*—(a) *Calculation of base and excess prices.* No change should be made in the method of calculation of the base and excess prices.

A proposal was made by some cooperative associations of producers to alter the base and excess prices by making the excess price the same as the Class IV price. No location differentials would apply to the excess price under this plan. The base price would then represent the remaining value of producer milk.

Under the base-excess plan now in effect, there is a fixed difference of 40 cents per hundredweight between the base and excess prices. Location differentials apply equally to both base and excess prices, and accordingly the 40-cent difference is maintained in all zones. The base-making period is September through November, and payment on base and excess is made only in the months of March through June.

Proponents of the plan to use the Class IV price as an excess price complained of the low excess price in outer zones of the milkshed under the present method. As an example, it was pointed out that the May 1955 excess price in the 21st zone was $2.56, as compared to the Class IV price of $2.93. It was indicated that this condition caused some withdrawal of excess milk from the pool. Nonpool manufacturing plants paid more than such excess price.

It is observed, however, that the average return to any producer, including both his base and excess milk, is no different from what his average return would be without the base plan, except insofar as his seasonal variation in production differs from the market-wide average of seasonal variation.

The relation of the excess price to the Class IV price is affected by the level of market-wide utilization. Some of the record data show how utilization changes in recent years would have affected this relationship if the base plan had been in effect. A relatively low level of utilization may result in an excess price in distant zones as low or lower than the Class IV price. The relationship is affected also, of course, by the level of the Class I differential. In this respect, improvement in the supply-demand adjustment which has occurred since the spring of 1955 will be reflected in the excess price.

In the non-base payment months of July through February, producer location differentials apply alike to all milk. The similar application of location differentials in base payment months results in the same allocation of the value of pool milk with respect to location, as in other months. The record does not justify a greater allocation of such value to outer zones in these months (such as would result from the proposed plan) than would be the case without the base plan.

(b) *Calculation of bases.* The amount of base milk for producers who have not earned a base, or for producers who relinquish an earned base, should be, beginning in 1957, 60 percent of deliveries in March, 55 percent of deliveries in April, and 50 percent in May and June. The opportunity for producers to take an optional base should be continued.

Order provisions allow a producer until January 15 of any year to decide whether he wishes to retain his earned base or take a base calculated the same as for a new producer. For the 1955 season, a new producer's base was calculated for the several months as follows: for March, 65 percent of his average daily deliveries in the month; for April, 60 percent; and for May and June, 55 percent. For the 1956 season the same percentages were continued by amendment to the order effective January 1, 1956. This amendment did not change the provisions for calculation of optional bases for subsequent years, which would allow as optional base milk 10 percent less than the average percentage of base milk calculated for the same month of the previous year with respect to producers with earned bases.

Proposals were made to reduce or elimnate the opportunity for a producer to relinquish his earned base in favor of a new base. These proposals were directed towards giving a greater incentive

for producers to earn a satisfactory base during the September–November base-earning period. One proposal was made to change the 10 percent deduction to be instead a deduction of 15 percent effective for the base-paying period of 1957, and 20 percent in 1958 and subsequent years.

The present provisions of the order allow producers who experience hardship in earning a base the same opportunity for sharing in the market as a producer who has not earned a base. This has been true because the calculation of optional bases and bases for new producers has been the same. Representatives of substantial groups of producers requested that provision for optional bases be retained. Optional bases could be retained without reducing the incentive to earn a good base, providing the optional base calculation is not too liberal. In this connection, it would appear desirable to continue to apply the same calculation to new producer bases and optional bases.

It was pointed out on the record that calculating optional bases by deducting 10 percent from the average percentage of base milk of producers with earned bases in the same month of the previous year, tends to give a more liberal option than the fixed percentages used in 1955 which were continued by amendment for 1956. Since liberal optional bases reduce the incentive to earn a base, it is concluded that the fixed percentage method of calculation should be continued.

For the 1955 season, 4888 producers relinquished their earned bases in favor of optional bases. In view of the apparent attractiveness of optional bases used in 1955, it is concluded that beginning with 1957 the percentages should be reduced to 60 percent of deliveries in March, 55 percent in April, and 50 percent in May and June.

By amendment effective January 1, 1956, the date by which producers must indicate whether they wish to take an optional base was extended from December 31 to January 15. The January 15 date should be retained.

7. *Allocation of own farm production.* The order should be changed to be explicit as to the method of prorating "own farm" production.

The order provides in § 941.45 (a) that a handler's own farm production be subtracted pro rata from the pounds of milk in each class. The method of prorating to each class is to assign the same percentage of this milk to each class as the handler's total utilization in such class is of his total receipts.

It was proposed by a handler, having own farm production, that the order be amended to provide a different method of proration. An exhibit presented at the hearing compared the present method of allocation with the proposed method. This exhibit shows that under the present method of allocating own farm production, the money value per hundredweight of the milk from a handler's own farm is equal to the money value per hundredweight of other milk which is pooled. The proposed method on the other hand gives different money values to own farm production and producer milk. This record does not support changing the relative values of own farm production and producer milk. Accordingly, it is concluded that the present method of prorating own farm production should be continued. The method should be explicitly set forth in the order.

8. *Price for sales outside the surplus milk manufacturing area.* No action relative to the provision for 70 cents additional Class I and Class II price on sales outside the surplus milk manufacturing area should be taken on this record. Before further action is taken, this year's experience with the provision needs to be evaluated.

On the basis of the hearing on August 24, 1955, this provision was amended to free week-end shipments from the provision for October and November 1955. Also this provision was set aside by suspension actions for September this year, and, subsequent to the amendment referred to, for November this year. The effects of such steps, as well as market experience with the provision this year, should become a part of the record of any hearing for considering whether beneficial effects can any longer reasonably be expected from this provision, and, if so, whether they might be enhanced by further amendment.

On this record, testimony in regard to this provision was conflicting. A few producer associations, arguing for its elimination, contended that it had become essentially detrimental to producers. Such argument was based on data showing changed conditions in the interstate and inter-regional trade in fluid milk, and in supply conditions of the Chicago area trade, and how the provision seems to have affected the marketing and prices of producer milk. Other parties, including most handlers as well as associations of producers representing the majority of producers, while admitting changed conditions as revealed by the data, supported the provision in its present or some modified form. Doubtless, evidence from this year's experience would contribute something to an appraisal of this provision. Since it will not again apply until next Fall, it may be examined in the light of this year's experience as well as its previous history.

9. *Pool plant approval.* The proposal to delete § 941.66 (c) is denied. No testimony was offered on this proposal.

10. *Pricing at reloading points.* Producer milk moved from the farm in a bulk tank truck and reloaded into another tank truck before entering a plant should be priced at the point of reloading.

A proposal was made on the record to establish order prices at locations where milk is reloaded, from the tank trucks which have brought the milk from farms, into a larger tank truck for movement to a plant. The proposal contemplated that the zone differentials, applicable in the case of milk reloaded in the manner described, would be the same as now applied in the case of plants, except that for milk reloaded in the marketing area the location differential would be four cents over the 70-mile zone price.

The evidence showed continued development of the practice of collecting milk from producers' farms in tank trucks. In March 1955, milk was obtained from 1398 producers in this manner as compared to 1040 in the prior November. Another recent development is the practice of transferring into a larger tank truck the loads from several trucks which have collected the milk from farms. Such reloading is accomplished without the milk entering a plant. It was testified that the health authority for Chicago has required that such transfers take place at approved facilities equiped for washing the tanks. In every case the reloading takes place at an established location.

The order now establishes minimum producer prices at the plant where the milk is first received. It is at this stage in the marketing process that milk received in cans, which currently represents most of the milk for the market, is accepted by the handler, and loses its identity as the milk of any particular producer. Plant prices are established throughout the supply area by the application of zone differentials based upon the cost of moving the milk to the market. The producer is thus assured of the order price, subject, of course to hauling and miscellaneous charges, at a plant with which he may establish a regular business connection. The same conditions apply to milk collected at farms in tank trucks and brought directly to a plant, except that such milk is accepted prior to arrival at the plant.

The development of reload points raises the problem as to whether, under present order provisions, the producer can be assured that his milk is similarly fully subject to order regulation, as in the case of milk moving directly to a plant. It is observed that the reloading operation makes it practically impossible for the individual farmer to know the actual plant destination of his milk. If producer prices under the order could be established at reload points, the producer would be assured of (1) a more definite association with the market, and (2) order prices for all of his milk moving to the reloading point.

It is apparent that milk transferred at a reload point has been accepted by the handler. The milk has already lost its identity, inasmuch as it has been commingled with other milk. Furthermore, the reloading operation provides a definite location for establishing a price, and the substantialness of the operation provides a basis for assigning responsibility for the milk under the order. For the handler, the reload point serves as a means of assembling loads for movement in large tank lots the same as milk moved from a receiving plant. The reload points have a regular association with the market in that they are operated primarily for supplying this market.

In view of the circumstances described, it appears that the function of a reload point is sufficiently similar to the function of pool plants as now defined so that a reload point may be considered to be a type of pool plant. Such a treatment of reload points under the order would mean that all qualified milk handled at the reload point would be producer milk. This appears to be a logical extension of the method of pricing now employed under the order, and it should be adopted.

General findings. (a) The tentative marketing agreement and the order, as amended and as hereby proposed to be further amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act;

(b) The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to § 2 of the act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply of and demand for milk in the marketing area, and the minimum prices specified in the tentative marketing agreement and in the order, as amended, and as hereby proposed to be further amended, are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk and be in the public interest; and

(c) The tentative marketing agreement and the order, as amended, and as hereby proposed to be further amended, will regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and will be applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity, specified in a marketing agreement upon which a hearing has been held.

Rulings on exceptions. In arriving at the findings and conclusions included in this decision, each of the exceptions received was carefully and fully considered in conjunction with the record evidence pertaining thereto. To the extent that the findings and conclusions herein are at variance with the exceptions, such exceptions are overruled.

Order of the Secretary Directing That a Referendum Be Conducted; Determination of a Representative Period and Designation of an Agent To Conduct Such Referendum

Pursuant to section 8c (19) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 608c (19)), it is hereby directed that a referendum be conducted among the producers (as defined in the order, as amended, regulating the handling of milk in the Chicago, Illinois, marketing area) who, during the month of October 1955, were engaged in the production of milk for sale in the marketing area specified in the aforesaid order as amended, to determine whether such producers favor the issuance of the order amending the order, as amended, which is filed herewith.

The month of October 1955 is hereby determined to be the representative period for the conduct of such referendum.

J. L. Cook is hereby designated agent of the Secretary to conduct such referendum in accordance with the procedure for the conduct of referenda to determine producer approval of milk marketing orders as published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on August 10, 1950 (15 F. R. 5177), such referendum to be completed on or before the 10th day from the date this decision is filed.

Marketing agreement and order. Annexed hereto and made a part hereof are two documents entitled, respectively, "Marketing Agreement Regulating the Handling of Milk in the Chicago, Illinois, Marketing Area," and "Order Amending the Order, as Amended, Regulating the Handling of Milk in the Chicago, Illinois, Marketing Area," which have been decided upon as the detailed and appropriate means of effectuating the foregoing conclusions. These documents shall not become effective unless and until the requirements of § 900.14 of the rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing proceedings to formulate marketing agreements and orders have been met.

It is hereby ordered, That all of this decision except the attached marketing agreement, be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. The regulatory provisions of said marketing agreement are identical with those contained in the order, as amended, and as hereby proposed to be further amended by the attached order which will be published with this decision.

Issued at Washington, D. C., this 13th day of February 1956.

[SEAL] EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

Order[1] Amending the Order, as Amended, Regulating the Handling of Milk in the Chicago, Illinois, Marketing Area

§ 941.0 *Findings and determinations.* The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth are supplementary and in addition to the findings and determinations previously made in connection with the issuance of the aforesaid order and of the previously issued amendment thereto; and all of said previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and affirmed, except insofar as such findings and determinations may be in conflict with the findings and determinations set forth herein.

(a) *Findings upon the basis of the hearing record.* Pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 601 et seq.), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing the formulation of marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR Part 900), a public hearing was held upon certain proposed amendments to the tentative marketing agreement and to the order, as amended, regulating the handling of milk in the Chicago, Illinois, marketing area. Upon the basis of the evidence introduced at such hearing and the record thereof, it is found that:

(1) The said order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act;

(2) The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to section 2 of the act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in the said marketing area, and the minimum prices specified in the order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk and be in the public interest; and

(3) The said order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, regulates the handling of milk in the same manner as and is applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in a marketing agreement upon which a hearing has been held.

Order relative to handling. It is therefore ordered, that on and after the effective date hereof the handling of milk in the Chicago, Illinois, marketing area shall be in conformity to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of the aforesaid order, as amended, and as hereby further amended, and the aforesaid order, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

1. Delete § 941.6 and substitute the following:

§ 941.6 *Reload point.* "Reload point" means any location at which milk moved from the farm in a tank truck is reloaded into another truck before entering a plant".

2. Delete § 941.45 (a) and substitute the following:

(a) Subtract from the pounds in each class the pounds of milk received from a handler's own farm production as follows:

(1) Determine the total quantity of milk, skim milk, and 3.5 percent milk equivalent of the butterfat in cream received by the handler from all sources;

(2) Determine the percentage that the quantity of milk in each class, computed pursuant to § 941.44, is of the quantity of milk computed pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph;

(3) Multiply the pounds of milk in own farm production by the percentages computed in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph and subtract the resulting pounds from the pounds of milk in the respective class.

3. In § 941.65 (a) after the word "plant" insert a comma and the words "or reload point,".

4. In § 941.66 delete the words preceding paragraph (a) and substitute:

§ 941.66 *Pool plant.* "Pool plant" means any plant or reload point which receives milk from dairy farmers and which:

5. Delete § 941.69 (a) (2) and substitute the following:

(2) Any producer who has not earned a base by deliveries during the previous September, October and November, and any producer who elects to relinquish his base pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph, shall be allotted a base for each of the delivery periods of March, April, May and June equal to the following percentages of his average daily deliveries:

Month:	*Percentage*
March	60
April	55
May	50
June	50

[1] This order shall not become effective unless and until the requirements of § 900.14 of the rules of practice and procedure, as amended, governing proceedings to formulate marketing agreements and orders have been met.

Provided, That for March, April, May and June 1956, the percentages used shall be, respectively, 65, 60, 55 and 55.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1200; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:48 a. m.]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[49 CFR Parts 141, 145, 147, 186, 187, 311, 312]

[Ex Parte 199]

OFFICE HOURS FOR FILING FREIGHT AND PASSENGER TARIFFS AND SCHEDULES

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

1. It appears there is a need for revision of the regulations issued under sections 6 (6), 217 (a), 218 (a), 306 (b), and 306 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act governing the filing of:

(1) Passenger tariffs of railroads and water carriers contained in Rule 41 (k) of Tariff Circular No. 18-A. (49 CFR 145.41);

(2) Tariffs of express companies contained in Rule 14 (d) of Tariff Circular No. 19-A. (49 CFR 147.14);

(3) Freight tariffs of railroads, pipe lines, and water carriers contained in Rule 14 (d) of Tariff Circular No. 20. (49 CFR 141.14);

(4) Minimum schedules of contract carriers by motor vehicle, covering the transportation of freight, contained in Rule 7 (d) of Tariff Circular MF No. 2. (49 CFR 187.7);

(5) Freight tariffs of common carriers by motor vehicle and joint freight tariffs of common carriers by motor vehicle and common carriers by water, other than railroad-owned or railroad-controlled water carriers, contained in Rule 20 (e) of Tariff Circular MF No. 3. (49 CFR 187.44);

(6) Tariffs and minimum schedules of common and contract carriers by motor vehicle, covering the transportation of passengers and express matter, contained in Rule 1 (c) of Tariff Circular MP No. 3. (49 CFR 186.1);

(7) Minimum schedules of contract carriers by water, covering the transportation of freight, contained in Rule 1 (d) of Tariff Circular No. 21. (49 CFR 312.101);

(8) Tariffs of common carriers by water, covering the transportation of freight, contained in Rule 1 (d) of Tariff Circular No. 22. (49 CFR 312.1);

(9) Tariffs of common carriers by water, covering the transportation of passengers, contained in Rule 1 (d) of Tariff Circular No. 23. (49 CFR 311.1);

2. Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237, 5 U. S. C. 1003), notice is hereby given of the proposed amendment of the cited provisions of the tariff circulars and sections of the Code of Federal Regulations identified in the first paragraph hereof by the addition to each circular and/or code section listed above of a paragraph reading as follows:

Tariff publications will be received for filing only during established business hours of the Commission. The office of the Commission is closed on Saturdays and Sundays and on the following holidays:

The 1st day of January; the 22d day of February; the 30th day of May; the 4th day of July; the first Monday in September; the 11th day of November; the fourth Thursday in November; and the 25th day of December.

When any holiday named above falls on Sunday, the office of the Commission will be closed on the following Monday.

3. Interested parties may file, on or before April 6, 1956, with this Commission, written statements of facts, opinions or arguments concerning the proposed rules. Any written statement so filed shall conform to the specifications provided in Rule 15 of the Commission's general rules of practice. An original, signed, and five copies shall be furnished for use of the Commission. No formal hearing with respect to the proposed rules is contemplated, but informal conferences with designated officials of this Commission may be had.

4. Notice to the public will be given by depositing a copy of this notice in the office of the Secretary of the Commission for inspection, and by filing a copy with the Director of the Federal Register.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCOY, *Secretary.*

[F. R. Doc. 56-1203; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:49 a. m.]

NOTICES

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS AT WICHITA, KANS., FOR KANSAS, NEBRASKA AND OKLAHOMA

The following is the text of Order No. 56055 of the Postmaster General, dated January 31, 1956:

Pursuant to the authority of section 1 (b) of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949, the following changes will become effective on February 6, 1956.

1. On the effective date there will be established a regional headquarters at Wichita, Kansas, under a Regional Director, who will exercise the powers, duties, functions, and jurisdiction delegated by Order No. 55809 dated January 3, 1955 (20 F. R. 276), and Order No. 55862 dated April 4, 1955. Pending appointment of a Regional Director the postal affairs affecting the Bureau of Operations and Bureau of Personnel in the region shall be under the direction of the Regional Operations Manager who will be responsible to the Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Post Office Operations. The Regional Operations Manager will be subject to all policy affecting regional operations prescribed by the Department in Washington. There will also be a Regional Controller in the regional office who will be responsible to the Assistant Postmaster General and Controller, Bureau of Finance. The Regional Personnel Manager will be administratively responsible to the Regional Operations Manager so far as Bureau of Operations activities are concerned, and functionally to the Assistant Postmaster General, Personnel. Functions such as those listed below, which were formerly discharged by various headquarters, bureaus, and offices in Washington, will now be discharged by the regional staff.

A. Personnel functions, including such items as recruitment, selection, and placement of personnel; training activities; labor relations; safety and health programs; classification of positions; awards and efficiency rating systems; review and disposition of disciplinary actions; and liaison with the Civil Service Commission in the region.

B. Service functions, including recommendations to the Department for the establishment or discontinuance of post offices, classified stations and branches; approval of requests for allowances of funds; maintenance of high standards of service in all post offices; and effective control of costs.

C. Industrial engineering functions, including administration of cost reduction programs; improvement in work methods; endorsement of requests for capital expenditures; maintenance of work standards; layout of facilities; provision of work simplification methods and training; and development of systems and procedures, other than accounting and fiscal procedures.

D. Controller functions, including the direction of accounting, budget and cost analysis activities.

E. Public information functions, including encouragement of public cooperation and participation in improving postal methods; and maintaining good relations with federal, state and municipal officials.

2. Pending the appointment of a Regional Director, this order does not affect the bureau and offices of the Department other than:

A. Bureau of Operations;

B. Bureau of Personnel;

C. Bureau of Finance (and Controller).

All other bureaus and offices, however, are expected to coordinate and cooperate with this new regional organization.

3. The region will be divided into three districts. All postmasters in each district will report directly to their district manager.

4. Previous orders or instructions concerning the routing of communications

from postmasters to the above-mentioned bureaus in Washington are hereby superseded. All communications, with respect to the functions set forth in this order will be directed to the appropriate district manager, with the exceptions of monthly and quarterly accounts, which will continue to be routed as at present.

5. District headquarters cities, and the jurisdiction of each district, are as follows:

DISTRICT NO. 1—WICHITA, KANS.

Kansas counties: All counties in Kansas.

DISTRICT NO. 2—OMAHA, NEBR.

Nebraska counties: All counties in Nebraska.

DISTRICT NO. 3—OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Oklahoma counties: All counties in Oklahoma.

6. District Managers will be designated in a separate announcement. They will act for and be responsible to the Regional Operations on post office matters within their Districts. Each District Manager will be responsible for functions delegated to him by the Regional Operations Manager, including such things as: making major operating decisions within his District; recommending action on all supervisory appointments; recommending action on requests for funds; advising Regional Operations Manager on District matters and conditions; carrying out regional policies in the District; interpreting departmental and regional policies and recommending changes; coordinating with other bureaus and government agencies in the District; taking necessary actions on complaints; directing the control of expenditures in the District; and maintaining essential records.

(R. S. 161, 396, as amended; sec. 1 (b), 63 Stat. 1066; 5 U. S. C. 22, 133z-15, 369)

[SEAL] ABE MCGREGOR GOFF,
The Solicitor.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1196; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:47 a. m.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

ALASKA

NOTICE OF PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LANDS

FEBRUARY 7, 1956.

The Department of the Army has filed an application, Serial No. 026009, for the withdrawal of the lands described below, from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws.

The applicant desires the land for use as a Repeater Site for the Alaska Communication System.

For a period of 60 days from the date of publication of this notice, persons having cause may present their objections in writing to the undersigned official of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Box 480, Anchorage, Alaska.

If circumstances warrant it, a public hearing will be held at a convenient time and place, which will be announced.

The determination of the Secretary on the application will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. A separate notice will be sent to each interested party of record.

The lands involved in the application are:

An unsurveyed parcel of land on the south side of the Glenn Highway at approximate mile 105.5 in the vicinity of Sheep Mountain more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the center line of the Glenn Highway at approximate Latitude 61°47'48" North and Longitude 147°40'21" West, said point being at the beginning of a 14° curve to the left at approximate mile 105.5 of the Glenn Highway; thence S. 84°16' E. 1,200 feet; thence South 3,100 feet; thence West 3,600 feet; thence North 3,461.4 feet to a point on the center line of the Glenn Highway; thence S. 84°16' E. along said highway center line 2,418.1 feet to the point of beginning, and containing 271.17 acres, more or less.

L. T. MAIN,
Acting Alaska Operations Supervisor.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1187; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:45 a. m.]

NEVADA

NOTICE OF PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LANDS

FEBRUARY 8, 1956.

The United States Forest Service has filed an application, Serial No. Nevada 043407, for the withdrawal of the lands described below, from location and entry under the General Mining Laws subject to existing valid claims. The applicant desires the land for a recreation area and administrative sites.

For a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this notice, persons having cause may present their objections in writing to the undersigned official of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, P. O. Box 1551, Reno, Nevada.

If circumstances warrant it, a public hearing will be held at a convenient time and place, which will be announced.

The determination of the Secretary on the application will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. A separate notice will be sent to each interested party of record.

The lands involved in the application are within the Toiyabe National Forest and are described below:

MT. DIABLO MERIDIAN, NEVADA

San Juan Administrative Site:
T. 15 N., R. 42 E., unsurveyed,
Sec. 32, E½SE¼.
Acreage: 80, more or less.
Tierney Creek Administrative Site:
T. 14 N., R. 42 E., unsurveyed,
Sec. 28, NW¼NW¼.
Acreage: 40, more or less.
Stoneberger Creek Recreation Area:
T. 15 N., R. 46 E., unsurveyed,
Sec. 22, N½SW¼.
Acreage: 80, more or less.

Total acreage is 200, more or less.

E. R. GREENSLET,
State Supervisor.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1188; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:45 a. m.]

Bureau of Reclamation

RIO GRANDE PROJECT, NEW MEXICO

FIRST FORM RECLAMATION WITHDRAWAL

AUGUST 27, 1953.

Pursuant to authority delegated by Departmental Order No. 2515 of April 7, 1949, I hereby withdraw the following described lands from public entry, under the first form of withdrawal, as provided by section 3 of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388):

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, NEW MEXICO

T. 29 S., R. 4 E.,
Sec. 5, Tract 64.

The above area aggregates 0.106 acre.

G. W. LINEWEAVER,
Assistant Commissioner.

[65411]

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

I concur. The records of the Bureau of Land Management will be noted accordingly.

EDWARD WOOZLEY,
Director,
Bureau of Land Management.

Notice for Filing Objections to Order Withdrawing Public Lands for the Rio Grande Project, New Mexico

AUGUST 27, 1953.

Notice is hereby given that for a period of 30 days from the date of this notice, persons having cause to object to the terms of the above order withdrawing certain public lands in the State of New Mexico, for use in connection with Relocation of the Wasteway of the Montoya Lateral—Right of Way, Rio Grande Project, may present their objections to the Secretary of the Interior. Such objections should be in writing, should be addressed to the Secretary of the Interior, and should be filed in duplicate in the Department of the Interior, Washington 25, D. C.

In case any objection is filed and the nature of the opposition is such as to warrant it, a public hearing will be held at a convenient time and place, which will be announced, where opponents to the order may state their views and where the proponents of the order can explain its purpose, intent, and extent. Should any objection be filed, notice of the determination by the Secretary as to whether the order should be rescinded, modified or let stand will be given to all interested parties of record and the general public.

G. W. LINEWEAVER,
Assistant Commissioner.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1190; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:46 a. m.]

Office of the Secretary

THREE AFFILIATED TRIBES OF FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

FEDERAL INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS

Pursuant to the act of August 15, 1953 (Pub. Law 277, 83d Cong., 1st Sess.), I certify that the following ordinance re-

lating to the application of the Federal Indian liquor laws on the Fort Berthold Reservation was duly adopted by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation which have jurisdiction over the area of Indian country included in the resolution:

Whereas the State of North Dakota at the last session of its 1955 Legislature have amended the State statute repealing the prohibition of sale of intoxicating beverages to Indians effective July 1st 1955, and

Whereas Public Law 277, 83d Congress, approved August 15, 1953, provided that sections 1154, 1156, 3113, 3488 and 3618 of title 18, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Federal Indian liquor laws, shall not apply to any act or transaction within any area of Indian country provided such act or transaction is in conformity with both the laws of the State in which such act or transaction occurs and with an ordinance duly adopted by the tribe having jurisdiction over such area of Indian country, certified by the Secretary of the Interior, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Now therefore be it resolved, that the Tribal Business Council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation North Dakota hereby resolved that the introduction, sale or possession of intoxicating beverages shall be lawful within the Indian country under the jurisdiction of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation. *Provided*, That such introduction, sale or possession is in conformity with the laws of State of North Dakota and in conformity with Ordinances of this tribe hereafter enacted.

Be is further resolved, that any tribal laws, including Fort Berthold Tribal Code, resolutions or ordinances heretofore enacted which prohibited the sale, introduction or possession of intoxicating beverages are hereby repealed.

Further resolved, that copy of this resolution be published in the Fort Berthold Agency News Bulletin for purpose of binding the approval of the people unless otherwise being subject to referendum under Article VIII of the Constitution of the Fort Berthold Reservation.

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 10, 1956.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1191; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:46 a. m.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Stabilization Service

UPLAND COTTON, 1956 CROP

NOTICE OF REDELEGATION OF FINAL AUTHORITY OF STATE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

Section 722.729 (b) of the Regulations Pertaining to Acreage Allotments for the 1956 Crop of Upland Cotton (20 F. R. 8247) issued pursuant to the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1376), provides that any authority delegated to a State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee by the regulations in §§ 722.717 to 722.729 (a), inclusive, may be redelegated by the State Committee. In accordance with section 3 (a) (1) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1002 (a)), which requires delegations of final authority to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, there are set out herein the redelegations which have been made by State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees of final authority vested in such committees by the Secretary of Agriculture in the regulations refererd to above. These redelegations are in addition to those contained in the notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on December 22, 1955 (20 F. R. 9870). Shown below are the sections of the regulations in which such authority appears and the persons, designated by name or by title, to whom the authority has been redelegated:

ALABAMA

Section 722.729 (a)—James C. Bailey, Program Specialist.

NORTH CAROLINA

Section 722.718 (f) (2)—J. L. Nicholson, Chief, Marketing Quota Section.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Section 722.729 (a)—State Administrative Officer or Acting State Administrative Officer and A. R. Crawford, Program Specialist.

(Sec. 375, 52 Stat. 66, as amended; 7 U. S. C. 1375. Interpret or apply secs. 301, 342-347, 361-368, 373, 374, 388, 52 Stat. 38, 56-59, 62-65, 68; 7 U. S. C. 1301, 1342-1347, 1361-1368, 1373, 1374, 1388)

Issued at Washington, D. C., this 13th day of February 1956.

[SEAL] EARL M. HUGHES,
Administrator.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1208; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:50 a. m.]

PEANUTS

NOTICE OF REDELEGATION OF FINAL AUTHORITY BY THE TENNESSEE STATE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

Section 729.731 of the Marketing Quota Regulations for the 1956 Crop of Peanuts (20 F. R. 6033), issued pursuant to the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1393), provides that any authority delegated to the State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee by the regulations may be redelegated by the State Committee. In accordance with section 3 (a) (1) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1002 (a)), which requires delegations of final authority to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, there are set out herein the redelegations of final authority which have been made by the Tennessee State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of authority vested in such committee by the Secretary of Agriculture in the regulations referred to above. Shown below are the sections of the regulations in which such authority appears and the persons to whom the authority has been redelegated:

TENNESSEE

Sections 729.710 through 729.731—State Administrative Officer or Acting State Administrative Officer and Program Specialist in Charge of Peanut Acreage Allotment and Marketing Quota Work, of the Office of the State ASC Committee.

(52 Stat. 66, 7 U. S. C. 1375; Rev. Stat. 161, 5 U. S. C. 22; 67 Stat. 633, 18 F. R. 3219; 19 F. R. 74. Interpret and/or apply 52 Stat. 38, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68; 55 Stat. 88; 66 Stat. 27; 7 U. S. C. 1301, 1358, 1359, 1361-1368, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1376, 1388)

Issued at Washington, D. C., this 10th day of February 1956.

[SEAL] WALTER C. BERGER,
Acting Administrator,
Commodity Stabilization Service.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1209; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:50 a. m.]

PEANUTS

NOTICE OF REDELEGATION OF FINAL AUTHORITY BY THE OKLAHOMA STATE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

Section 729.731 of the Marketing Quota Regulations for the 1956 Crop of Peanuts (20 F. R. 6033), issued pursuant to the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1301-1393), provides that any authority delegated to the State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee by the regulations may be redelegated by the State Committee. In accordance with section 3 (a) (1) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1002 (a)), which requires delegations of final authority to be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, there are set out herein the redelegations of final authority which have been made by the Oklahoma State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of authority vested in such committee by the Secretary of Agriculture in the regulations referred to above. Shown below are the sections of the regulations in which such authority appears and the persons to whom the authority has been redelegated:

OKLAHOMA

Sections 729.710 to 729.731—Samuel A. Shelby, Chief, Program Specialist Staff (Production Adjustment), and Marvin E. Taylor, Program Specialist (Production Adjustment), of the Office of the State ASC Committee.

(52 Stat. 66, 7 U. S. C. 1375; Rev. Stat. 161, 5 U. S. C. 22; 67 Stat. 633, 18 F. R. 3219; 19 F. R. 74. Interpret and/or apply 52 Stat. 38, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68; 55 Stat. 88; 66 Stat. 27; 7 U. S. C. 1301, 1358, 1359, 1361-1368, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1376, 1388)

Issued at Washington, D. C., this 10th day of February 1956.

[SEAL] WALTER C. BERGER,
Acting Administrator,
Commodity Stabilization Service.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1210; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:50 a. m.]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. G-3664, G-9045, G-9046]

MCCARTHY OIL AND GAS CORP.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING

FEBRUARY 8, 1956.

Upon consideration of the telegraphic request, filed February 7, 1956, by Coun-

sel for McCarthy Oil and Gas Corporation for postponement of the hearing now scheduled for February 14, 1956, in the above-designated matter:

The hearing now scheduled for February 14, 1956, is postponed to a date to be hereafter fixed by further notice.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1192; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:46 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-3123]

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE COMPANY OF AMERICA

ORDER GRANTING MOTION AND RECONVENING HEARING

Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (Natural) on January 13, 1956, filed with the Commission a motion for leave to present additional direct evidence "in order that the record in this proceeding may fully disclose that the price assigned to the gas produced by it from its reserves in the West Panhandle Field of Texas to encourage the exploration, development and ownership of gas reserves by Natural is in the public interest."

In support of the motion, Natural states that it had presented its direct evidence in justification of the rates in issue in this proceeding; that the hearing had been recessed to a time to be fixed by further order of the Commission; that subsequent to Natural's presentation of its evidence relating to the price to be allowed for gas produced by Natural, in accordance with the Commission's Opinion No. 269 and accompanying order issued in the matter of Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, et al., Docket Nos. G-1116, et al., the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in City of Detroit, et al. v. Federal Power Commission, et al. (decided December 15, 1955) reviewed Opinion No. 269 and remanded it to the Commission for further proceedings; and that said decision would appear to require further evidence, in addition to that heretofore presented by Natural.

Natural asserts that it is endeavoring to prepare such additional evidence for presentation at the earliest possible date, but in view of prior urgent commitments of personnel responsible for its preparation Natural urges that the hearing shall not be reconvened until on or after March 26, 1956. Natural states that it intends to prepare and serve such additional direct testimony, and any exhibits relating thereto, upon the parties to the proceeding pursuant to § 1.20 (h) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.20 (h)) on or about February 28, 1956.

The City of Chicago, an intervener herein, on January 25, 1956, filed a protest to the aforesaid motion.

Upon consideration of the motion and the protest thereto, the Commission finds: It is appropriate and proper and in the public interest that the motion of Natural be granted.

The Commission orders:

(A) The motion filed by Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America for leave to present additional direct evidence relating to the price to be allowed for natural gas produced by the company from its reserves in the West Panhandle Field of Texas, and for no other purpose whatsoever, be and it is hereby granted: *Provided, however*, That Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America shall on or before February 28, 1956, serve upon the parties to this proceeding, including Staff counsel, all direct testimony, and any exhibits relating thereto, pursuant to the provisions of § 1.20 (h) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.20 (h)).

(B) The hearing in this proceeding be reconvened on March 26, 1956, at 10:00 a. m., e. s. t., in a hearing room of the Federal Power Commission, 441 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Adopted: February 8, 1956.

Issued: February 10, 1956.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1193; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:47 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-6214 etc.]

VAN LEWIS ET AL.

NOTICE OF FINDINGS AND ORDER

FEBRUARY 9, 1956.

In the matters of Van Lewis, Docket No. G-6214; Van Lewis, Attorney in Fact, for Henrietta Yeager Jones, Docket No. G-6215; Nancy Lewis Welch, et al., Docket No. G-6218; R. D. McDonald, Jr., Docket No. G-6902.

Notice is hereby given that on January 16, 1956, the Federal Power Commission issued its findings and order adopted January 11, 1956, issuing certificates of public convenience and necessity in the above-entitled matters.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1194; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:47 a. m.]

[Docket No. G-6491 etc.]

HENRY I. SCHOBER ET AL.

NOTICE OF FINDINGS AND ORDERS

FEBRUARY 9, 1956.

In the matters of Henry I. Schober and T. A. Williams, Docket No. G-6491; Ben F. Brack, et al., Docket No. G-6919; R. T. Boteler, Docket No. G-8646; Evon A. Ford, Docket No. G-8650; Sun Oil Company (Southwest Division), Docket No. G-8683; James F. Borthwick, Jr., Docket No. G-8740; Roy H. Bettis, G. Frederick Shepherd, W. B. Shriver, and John L. Loeb, Docket No. G-8744; Jack W. Grigsby, Docket No. G-8796; Gulf Oil Corporation, Docket No. G-8852; Pubco Development, Inc (N. S. L.), Docket No. G-9140; Phillips Petroleum Company, Docket No. G-9172; J. M. Flaitz & R. B. Mitchell, Docket No. G-9324.

Notice is hereby given that on January 13, 1956, the Federal Power Commission issued its findings and orders adopted January 11, 1956, issuing certificates of public convenience and necessity in the above-entitled matters.

[SEAL] LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary.

[F. R. Doc. 56-1195; Filed, Feb. 15, 1956; 8:47 a. m.]