federal register

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1973

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Volume 38 ■ Number 45

Pages 6269–6360

PART I

(Part II begins on page 6339)

HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS ISSUE

This listing does not affect the legal status of any document published in this issue. Detailed table of contents appears inside.

(Continued inside)

REMINDERS

(The items in these lists were editorially compiled as an aid to FEDERAL REGISTER users. Inclusion or exclusion from these lists has no legal significance. Since these lists are intended as reminders, they do not include effective dates, comment deadlines, or hearing dates that occur within 14 days of publication.)

Rules Going into Effect Today

federal register

Area Code 202 Phone 962–8626

Published daily, Monday through Friday (no publication on Saturdays, Sundays, or on official Federal holidays), by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20408, under the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C., Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The FEDERAL REGISTER provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive orders and Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by Act of Congress and other Federal agency documents of public interest.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $2.50 per month or $25 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies is 20 cents for each issue, or 20 cents for each group of pages as actually bound. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

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

Contents

(*Continued on next page*)

List of CFR Parts Affected

The following numerical guide is a list of the parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in today's issue. A cumulative list of parts affected, covering the current month to date, appears following the Notices section of each issue beginning with the second issue of the month. In the last issue of the month the cumulative list will appear at the end of the issue.

A cumulative guide is published separately at the end of each month. The guide lists the parts and sections affected by documents published since January 1, 1973, and specifies how they are affected.

Rules and Regulations

Title 9—Animals and Animal Products

CHAPTER I—ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCHAPTER D—EXPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF ANIMALS (INCLUDING POULTRY) AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

PART 94—RINDERPEST, FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, FOWL PEST (FOWL PLAGUE), NEWCASTLE DISEASE (AVIAN PNEUMOENCEPHALITIS), AFRICAN SWINE FEVER, AND HOG CHOLERA: PROHIBITED AND RESTRICTED IMPORTATIONS

Restrictions on Importation of Pork and Pork Products From Certain Countries

Correction

In FR Doc. 73-2901 appearing on page 4384 in the issue of Wednesday, February 14, 1973, the headings should read as set forth above.

Title 13—Business Credit and Assistance

CHAPTER IV—EMERGENCY LOAN GUARANTEE BOARD

PART 402—RULES REGARDING AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION

Part 402 to Chapter IV of Title 13 reflects the rules and procedures adopted by the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board to comply with the requirements of making information available under the Public Information Act.

1. Effective February 21, 1973, Title 13 is amended by adding a new Part 402 to Chapter IV as follows:

Sec.
402.1 Basis.
402.2 Definition.
402.3 Published information.
402.4 Access to records.
402.5 Exemptions from disclosure.

AUTHORITY: 5 U.S.C. 552.

§ 402.1 Basis.

This part is issued by the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board (the "Board") pursuant to the requirements of section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code, including the requirements that every Federal agency shall publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER, for the guidance of the public, descriptions of the established places at which, the officers from whom, and the methods whereby, the public may obtain information, make submittals or requests, or obtain decisions.

§ 402.2 Definition.

"Records of the Board." For purposes of this part, the term "records of the Board" means rules, statements, opinions, orders, memoranda, letters, reports, accounts, and other papers containing information in the possession of the Board that constitute part of the Board's official files.

§ 402.3 Published information.

(a) *"Federal Register."* To the extent required by sections 552 and 553 of title 5 of the United States Code, and subject to the provisions of § 402.5, the Board publishes in the FEDERAL REGISTER for the guidance of the public, in addition to this part, descriptions of its organization and procedures, substantive rules of general applicability, statements of general policy, and interpretations of general applicability. Because of the nature of its functions pursuant to the Emergency Loan Guarantee Act of August 9, 1971 (Public Law 92-70) (the "Act"), the Board normally does not issue any substantive rules of general applicability, statements of general policy, or interpretations of general applicability.

(b) *Annual report.* As required by section 12 of the Act, the Board submits to the Congress annually a full report of its operations under the Act and such report is made public immediately after its submission to the Congress.

(c) *Other published information.* From time to time, the Board issues statements to the press relating to its operations.

(d) *Obtaining published information.* If not otherwise available through the Government Printing Office, published information released by the Board may be obtained without cost from the Secretary of the Board, Main Treasury Building, Washington, D.C. 20220.

§ 402.4 Access to records.

(a) *General rule.* All records of the Board, including information set forth in section 552(a)(2) of title 5 of the United States Code, are made available to any person, upon request, for inspection and copying in accordance with the provisions of this section and subject to the limitations stated in § 402.5. Records falling within the exemptions from disclosure set forth in section 552(b) of title 5 of the United States Code and in § 402.5 may nevertheless be made available in accordance with this section to the fullest extent consistent, in the Board's judgment, with the effective performance of the Board's statutory responsibilities and with the avoidance of injury to a public or private person intended to be protected by such exemptions.

(b) *Obtaining access to records.* Records of the Board subject to this section are available by appointment for public inspection or copying during regular business hours on regular business days at the office of the secretary of the Board. Every request for access to such records, other than published records described in § 402.3, shall be submitted in writing to the secretary of the Board, shall state the name and address of the person requesting such access, and shall describe such records in a manner reasonably sufficient to permit their identification without undue difficulty; and such person shall pay a fee in an amount based upon $5 per hour for the time required to locate such records and prepare them for inspection, plus 10 cents per standard page for any copying thereof. For making available a record by mail an appropriate fee will be charged to cover the cost of postage and any packaging or special handling.

§ 402.5 Exemptions from disclosure.

(a) *General rule.* Except as otherwise provided in this part or as may be specifically authorized by the Board, information in the records of the Board that has not been published in accordance with § 402.3 and is determined by the secretary of the Board, subject to the appeal provided in § 402.6, is not available to the public through other sources will not be made available for inspection and copying if such information is exempted from required disclosure by the provisions of section 552(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) *Deletion of identifying details.* Before any records are made available under § 402.4(a) any identifying details the disclosure of which would be an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy will be deleted by the secretary of the Board and justification therefor will be made in writing.

(c) *Prohibition against disclosure.* Except as provided in this part, no officer, employee, or agent of the Board shall disclose or permit the disclosure of any exempt information, as defined in § 402.5(a) or § 402.5(b), of the Board to anyone (other than an officer, employee, or agent of the Board properly entitled to such information for the performance of his official duties), whether by giving out or furnishing such information or a copy thereof or by allowing any person to inspect or copy such information or copy thereof, or otherwise.

§ 402.6 Appeal.

(a) Any person denied access to records requested under § 402.4 may within 30 days after notification of such denial,

file an appeal to the Executive Director of the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board. Such an appeal shall be in writing addressed to the Executive Director of the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board, c/o The Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C. 20220. The appeal shall provide the name and address of the appellant, the identification of the record denied, and the dates of the original request and its denial.

(b) The appeal will be promptly considered. The granting or denial of the request upon appeal shall constitute final agency action.

2a. This action is taken pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code.

b. The provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, relating to notice and public participation and to deferred effective dates, are not followed in connection with the adoption of this action, because the rules involved are procedural in nature and accordingly do not constitute substantive rules subject to the requirements of such section.

Dated: February 26, 1973.

TIMOTHY G. GREENE,
Secretary, Emergency Loan Guarantee Board.

[FR Doc.73-4469 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Title 14—Aeronautics and Space

CHAPTER I—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. 11802; Amdt. 61-60]

PART 61—CERTIFICATION: PILOTS AND FLIGHT INSTRUCTORS

Miscellaneous Amendments; Correction

The purpose of this correction is to supply language inadvertently omitted from the lead-in statement in § 61.87(d) of Amendment 61-60 published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on February 1, 1973 (38 FR 3156), to become effective November 1, 1973. The correction is consistent with the proposal in Notice 72-9.

Accordingly, the lead-in statement in paragraph (d) of § 61.87 of Amendment 61-60, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on February 1, 1973 (38 FR 3172; FR Doc. 73-1899), is corrected to read as follows:

§ 61.87 Requirements for solo flight.

* * * * *

(d) *Flight instructor endorsements.* A student pilot may not operate an aircraft in solo flight unless his student pilot certificate is endorsed, and unless within the preceding 90 days his pilot logbook has been endorsed, by an authorized flight instructor who—

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 1, 1973.

J. H. SHAFFER,
Administrator.

[FR Doc.73-4410 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Airspace Docket No. 72-NW-27]

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS, AREA LOW ROUTES, CONTROLLED AIRSPACE, AND REPORTING POINTS

Alteration of Transition Area

On January 19, 1973, a notice of proposed rule making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 1938) stating that the Federal Aviation Administration was considering an amendment to Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations that would alter the description of the Bellingham, Wash., transition area.

Interested persons were given 30 days in which to submit written comments. No objections to the proposed amendment were received.

In consideration of the foregoing, the proposed amendment is hereby adopted without change.

Effective date. This amendment shall be effective 0901 G.m.t., May 24, 1973.

(Sec. 307(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 49 U.S.C. 1348(a); sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in Seattle, Wash., on February 28, 1973.

C. B. WALK, Jr.,
Director, Northwest Region.

In § 71.181 (38 FR 435) the description of the Bellingham, Wash., transition area is amended as follows:

To the text add, "and within 3.5 miles north and 8 miles south of the 288° bearing from Lummi NDB (latitude 48°47'-38'' N.; longitude 122°32'08'' W.) extending from the NDB 11.5 miles west of the NDB."

[FR Doc.73-4411 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Airspace Docket No. 72-NW-26]

PART 71—DESIGNATION OF FEDERAL AIRWAYS, AREA LOW ROUTES, CONTROLLED AIRSPACE, AND REPORTING POINTS

Alteration of Transition Area

On January 17, 1973, a notice of proposed rule making was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (38 FR 1644) stating that the Federal Aviation Administration was considering an amendment to Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations that would alter the description of the Idaho Falls, Idaho, transition area.

Interested persons were given 30 days in which to submit written comments. No objections to the proposed amendment were received.

In consideration of the foregoing, the proposed amendment is hereby adopted without change.

Effective date. This amendment shall be effective 0901 G.m.t. May 24, 1973.

(Sec. 307(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1968, as amended, 49 U.S.C. 1348(a); sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in Seattle, Wash., on February 28, 1973.

C. B. WALK, Jr.,
Director, Northwest Region.

In § 71.181 (38 FR 435) the description of the Idaho Falls, Idaho, transition area is amended as follows:

In line 2 of the text, delete, "* * * extending from 21.5 miles northeast * * *" and substitute therefor, "* * * extending from 25.5 miles northeast * * *"

[FR Doc.73-4412 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Docket No. 12573; Amdt. No. 854]

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

Miscellaneous Amendments

This amendment to Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations incorporates by reference therein changes and additions to the Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAP's) that were recently adopted by the Administrator to promote safety at the airports concerned.

The complete SIAP's for the changes and additions covered by this amendment are described in FAA Forms 3139, 8260-3, 8260-4, or 8260-5 and made a part of the public rule making dockets of the FAA in accordance with the procedures set forth in Amendment No. 97-696 (35 FR 5609).

SIAP's are available for examination at the Rules Docket and at the National Flight Data Center, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591. Copies of SIAP's adopted in a particular region are also available for examination at the headquarters of that region. Individual copies of SIAP's may be purchased from the FAA Public Document Inspection Facility, HQ-405, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591, or from the applicable FAA regional office in accordance with the fee schedule prescribed in 49 CFR 7.85. This fee is payable in advance and may be paid by check, draft, or postal money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States. A weekly transmittal of all SIAP changes and additions may be obtained by subscription at an annual rate of $150 per annum from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Additional copies mailed to the same address may be ordered for $30 each.

Since a situation exists that requires immediate adoption of this amendment, I find that further notice and public procedure hereon is impracticable and good cause exists for making it effective in less than 30 days.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended as follows, effective on the dates specified:

1. Section 97.23 is amended by originating, amending, or canceling the following VOR-VOR/DME SIAP's effective March 22, 1973.

Mosinee, Wis.—Central Wisconsin Airport, VOR-A, Amdt. 1.

* * * effective March 15, 1973.

New Castle, Ind.—New Castle-Henry County Municipal Sky Castle Airport, VOR Runway 27, Original.

* * * effective February 27, 1973.

Valdosta, Ga.—Valdosta Municipal Airport, VOR Runway 35, Amdt. 20.

2. Section 97.25 is amended by originating, amending, or canceling the following SDF–LOC–LDA SIAP's effective March 22, 1973.

Mosinee, Wis.—Central Wisconsin Airport, LOC Runway 8, Original.
Mosinee, Wis.—Central Wisconsin Airport, LOC (BC) Runway 26, Original.
Philadelphia, Pa.—Philadelphia International Airport, LOC (BC) Runway 27R, Original.

* * * effective February 22, 1973.

Christiansted, St. Croix, V.I.—Alexander Hamilton Airport, LOC Runway 9, Amdt. 1.

3. Section 97.27 is amended by originating, amending, or canceling the following NDB/ADF SIAP's effective April 19, 1973.

Youngstown, Ohio—Lansdowne Airport, NDB–A, Amdt. 3.

* * * effective February 22, 1973.

Christiansted, St. Croix, V.I.—Alexander Hamilton Airport, NDB Runway 9, Amdt. 1.

4. Section 97.29 is amended by originating, amending, or canceling the following ILS SIAP's effective February 23, 1973.

Lebanon, N.H.—Lebanon Regional Airport, ILS Runway 7, Amdt. 1.

* * * effective February 22, 1973.

Pontiac, Mich.—Oakland-Pontiac Airport, ILS Runway 9, Amdt. 1.

(Secs. 307, 313, 601, 1110, Federal Aviation Act of 1958; 49 U.S.C. 1438, 1354, 1421, 1510; sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c) and 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(1))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 1, 1973.

C. R. MELUGIN, Jr.,
Acting Director,
Flight Standards Service.

NOTE: Incorporation by reference provisions in §§ 97.10 and 97.20 (35 FR 5610) approved by the Director of the Federal Register on May 12, 1969.

[FR Doc.73–4413 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

Title 17—Commodity and Securities Exchanges

CHAPTER II—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34–10020]

PART 240—GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS, SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

Continued Suspension of Exempted Securities

On January 30, 1973, in Securities Exchange Release No. 9974 (38 FR 4401), the Commission suspended the operation of paragraph (m) of Rule 15c3–3 under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934[1] as to sell orders for exempted securities (e.g., U.S. Government and municipal obligations) until March 1, 1973, and requested comments of interested persons by February 20, 1973, regarding the operational problems encountered by customers in making deliveries of exempted securities within the designated time frame of paragraph (m). It was stated in Release No. 9974, that it had been represented to the Commission that the application of paragraph (m) to exempted securities may create operational hardships with respect to the delivery of exempted securities, and, in this connection, the Commission had been requested to reconsider the applicability of the rule with respect to exempted securities, particularly with regard to paragraph (m).

The Commission has received numerous comments on the operational problems encountered by applying paragraph (m) to exempted securities. As most of these comments were received on or around February 20, the Commission is still in the process of reviewing them. As it does not appear that this review will be completed by March 1, the Commission has determined to continue the suspension of the operation of paragraph (m) as to sell orders for exempted securities until April 10, 1973. After reviewing the comments, the Commission will set forth its views on this matter.

Broker-dealers are reminded that paragraph (m) remains in effect as to sale transactions by all customers, including financial institutions, with regard to all securities other than exempted securities.

The continued suspension of paragraph (m) with regard to exempted securities relieves a restriction within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 553(d) and is effective March 1, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT,
Secretary.

MARCH 1, 1973.

[FR Doc.73–4458 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

[1] Paragraph (m) of Rule 15c3–3 requires that if a broker-dealer executes a sell order for a customer and if for any reason the broker-dealer has not obtained possession of the securities from the customer within 10 business days after settlement date, the broker-dealer shall immediately thereafter close the transaction by purchasing securities of like kind and quantity.

Title 26—Internal Revenue

CHAPTER I—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SUBCHAPTER A—INCOME TAX

[T.D. 7265]

PART 1—INCOME TAX; TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1953

Percentage To Be Used by Foreign Life Insurance Companies in Computing Income Tax for the Taxable Year 1972 and Estimated Tax for the Taxable Year 1973

This document contains the proclamation of the Secretary of the Treasury of a percentage to be used in determining a "minimum figure" for each foreign corporation carrying on a life insurance business, as provided for under section 819 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (see 26 CFR 1.819).

Where this minimum figure exceeds such a corporation's surplus held in the United States, the amount of the "policy and other contract liability requirements" (determined under section 805 without regard to section 819), and the amount of the "required interest" (determined under section 809(a) without regard to section 819), must each be reduced by an amount determined by multiplying such excess by the "current earnings rate" (as defined in section 805(b)(2)).

It is hereby determined that for purposes of computing the 1972 income tax for foreign corporations carrying on a life insurance business a percentage of 15.1 shall be used in determining the "minimum figure" under section 819.

It is presently anticipated that the data with respect to domestic life insurance companies for 1972 required for the computation of the percentage to be used by foreign corporations carrying on a life insurance business in computing their estimated tax for the taxable year 1973 will not be available in time for the filing of the declaration of estimated tax for such taxable year. Accordingly, it is hereby determined that for purposes of computing the estimated tax for the taxable year 1973 and payments of installments thereof by such corporation a percentage of 15.1 (the percentage applicable for 1972) shall be used in determining the minimum figure under section 819. No additions to tax shall be made because of any underpayment of estimated tax for the taxable year 1973 which results solely from the use of this percentage.

Because the percentage announced in this Treasury decision is computed from information contained in the income tax returns of domestic life insurance companies for the year 1971, which are not open to public inspection, the public accordingly cannot effectively participate in the determination of such figure. Therefore, it is found that it is unnecessary to issue this Treasury decision with notice and public procedure thereon under subsection (b) of 5 U.S.C. 553 or subject to the effective date limitation of subsection (d) of that section.

[SEAL] FREDERIC W. HICKMAN,
Assistant Secretary
of the Treasury.

MARCH 3, 1973.

[FR Doc.73–4504 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

[T.D. 7264]

PART 12—TEMPORARY INCOME TAX REGULATIONS UNDER THE REVENUE ACT OF 1971

Transfer to a DISC of Assets of Export Trade Corporation

This document contains amendments to § 12.5 of the Income Tax Regulations, which was promulgated in 26 CFR Part 12 and published in 37 FR 26007 for December 7, 1972, in order to conform the regulations to section 505 of the Revenue Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 551).

Under section 505(c) of the Revenue Act of 1971, no corporation may qualify as an export trade corporation unless it qualified prior to October 31, 1971. Section 505(b) provides for a tax-free transfer of the business of an existing export trade corporation to a DISC without the need of complying with section 367 and the other provisions of sections 354 through 368 of the Internal Revenue

Code. Section 12.5 of the Income Tax Regulations, which is hereby amended, provides rules for the transfer, including an indirect transfer, to a DISC of assets of an export trade corporation under section 505.

The amendments to § 12.5 contained herein clarify the applicability of such rules to transactions in which there is integrally involved the transfer of stock of the export trade corporation as well as a transfer of its assets. If the export trade corporation does not receive consideration for the stock or assets, then, with one possible exception, no gain or loss shall be recognized by, and no constructive dividend shall be included under section 301 of the Internal Revenue Code in the gross income of, the DISC, the export trade corporation, or their common parent by reason of the transaction.

The one exception is that if a party other than the export trade corporation receives consideration for the transfer of stock the rules of § 12.5 and section 505 do not prevent the recognition of so much of the gain realized by such party as is solely attributable to receiving such consideration and do not prevent the attribution of such recognized gain to the common parent. The amount of such gain is not adjusted by reason of section 482 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Amendments to the regulations. In order to clarify the applicability of section 505 of the Revenue Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 551) and § 12.5 of the Income Tax Regulations (26 CFR Part 12) to certain transactions involving the transfer to a DISC of stock and assets of an export trade corporation, paragraphs (a) and (b) of § 12.5 are hereby amended to read as follows:

§ 12.5 Transfer to a DISC of assets of export trade corporation.

(a) *In general.* (1) Section 505 of the Revenue Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 551) permits, subject to certain adjustments, certain tax-free transactions involving a transfer of property by an export trade corporation (as defined in section 971) to a DISC (as defined in section 992(a)).

(2) For purposes of this section, all statutory references are to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 except that references to section 505 are to the Revenue Act of 1971. All terms used in this section shall have the same meaning as when used in such Code.

(b) *Direct, indirect, and other transfers.* (1) Under section 505(b)(1), if during a taxable year of an export trade corporation beginning before January 1, 1976, such export trade corporation without receiving consideration directly transfers property to a DISC, if all of the oustanding stock of each of such corporations is owned by a common parent, and if certain other conditions are met, then, among other consequences enumerated in section 505, notwithstanding section 367 or any other provision of Chapter 1 of the Code, no gain or loss shall be recognized by, and no constructive dividend shall be includible in the gross income of the export trade corporation, the parent, or the DISC by reason of such transaction. If, instead of a direct transfer from the export trade corporation to the DISC, the parties enter into an indirect transfer in which the property is distributed by the export trade corporation to the parent without receiving consideration and immediately thereafter is transferred by the parent to the DISC, then for purposes of section 505(b) the transaction will be treated as a direct transfer by the export trade corporation to the DISC, but only if—

(i) It is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner or his delegate that such indirect transfer of the property was carried out for bona fide business reasons, and

(ii) Each U.S. person (as defined in section 7701(a)(30)) which is a party to the indirect transfer enters into a closing agreement under section 7121 which provides that each of the tax consequences enumerated in section 505(b) shall apply.

(2) Subparagraph (1) of this paragraph shall apply also to:

(i) Any other indirect transfer of property of the export trade corporation to the DISC if section 505 would be applicable to a direct transfer of such property by the export trade corporation to the DISC, and

(ii) Any transaction as a part of which the stock of the export trade corporation is transferred to the DISC prior to a direct transfer of the property of the export trade corporation to the DISC,

if all of the parties to such indirect transfer or transaction meet the 100 percent stock ownership requirement set forth in paragraph (c) of this section.

(3) A transaction described in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph includes any transaction in which the common parent or its wholly owned subsidiary acquires the stock of the export trade corporation without any consideration paid directly or indirectly to the export trade corporation. Thus, except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, no gain or loss is recognized by, and no constructive dividend is includable under section 301 in the gross income of, the export trade corporation, the common parent, or the DISC by reason of such transaction. If, in exchange for such transfer of stock, a party, other than the export trade corporation, receives consideration and realizes gain, then subparagraph (1) of this paragraph and section 505 do not apply with respect to the amount realized by such party (determined without regard to section 482) and thus do not prevent recognition of such gain and, for example, the application of section 951 to the parent of such party with respect to such gain.

* * * * *

Because of the need for immediate guidance with respect to the provisions contained in this Treasury decision, it is found impracticable to issue it with notice and public procedure thereon under subsection (b) of section 553 of title 5 of the United States Code or subject to the effective date limitation of subsection (d) of that section.

(Sec. 7805, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, 68A Stat. 917; 26 U.S.C. 7805)

[SEAL] JOHNNIE M. WALTERS,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Approved: March 3, 1973.

FREDERIC W. HICKMAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[FR Doc.73-4503 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Title 29—Labor

CHAPTER V—WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

PART 511—WAGE ORDER PROCEDURE FOR PUERTO RICO, THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND AMERICAN SAMOA

Compensation of Committee Members

Pursuant to authority in section 5 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1062, as amended; 29 U.S.C. 205) and Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1950 (3 CFR 1949–53 Comp., p. 1004), I hereby amend 29 CFR 511.4 to read as set forth below. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the compensation of each member of an industry committee from $90 to $95 for each day spent in the work of the committee.

As this amendment concerns only a rule of agency practice, and is not substantive, notice of proposed rule making, opportunity for public participation, and delay in effective date are not required by 5 U.S.C. 553. It does not appear that such participation or delay would serve a useful purpose. Accordingly, this revision shall be effective immediately.

§ 511.4 Compensation of committee members.

Each member of an industry committee will be allowed a per diem of $95 for each day actually spent in the work of the committee, and will, in addition, be reimbursed for necessary transportation and other expense incident to traveling in accordance with Standard Government Travel Regulations then in effect. All travel expenses will be paid on travel vouchers certified by the Administrator or his authorized representative. Any other necessary expenses which are incidental to the work of the committee may be incurred by the committee upon approval of, and shall be paid upon certification of, the Administrator or his authorized representative.

(Sec. 5, 52 Stat. 1062, as amended; 29 U.S.C. 205)

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 2d day of March 1973.

BEN P. ROBERTSON,
Acting Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, United States Department of Labor.

[FR Doc.73-4438 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Title 32—National Defense

CHAPTER XVI—SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

PART 1661—CLASSIFICATION OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Types of Decisions; Correction

The cross-reference in § 1661.10(a)(2) line 5, that appeared in FR Doc. 72-22438 (37 FR 28900 (December 30, 1972)) should read §§ 1661.3 and 1661.4.

BYRON V. PEPITONE,
Acting Director.

MARCH 5, 1973.

[FR Doc.73-4477 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Title 40—Protection of Environment

CHAPTER I—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SUBCHAPTER C—AIR PROGRAMS

PART 52—APPROVAL AND PROMULGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Maintenance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards

On April 30, 1971, pursuant to section 109 of the Clean Air Act, as amended, the Administrator promulgated national primary and secondary ambient air quality standards for six pollutants. The Act requires that the primary standards protect the public health with an adequate margin of safety and that the secondary standards protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse affects. Under section 110 of the Act, States are required to prepare and submit to the Administrator plans for implementing the national ambient air quality standards in each air quality control region in the State. The Administrator published on May 31, 1972, his initial approvals and disapprovals of the State implementation plans developed and submitted under these provisions of Federal law.

On January 31, 1973, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit decided the case of "Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., et al. v. Environmental Protection Agency" (Civil Action No. 72-1522) and seven other related cases. The Court's order required the Administrator to review within 30 days from the date of the order the maintenance provisions of all State implementation plans that were approved on May 31. The Administrator was directed to disapprove plans "which do not provide for measures necessary to insure the maintenance of the primary standard after May 31, 1975, and those plans which do not analyze the problem of maintenance of standards in a manner consistent with applicable regulations * * *."

The Administrator has completed his review as required by the court order. This further examination of State plans confirmed that no State plan contained adequate growth projections for any significant period of time into the future. Moreover, it is recognized that maintenance of standards cannot be insured simply by projecting future growth and curtailing present emissions in order to provide opportunities for this future growth of emission sources. Since the plans must provide for maintenance of the standards over an indefinite period of time, it is the Administrator's determination that the most practical manner in which to adequately and effectively provide for maintenance of the standards at this time is to require State plans to contain procedures by which each State will review a wide range of new sources and causes of air pollution and will have the authority to prevent the development of such sources or causes where necessary to insure that the standards are maintained.

Maintenance is partially insured by the provisions of 40 CFR 51.18 which require each State plan to have adequate procedures to review, and where necessary prevent, the construction or modification of any stationary source at a location where emissions from that source would result in interference with the attainment or maintenance of a national standard or with the State control strategy. Where State plans were judged inadequate in this respect, the Administrator has promulgated or will promulgate such regulations. In addition, new source performance standards promulgated by the Administrator under section 111 of the Act and motor vehicle emission standards promulgated under section 202 will also serve to mitigate the impact of growth.

However, these measures, by themselves, are not adequate to insure the maintenance of standards, particularly for air pollutants emitted largely by motor vehicles. Nor do they deal with the problem of emissions generated not by the facility being constructed but by sources associated with such facility, including general urban and commercial development. In the Administrator's judgment, it is also necessary to require States to review, and where necessary prevent, the construction of facilities which may result in increased emissions from motor vehicle activity or emissions from stationary sources that could cause or contribute to violations of national ambient air quality standards. Such facilities generally are designated "complex sources." EPA guidelines did not require this and the review of State plans indicates that no State included such a provision in its implementation plan. Accordingly, in order to comply with the court order, it has been determined that all State plans must be disapproved to the extent that they do not contain provisions which will permit the review, and provide the authority to prevent, the construction, modification, or operation of complex sources at a location where emissions associated with such source would result in violation of a national standard or the State's control strategy.

The action taken herein to disapprove State implementation plans with respect to their lack of provisions for review of complex sources is not intended to affect, and should not be construed as affecting, the validity of prior approvals of State plans by the Administrator or prior promulgation of regulations to correct State plan deficiencies. Provisions of approved or promulgated plans remain in effect and are enforceable by the State and/or Federal Government in accordance with the provisions of the Clean Air Act.

The Administrator has also determined that many States' procedures for the review of stationary sources, and the consequent authority to disapprove the construction or modification of any such source where it would interfere with the maintenance of a national standard, contain a variety of exemptions so that certain sources need not be reviewed by the State prior to construction or modification. While such exemptions will not necessarily interfere with the ability of the State to attain the national standards, the exempted sources may, at some time in the future, comprise significant sources of air pollution which should be reviewed in order to insure maintenance of the standards. Accordingly, the Administrator will also set forth a regulation that will specify a limitation on the sources that may be exempted from a new source review procedure.

In order to correct the disapprovals set forth in this document, the Administrator will require States, where necessary, to revise their review procedures for construction or modification of sources. He will also require all States to adopt and submit to him a legally enforceable procedure for reviewing the impact of the construction or modification of a "complex source" and for preventing the construction or modification of such complex source where necessary to attain and maintain a national standard or to prevent interference with the State control strategy. The Administrator will propose amendments to 40 CFR Part 51 which will set forth such requirements. This document is intended to be an advance notice of proposed rule making and will appear at page 6290 of this issue.

The complex source review procedures will also be required as part of the plan for attainment of the standards. EPA is continuing to review the problem of maintenance of standards to determine other techniques or procedures that could be employed by States as part of their plans.

At the present time, the Environmental Protection Agency is preparing draft regulations which will identify the types of facilities to be covered by complex source regulations and some of the factors to be considered in determining the impact that such facilities will have on air quality, as a result of emissions directly from such facilities and from air pollution sources associated with them.

A complex source is generally defined as a facility that has or leads to secondary or adjunctive activity which emits or may emit a pollutant for which there is a national standard. These sources include, but are not limited to:

(1) Shopping centers;
(2) Sports complexes;
(3) Drive-in theaters;
(4) Parking lots and garages;
(5) Residential, commercial, industrial, or institutional developments;

(6) Amusement parks and recreational areas;
(7) Highways;
(8) Sewer, water, power, and gas lines;

and other such facilities which will result in increased emissions from motor vehicles or other stationary sources. The regulation will further provide that each State must have procedures whereby, prior to construction or modification of such sources, the State will be able to determine whether the construction or modification of the complex source would cause violations of the applicable portions of a control strategy or interfere with the attainment or maintenance of the national ambient air standards. States will be required to have the authority to disapprove the construction or modification where it would have such a result. The regulation will set forth the basic minimum considerations which should be addressed by a State before it can approve or disapprove any such construction or modification. States should begin now to determine their legal authority to adopt such a regulation, and to obtain such authority where it is lacking.

The order of the court on January 31, 1973, required the Administrator, upon disapproval of State plans, to direct States to submit approval provisions for maintaining the standards by April 15, 1973. Since this does not provide States with adequate time to develop corrective regulations and submit them to the Administrator in accordance with the procedural requirements of 40 CFR 51.4, the Administrator has applied to the court for a modification of that order to defer submittal of plans by the States until after the promulgation of the amendments to Part 51 establishing the requirement of a complex source provision. The new timetable requested from the court would permit proposal of the amendment to 40 CFR Part 51 on April 15 with the final regulation being promulgated by June 11, 1973. State plans providing for maintenance of the standards and containing such a procedure would have to be submitted by August 15. Should the court not modify its order, States will have to submit their plan for maintenance of the standards by April 15, 1973. Should the court grant the motion, the disapproval prescribed below will be amended to set forth the later date for submittal of the plans.

The amendments set forth below are effective from the date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER since the amendments are made pursuant to a court order which requires the Agency to disapprove the State plans which do not provide for maintenance of the primary standards.

Dated: March 2, 1973.

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Administrator,
Environmental Protection Agency.

Subpart A of Part 52, Chapter I, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended by adding § 52.22 as follows:

§ 52.22 Maintenance of national standards.

Subsequent to January 31, 1973, the Administrator reviewed again State implementation plan provisions for insuring the maintenance of the national standards. The review indicates that State plans generally do not contain regulations or procedures which adequately address this problem. Accordingly, all State plans are disapproved with respect to maintenance because such plans lack enforceable procedures or regulations for reviewing and preventing construction or modification of facilities which will result in an increase of emissions from State plans are disapproved with respect other sources of pollutants for which there are national standards. The disapproval applies to all States listed in Subparts B through DDD of this part. Nothing in this section shall invalidate or otherwise affect the obligations of States, emission sources, or other persons with respect to all portions of plans approved or promulgated under this part. Pursuant to an order of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit entered on January 31, 1973, State plans providing for maintenance of the national standards must be submitted to the Administrator no later than April 15, 1973.

[FR Doc.73-4405 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Title 41—Public Contracts and Property Management

CHAPTER I—FEDERAL PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS

PART 1-15—CONTRACT COST PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

Miscellaneous Amendments

Correction

In FR Doc. 73-3376, appearing at page 4753 in the issue of Thursday, February 22, 1973, the following changes should be made:

1. On page 4755, directly under § 1-15.306-4(a), place a line of five stars.

2. In the first line of paragraph (g) of § 1-15.309-7, in the second column on page 4757, after the word "charging", insert "*personal services*. Budget estimates on a".

3. In the second column on page 4758, directly above § 1-15.309-13, place a line of five stars.

Title 43—Public Lands: Interior

CHAPTER II—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SUBCHAPTER E—FOREST MANAGEMENT (5000)

[Circular 2339]

SALES OF FOREST PRODUCTS

Timber Sale Contract Procedures

On page 26114 of the FEDERAL REGISTER of December 8, 1972, there was published a notice and text of a proposed amendment to Group 5400 of Title 43, Code of Federal Regulations. The purpose of the amendment is to update the regulations relating to timber sale contracts and bidding procedures. These changes include definition of "loading point," permission to submit a payment bond to assure payment for timber to be cut, revision and clarification of bidding procedures, provision for the resale of timber involved in uncompleted contracts, and extension of the maximum term for a timber contract from 30 to 36 months.

Interested persons were given until January 8 to submit comments, suggestions, or objections to the proposed amendment. No comments were received. However, it has been determined that the format of portions of the proposal would be more self-explanatory if the text was rearranged. Accordingly, several editorial changes are made and the proposed amendments to §§ 2451.2, 2451.4, and 2461.2 are revised.

Since these are nonsubstantive modifications, the proposed amendment is hereby adopted as revised, and is set forth below in its entirety. This amendment shall become effective July 1, 1973.

JOHN C. WHITAKER,
Acting Secretary
of the Interior.

MARCH 1, 1973.

Group 5400 of Chapter II of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 5400—SALES OF FOREST PRODUCTS; GENERAL

1. In § 5400.0-5 a new paragraph (m) is added to read as follows:

§ 5400.0-5 Definitions.

* * * * *

(m) "Loading point" means any landing or other area in which logs are capable of being loaded for transportation out of the contract area: *Provided, however,* That right-of-way timber which has been cut shall not be considered to be at a loading point until such time as logs from any source are actually transported over that portion of the right-of-way.

PART 5440—CONDUCT OF SALES

Subpart 5441—Advertised Sales

2. In § 5441.1-1 the last sentence is amended to read as follows:

§ 5441.1-1 Bid deposits.

* * * The deposit of the successful bidder will be applied on the purchase price at the time the contract is signed by the authorized officer unless the deposit is a corporate surety bid bond or a bond is accepted by the Bureau to secure payment of the first installment.

3. Subpart 5442 is revised to read as follows:

Subpart 5442—Bidding Procedure

Sec.
5442.1 Procedure.
5442.2 Resale of timber from uncompleted contracts.
5442.3 Rejection of bids; waiver of minor deficiencies.

AUTHORITY: Sec. 5, 50 Stat. 875, 61 Stat. 631, as amended, 69 Stat. 367; 43 U.S.C. 1181e. 30 U.S.C. 601 et seq.

§ 5442.1 Bidding.

(a) Bidding at competitive sales shall be conducted by the submission of sealed bids, written bids, oral bids, or a combination of bidding methods as directed by the authorized officer.

(b) In sealed bid sales, the bidder submitting the highest sealed bid shall be declared the high bidder. In the event of a tie in high sealed bids, the high bidder shall be determined by lot from among those who submitted the tie bids.

(c) In oral auction sales, submission of the required minimum bid deposit and a written bid at not less than the advertised appraised price shall be required to participate in oral bidding. The officer conducting the sale shall declare a specific period, prior to oral bidding on each tract, during which bid deposits and written bids may be submitted. Bid deposits and written bids also may be submitted any time prior to the specific period declared by the officer conducting the sale. Oral bidding to determine the high bidder shall begin from the highest written bid after closure of the submittal period. In the event there is a tie in high written bids, and no oral bidding occurs, the bidder who was the first to submit his bid deposit and written bid shall be declared the high bidder. If the officer conducting the sale cannot determine who made the first submission of high tie written bids, the high bidder shall be determined by lot. The declared high bidder must confirm his oral bid in writing immediately after the sale, but failure to do so shall not relieve him of his purchase obligation.

§ 5442.2 Resale of timber from uncompleted contracts.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, in the resale of timber remaining from an uncompleted timber sale contract, no bid will be considered from any person, or from an affiliate of such person, who failed to complete the original contract because of: (1) Cancellation for purchaser's breach; or (2) failure to cut designated timber on portions of the sale area and complete payment by the expiration date. As used in this section: "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, or association; an "affiliate" means a person who controls or is controlled by another person.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this section shall apply only: (1) When 50 percent or more of the timber included in the resale is timber remaining from the uncompleted contract; or (2) when imposed because of failure to cut designated timber on portions of the sale area and to complete payments by the expiration date on contracts awarded after the effective date of this regulation.

§ 5442.3 Rejection of bids; waiver of minor deficiencies.

When the authorized officer determines it to be in the interest of the Government to do so, he may reject any or all bids and may waive minor deficiencies in the bids or the timber sale advertisement.

PART 5450—AWARD OF CONTRACT

Subpart 5450—Award of Contract; General

§ 5450.1 [Amended]

4. In § 5450.1 the third sentence of paragraph (a) and the first sentence of paragraph (b) are amended by changing "required performance bond" to read "required performance bond and any required payment."

5. Subpart 5451 is amended as follows: The heading of Subpart 5451 is amended by changing "Performance Bond" to read "Bonds", the heading of § 5451.1 is amended by changing "Minimum bond requirements; types." to read "Minimum performance bond requirements; types."; § 5451.2 is revised, the heading of § 5451.3 is amended by changing "Bond reduction" to read "Performance bond reduction", and a new § 5451.4 is added. As amended Subpart 5451 reads as follows:

Subpart 5451—Bonds

§ 5451.1 Minimum performance bond requirements; types.

* * * * *

Subpart 5451—Bonds

Sec.
5451.1 Minimum performance bond requirements; typs.
5451.2 Performance bonds in excess of minimum.
5451.3 Performance bond reduction.
5451.4 Payment bond.

AUTHORITY: Sec. 5, 50 Stat. 875, 61 Stat. 681, as amended, 69 Stat. 367; 43 U.S.C. 1181e, 30 U.S.C. 601 et seq.

§ 5451.2 Performance bonds in excess of minimum.

(a) To obtain permission for the delayed payment of the first installment, the purchaser must increase the minimum performance bond required by § 5451.1(a) by an amount equal to the first installment. The increased bond must be on a form approved by the Director and upon completion must be approved by the authorized officer. If a bond of corporate surety is used, the bond shall provide that the surety will make payment to the Bureau of the amount of the increase within 60 days after demand therefor by the Bureau whenever the purchaser shall fail to make payment as required by § 5461.2(a)(2) of this chapter.

(b) To obtain permission to cut timber before payment of the second or a subsequent installment the purchaser must increase the minimum performance bond required by § 5451.1(a) by an amount equal to one or more installment payments, as determined by the authorized officer. The adjusted bond must be approved by the authorized officer in writing prior to cutting any timber under the adjusted bond.

§ 5451.3 Performance bond reduction.

* * * * *

§ 5451.4 Payment bond.

To obtain permission to (a) cut and remove timber, or (b) remove timber already cut, which has been secured by an increased performance bond as provided for in § 5451.2(b), before payment of the second or subsequent installments, the purchaser must obtain a payment bond in an amount equal to one or more installment payments as determined by the authorized officer. The payment bond may be a bond of a corporate surety shown on the approved list issued by the U.S. Treasury Department and executed on an approved form or negotiable securities of the United States. The payment bond must be approved by the authorized officer in writing prior to cutting or removing any timber under the bond. If a bond of a corporate surety is used, the payment bond shall provide that if the purchaser fails to make payment as required by § 5461.2(a)(4) of this chapter, the surety will make such payment including any required interest to the Bureau within 60 days after demand therefor by the Bureau. With the written approval of the authorized officer a single blanket payment bond may be allocated to two or more contracts with the same purchaser in the same Bureau of Land Management administrative district.

PART 5460—SALES ADMINISTRATION

Subpart 5461—Contract Payments

§ 5461.1 [Amended]

6. In § 5461.1, the first sentence is amended by changing the reference "§ 5451.2" to read "§§ 5451.2 and 5451.4."

7. In § 5461.2, paragraph (a)(2) is revised and paragraphs (a)(3) and (4) are added. As amended § 5461.2 reads as follows:

§ 5461.2 Installment payment requirements.

(a) Contract installment payments shall be determined by authorized officer as follows:

* * * * *

(2) *Delayed payment of first installment.* Payment of the first installment required in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph may be delayed if the purchaser increases the performance bond as provided by § 5451.2(a) of this chapter. If delayed payment of first installment is approved by the authorized officer, cash payment for that installment must be made either before the cutting or removing of the last portion of timber sold under the contract having a value equal to the amount of the first installment or at any time the Bureau exercises its authority to cancel the rights of the purchaser under the terms of the contract, whichever occurs first.

(3) *Delayed payment of second or subsequent installments.* Delayed payment of the second or a subsequent installment may be allowed if the purchaser furnishes a bond as provided by § 5451.2(b) of this chapter. The first installment shall be paid in the same manner as provided in paragraph (a)(1) and (2) of this section. If cutting is permitted before payment, as provided by § 5451.2(b) of this chapter, payment by installment shall be made before timber may be skidded or yarded to a loading point or removed from the contract area. Each subsequent installment shall be due and payable without notice when the sale value of the timber skidded or yarded

to a loading point or removed equals the sum of all the payments minus the first installment. The unenhanced value of timber allowed to be cut in advance of payment is limited to the amount of the increase over and above the required minimum performance bond. Upon payment, the amount of the bond may be applied to other timber sold under the contract to permit its cutting in advance of payment.

(4) *Payment where cutting or removal has been permitted under payment bond authorized by § 5451.4 of this chapter.* The first installment shall be paid in the same manner as provided in subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph. If cutting and/or removal is permitted before payment, as provided by § 5451.4 of this chapter, the purchaser shall be billed monthly for timber skidded or yarded to a loading point or removed from the contract area and for any related road maintenance fees unless a lesser period is agreed to by the Bureau and the purchaser. Payment shall be made within 15 days of the billing date shown on the billing form. The unenhanced value of timber allowed to be cut and/or removed in advance of payment is limited to the amount of the payment bond. Upon payment, the amount of the bond may be applied to other timber.

Subpart 5463—Expiration of Time for Cutting and Removal

§ 5463.1 [Amended]

8. In § 5463.1 the words "thirty months" are changed to read "thirty-six months."

[FR Doc.73-4491 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Title 50—Wildlife and Fisheries

CHAPTER I—BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PART 28—PUBLIC ACCESS, USE, AND RECREATION

De Soto National Wildlife Refuge, Iowa and Nebr.

The following special regulations are issued and are effective on March 8, 1973.

§ 28.28 Special regulations, public access, use, and recreation, for individual wildlife refuge areas.

IOWA-NEBRASKA

DE SOTO NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Public recreational activities on De Soto National Wildlife Refuge, Missouri Valley, Iowa, are permitted from April 15 through September 30, 1973, inclusive, subject to the following special conditions:

(1) *Authorized activities.* Public recreational activities are limited to fishing, picnicking, swimming, boating, water skiing, sightseeing, mushroom picking, and nature observation.

(2) *Open season.* The open season for general public recreation use is from April 15, 1973, through September 30, 1973. During the period April 15, 1973, through May 25, 1973, the public recreational use area is open from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. c.d.s.t. During the remainder of the public recreational season, the area is open daily from 6 a.m. through 10 p.m., c.d.s.t. Between the dates of September 16 and September 30, 1973, all water-oriented recreational activities, except boat and bank fishing, are prohibited. Swimming will be permitted from May 16 through September 3, 1973, between the hours of 11 a.m. and 7 p.m., and only in the designated beach area. Admittance onto the refuge is prohibited 1 hour prior to the scheduled closing time. Two separate mushroom picking areas are open daily to the public during the month of May, hours of use are the same as for the general use area.

(3) *Open area.* The area open for general public use comprises approximately 2,000 acres and the special mushroom picking areas comprise approximately 1,100 acres. These areas are delineated on a map available at the refuge headquarters and from the office of the Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, 10597 West Sixth Avenue, Denver, CO 80215. Maps of the open areas are also posted or available for handout at entrance points.

(4) *Access.* Entry onto the open area is permitted only at gates or points of entry specifically posted for this purpose.

(5) *User fees.* Entry to the public use area shall be subject to fee charging for use of facilities. The types of user permits available and the fees therefor shall be as determined by the Secretary. Permits will be available at fee collection stations located at two entrance points.

(6) *Other provisions.* The use of air mattresses, innertubes, beach balls and all other flotation devices, other than life preservers, is prohibited on refuge waters.

(b) The possession of bottles or cans is prohibited on the designated swimming beach.

(c) The use of fire is permitted, but only in grills.

(d) Access to refuge waters with airboats or houseboats is prohibited.

(e) Access to refuge waters with boats that have toilets that flush directly into the water is prohibited, unless such toilets are sealed from use.

(f) The possession of open alcoholic beverages is prohibited on any boat propelled by mechanical power while the craft is in operation.

(g) The lake being long and narrow requires that all boaters keep to the right and maintain a highway type traffic pattern. Turns shall always be made to the operator's left except when beaching or docking a boat.

(h) A portion of the refuge lake is posted as a "No Wake Zone." Boaters using this area shall travel at an idling speed sufficiently slow to prevent a wake that would rock another boat.

(i) All boats are prohibited from loading or unloading passengers from the swimming area.

(j) All boat and bank fishermen will be permitted to use the entire lake.

The provisions of this special regulation supplement the regulations which govern public access, use, and recreation on wildlife refuge areas generally which are set forth in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 28, and are effective through September 30, 1973.

STEVEN W. FRICK,
Acting Refuge Manager, De Soto National Wildlife Refuge, Missouri Valley, Iowa.

FEBRUARY 28, 1973.

[FR Doc.73-4474 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

PART 32—HUNTING

Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge, Tex.

The following special regulation is issued and is effective on March 8, 1973.

§ 32.22 Special regulations; upland game; for individual wildlife refuge areas.

TEXAS

HAGERMAN NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The public hunting of rabbits and squirrels on the Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge, Tex., is permitted only on the area designated by signs as open to hunting. This open area, comprising 2,644 acres, is delineated on maps available at refuge headquarters, 15 miles northwest of Sherman, Tex., and from the Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Post Office Box 1306, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Hunting shall be in accordance with all applicable State regulations governing the hunting of rabbits and squirrels subject to the following special conditions:

(1) The open season for hunting rabbits and squirrels on the refuge extends from May 1 through July 31, 1973, inclusive.

(2) Hunting with rifles or handguns is not permitted.

The provisions of this special regulation supplement the regulations which govern hunting on wildlife refuge areas generally which are set forth in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 32, and are effective through July 31, 1973.

BERT M. ANDUSS,
Refuge Manager, Hagerman National Wildlife Refuge, Sherman, Tex.

FEBRUARY 22, 1973.

[FR Doc.73-4475 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

PART 33—SPORT FISHING

Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge, Ill.-Iowa-Mo.

The following special regulation is issued and is effective on March 8, 1973.

§ 33.5 Special regulations; sport fishing; for individual wildlife refuge areas.

ILLINOIS-IOWA-MISSOURI

MARK TWAIN NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Sport fishing on the Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge, Ill., Iowa, and Mo., is permitted only on the areas designated by signs as open fishing. These open areas, comprising 6,457 acres, are

delineated on maps available at the refuge headquarters and from the office of the Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Federal Building, Fort Snelling, Twin Cities, Minn. 55111. Sport fishing shall be in accordance with all applicable State regulations subject to the following special conditions:

ILLINOIS

(1) The open season for sport fishing on the Batchtown, Calhoun, and Gilbert Lake Divisions of the Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge extends from January 1, 1973, through October 15, 1973, with the exception of certain designated areas which are open until December 31, 1973.

(2) The open season for sport fishing on the Keithsburg Division of the Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge extends from January 1, 1973, through October 15, 1973.

(3) The open season for sport fishing on the Gardner Division of the Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge extends from January 1, 1973, through October 15, 1973.

IOWA

(1) The open season for sport fishing on the Louisa Division of the Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge extends from January 1, 1973, through September 30, 1973, with the exception of areas adjacent to the Port Louisa road which are open until December 31, 1973.

(2) The open season for sport fishing on the Big Timber Division of the Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge extends from January 1, 1973, through December 31, 1973.

MISSOURI

(1) The open season for sport fishing on the Clarence Cannon National Wildlife Refuge extends from April 1, 1973, through September 30, 1973, with the exception of Bryants Creek and certain designated areas which are open from January 1, 1973, through December 31, 1973.

The provisions of this special regulation supplement the regulations which govern fishing on wildlife refuge areas generally which are set forth in Title 50, Part 33, and are effective through December 31, 1973.

LESLIE F. BEATY,
Refuge Manager, Mark Twain National Wildlife Refuge, Quincy, Ill.

MARCH 1, 1973.

[FR Doc.73-4476 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CHAPTER II—NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE, NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SUBCHAPTER F—AID TO FISHERIES

PART 258—FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT PROCEDURES

Provision for Extension and Change of Fund's Name

The account established in the Treasury of the United States under the provisions of section 7(c) of the Act and referred to as the Fishermen's Protective Fund shall hereinafter be known as the Fishermen's Guarantee Fund.

Public Law 92-594 amended section 7 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1977) by providing that "The provisions of this section shall be effective until July 1, 1977."

Agreements and fees under the Act are based on a July 1 to June 30 year. Nevertheless, since the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 was to have expired on February 8, 1973, agreements for the year beginning July 1, 1972, were effective only through February 8, 1973. Public Law 92-594 amended the Act by extending its provisions until July 1, 1977. Therefore, § 258.5 of the regulations is here being amended to extend agreements for the year beginning July 1, 1972, through a new termination date of June 30, 1973. Fees are subject to adjustment as provided for in paragraph (a) of § 258.5. The Administration is presently considering adjusting fees for the current agreement year. Appropriate notice will first be given.

This amendment relates to matters which are exempt from the rule making requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. 553). Furthermore, this amendment makes no substantive change in the conduct of the program. This amendment is hereby adopted.

Paragraph (d) of § 258.1 is hereby amended by deleting the present paragraph and substituting therefor the following:

§ 258.1 Definition of terms.

* * * * *

(d) *Fishermen's Guarantee Fund.* The account established in the Treasury of the United States under the provision of section 7(c) of the Act.

* * * * * *

§ 258.5 [Amended]

Paragraph (b) of § 258.5 is hereby amended by deleting "February 8, 1973, unless extended" and substituting therefor "June 30, 1973,".

Dated: February 27, 1973.

By order of the Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

ROBERT M. WHITE,
Administrator.

[FR Doc.73-4443 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Title 6—Economic Stabilization

CHAPTER I—COST OF LIVING COUNCIL

PART 130—COST OF LIVING COUNCIL PHASE III REGULATIONS

Sale of Crude Petroleum and Petroleum Products

Part 130 is amended by adding an appendix to Subpart K providing for special mandatory rules established pursuant to Subpart K of the Economic Stabilization Regulations and setting forth Special Rule No. 1 governing prices for the sale of crude petroleum and petroleum products.

On February 1, 1973, the Cost of Living Council issued a notice of public hearings to receive information and to hear the views of interested persons on appropriate pricing policies for home heating oil with special emphasis on price increases for home heating oil recently effected by major producers. Hearings were held February 7-9, 1973, in the General Services Administration Auditorium, Washington, D.C. Oral and written testimony was received from the representatives of various segments including government agencies, consumers and the oil industry.

The record of the proceedings, together with copies of statements filed with the Council, is available for inspection at the public reference facility of the Council at Room B-120, 2000 M Street NW., Washington, DC during normal business hours.

Based upon its review of the record and other information available to it, the Council has determined that price increases on home heating oil placed into effect in January and February 1973 by many oil companies are supported by adequate cost justification. Moreover, since the date of hearing, the United States has devalued the dollar, thereby increasing the price of imported crude petroleum and petroleum products and adding to the costs incurred by the companies. Consequently, the Council has concluded that the foregoing price increases for home heating oil are not unreasonably inconsistent with the standards of the Economic Stabilization Program so as to warrant challenge under Subpart J of the Council's regulations.

Subpart K of Title 130 of the Economic Stabilization Regulations provides:

"Whenever the Council in the course of administering the Economic Stabilization Program determines that the goals of the program would be significantly advanced by reasserting controls over an industry, sector of the economy, or a part thereof, it may issue a special rule providing, on a prospective basis, for the stabilization of prices or wages and salaries on a mandatory basis, in that industry, sector of the economy or part thereof." Special Rule No. 1 governing prices charged for crude petroleum and petroleum products is being issued pursuant to the procedures of Subpart K.

The petroleum industry is one of America's most basic industries and petroleum products are one of its basic resources. Annual sales are in excess of $80 billion. Moreover, petroleum is not only a vital energy source, but also a basic raw material used in the production of countless manufactured goods. A special rule restraining price increases is thus of particular importance in this industry both because of the influence of petroleum price movements on other segments of the economy, through what might be characterized as a ripple effect, and because petroleum products serve as important inputs into the production process in most sectors. Moreover, since a large portion of crude oil supply is subject to pricing arrangements involving international agreements and since crude

oil production is unevenly distributed among geographic regions, more specific restraints on prices will help to assure less inflationary cost and price increases throughout the production, processing and distribution chain.

The hearings conducted by the Council clearly brought out the need for actions to assure adequate supplies of gasoline as well as home heating oil in the months immediately ahead. Seasonal demand fluctuations are likely to create pressures on gasoline supplies, and hence upon current gasoline prices, during the summer months. A special rule governing the prices of these products should provide companies with greater certainty on their pricing obligations under the Economic Stabilization Program and should help them in their planning process and in making the wide range of business decisions needed to increase domestic supply. Special rules which recognize the need for flexibility in individual prices to meet seasonal demand fluctuations should also help assure adequate supplies in circumstances where, as here, current prices are below base, but seasonal fluctuation and demand-supply factors may bring about increases above base. In the context of other actions being taken by the Administration to deal with the pressing need for increased supplies of crude petroleum and petroleum products, the special rules should help to stimulate needed domestic investment in expanded refining capacity and to encourage other actions to alleviate possible supply shortfalls.

For all of the foregoing reasons the Council has therefore concluded that the Economic Stabilization Program would be significantly advanced by issuing special rules establishing mandatory controls governing prices for the sale of crude petroleum and petroleum products.

Paragraph 1 sets forth the scope of the controls, which apply to price increases for the sale of crude petroleum and petroleum products. Paragraph 2, in defining the terms used in the special rule, providing that base price for a product covered by a term limit pricing agreement on January 10, 1973, is the price for that product in effect on that date. Otherwise, its base price is its base price as defined in Phase II Price Commission regulations. Paragraph 3 provides that firms which derive $250 million or more of annual sales or revenues from the sale of the specified products are subject to the special rule.

Price increases for these products above base (as defined in paragraph 2 of the special rule) are limited to a weighted annual average price increase of 1 percent above base prices for the year beginning January 11, 1973. Increases above that figure, but not more than 1.5 percent on a weighted annual average basis, must be supported by new cost justification, incurred since the date of this regulation. Any increase above 1.5 percent over base is subject to profit margin limitations and to prenotification rules of the Council in addition to the foregoing rule. Term limit pricing authorization applicable to firms subject to the special rule are terminated as of March 6, 1973. Price increases on covered products made after January 10, 1973, pursuant to a TLP, are to be included in the calculation of weighted average annual price increases.

Firms subject to the special rule are required to file an initial report listing the base prices of their covered products and a calculation of their weighted average price increase covering the period from January 10, 1973, to the date of the special rule. They are also required to file monthly reports covering posted price movements, cost increases, and supply conditions and quarterly reports covering cost increases, profit margins, supply conditions, and weighted average annual price increases.

Because the immediate implementation of Executive Order No. 11695 is required, and because the purpose of this special rule is to provide immediate guidance as to a Cost of Living Council decision, the Council finds that publication in accordance with normal rule making procedure is impracticable and that good cause exists for making this special rule effective in less than 30 days. Interested persons may submit comments regarding this special rule. Communications should be addressed to the Office of General Counsel, Cost of Living Council, Washington, D.C. 20508.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 6, 1973.

JAMES W. MCLANE,
Deputy Director,
Cost of Living Council.

Part 130 of Title 6 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended by adding an appendix to Subpart K to read as follows:

APPENDIX

SPECIAL RULES REASSERTING MANDATORY CONTROLS

Special Rule No. 1

1. *Scope.* This special rule issued in accordance with the provisions of 6 CFR 130.101 establishes mandatory rules governing price adjustments for the sale of crude petroleum and petroleum products.

2. *Definitions.* As used in this special rule—

"Base price" means, in the case of a product not subject to a term limit pricing authorization on January 10, 1973, the base price determined under the provisions of Subpart F of 6 CFR, Part 300, which were in effect on January 10, 1973, or in the case of a product subject to a term limit pricing authorization on January 10, 1973, the price in effect on January 10, 1973.

"Control year" means the year beginning January 11, 1973, and ending January 10, 1974.

"Covered product" means any product described in Standard Industrial Classification Code 1311 (other than natural gas) or 2911.

3. *Applicability.* This special rule applies to each firm which derives $250 million or more of its annual sales or revenues from the sale of covered products.

4. *Pricing rules for covered products.* (a) Except as otherwise provided in subparagraphs (b) and (c) of this paragraph, a firm to which this special rule applies may not increase the price for a covered product above its base price if the increase would result in a weighted annual average price increase for the control year for the firm's covered products of more than 1 percent above base prices.

(b) A firm may increase the price for a covered product above its base price resulting in a weighted annual average price increase for the control year for the firm's covered products of more than 1 percent above base prices but not more than 1.5 percent above base prices only to reflect increased costs incurred since March 6, 1973.

(c) A firm may increase the price for a covered product above its base price resulting in a weighted annual average price increase for the control year for the firm's covered products of more than 1.5 percent only if, in addition to meeting the cost justification requirements of subparagraph (b), (i) the firm's profit margin does not increase over that which prevailed during the base period as defined in Subpart L of 6 CFR, Part 130, and (ii) the firm prenotifies the Cost of Living Council of the increase and receives approval before implementing the increase.

5. *Effect on term limit pricing authorizations.* Term limit pricing authorizations applicable to firms to which this special rule applies are hereby terminated effective March 6, 1973. In computing weighted annual average price increases for the control year, a firm shall include all price increases for covered products put into effect after January 10, 1973, pursuant to a TLP authorization.

6. *Reporting requirements.* Firms to which this special rule applies shall file the following reports with the Cost of Living Council on forms to be prescribed by the Council:

(a) Each firm shall file not later than March 30, 1973, a list of the base price, as defined in paragraph 2 of this special rule, for each of its covered products, and a calculation of its weighted average annual price increase for price increases in covered products implemented since January 10, 1973, and before March 6, 1973.

(b) Each firm shall file a monthly report not later than 30 days after the close of each calendar month commencing with March 1973, setting forth posted price movements, cost increases, and supply conditions.

(c) Each firm shall file a quarterly report, not later than 45 days after the close of each of its fiscal quarters, setting forth cost increases, profit margin, supply conditions, and a computation of its weighted average annual price increase for prices increased above base price as defined in paragraph 2 of this special rule.

[FR Doc.73-4588 Filed 3-6-73;4:01 pm]

Title 7—Agriculture

CHAPTER I—AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE (STANDARDS, INSPECTIONS, MARKETING PRACTICES), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PART 68—REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS FOR INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS THEREOF

Fees and Charges for Certain Federal Inspection Services

Statement of considerations. The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 provides for the collection of fees equal as nearly as may be the cost of inspection services rendered under its provisions. This amendment adjusts the hourly rate for services charged by the hour under § 68.42a from $10.12 to $11.20 per hour, and makes corresponding changes in fees or charges for certain other services

which are based on the hourly rate. The changes are necessary due to recent general salary increases to Federal employees and increases in other costs.

The amendment provides for a baking test for cookies and for a new demonstration grading service. The fee for the baking test for cookies is $5 per test. The fee for the demonstration grading service will be $175 per request, plus all travel costs associated with the performance of the service.

Certain laboratory tests for which there have been no requests for service for several years are being deleted from § 68.42a.

Pursuant to sections 203 and 205 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1622, 1624), the provisions of 7 CFR 68.42a prescribing fees in connection with the inspection of agricultural commodities administratively assigned to the Grain Division are hereby amended as follows:

§ 68.42a Fees and charges for certain Federal inspection services.

The following fees and charges apply to the Federal inspection services specified below:

Service	*Fee or charge*
Appeal inspection:	
(a) Basis original sample	[1]
(b) Basis new sample	[2]
Bean, lentil, and pea inspection (including chick peas, cowpeas, split peas, and similar commodities):	
(a) Lot inspection:	
(1) Field run (quality and dockage analysis)—per lot	$1.15
(2) Other than field run (grade, class, and quality)—per lot	5.35
(In addition to the fee for analysis or grading in (1) and (2) above, a fee for sampling, checkweighing, and checkloading, if any, will be assessed at the prescribed rate.)	
(b) Sample inspection:	
(1) Field run (quality and dockage analysis)—per lot	7.15
(2) Other than field run (grade, class, and quality)—per sample	5.35
Checkloading—per man-hour	[3] 11.20
Checkweighing—per man-hour	[3] 11.20
Condition examination—per man-hour	[3] 11.20
Demonstration grading—per request	[4] 175.00
Extra copies of certificates—per copy	1.00
Grade factor analysis (as defined in any official U.S. Standards) per factor	3.60
Hay and straw inspection:	
(a) Lot inspection:	
(1) For sampling and grading—per man-hour	11.20
(b) Sample inspection:	
(1) Grade only—per sample	7.15
(2) Factor analysis—per man-hour	11.20
Hop inspection:	
(a) Lot inspection:	
(1) For seed, leaf, and stem content—per lot	8.45
(2) Aphid infestation—per lot	11.20
(In addition to the fee for analysis in (1) and (2) above, a charge for sampling, if any, will be assessed at the prescribed rate.)	
(b) Sample inspection:	
(1) For seed, leaf, and stem content—per sample	8.45
(2) Aphid infestation—per sample	11.20
Laboratory report	1.00
Laboratory testing:	
(a) In addition to the charges, if any, for sampling or other requested service, a fee will be assessed for each laboratory analysis or test as follows:	
(1) Acetyl value	5.00
(2) Acidity—Greek	1.70
(3) Acid value—oil	2.35
(4) Aflatoxin	15.00
(5) Appearance, flavor, and odor of oils	1.10
(6) Ash	1.70
(7) Bacteria count	3.50
(8) Baking test—bread	7.50
(9) Baking test—cookies	5.00
(10) Baking test—prepared mix	3.05
(11) Baumé	4.50
(12) Break test	3.05
(13) Calcium AOAC	4.00
(14) Calcium enrichment	4.00
(15) Calcium carbonate	4.00
(16) Carotenoid color	4.50
(17) Checked and broken macaroni units	2.65
(18) Clarity of oil involving heating	1.45
(19) Cold test—oil	.75
(20) Color—bleached	2.10
(21) Color—Gardner	2.10
(22) Color—Lovibond	2.10
(23) Color—Wesson	2.10
(24) Color—oil and shortening	2.10
(25) Congealpoint	4.30
(26) Consistency	1.35
(27) Cooking test	1.85
(28) Crude fat	2.25
(29) Crude fiber	3.35
(30) Density	1.20
(31) Diastatic activity of flour	2.80
(32) Enrichment—quick test	.85
(33) Falling number	1.25
(34) Farinograph characteristics	5.00
(35) Fat—acid hydrolysis	4.40
(36) Fat—crude	2.25
(37) Fat—extraction	2.25
(38) Fat acidity	1.70
(39) Fat stability—AOM	4.80
(40) Fiber, crude	3.35
(41) Filth—heavy	3.05
(42) Filth—light	4.85
(43) Flash point—open and closed cup	3.05
(44) Flavor, odor, and appearance of oils	1.10
(45) Foots—heated and/or chilled	2.15
(46) Foreign material—processed grain products	2.65
(47) Free fatty acids	2.35
(48) Gossypol, free	3.00
(49) Grade and class of unprocessed grain	[4] 2.30
(50) Heating test—oil and shortening	2.25
(51) Hydrogen ion concentration—pH	1.70
(52) Insoluble bromides	2.20
(53) Insoluble impurities—oil and shortening	2.80
(54) Iodine number or value	2.60
(55) Iron enrichment	6.60
(56) Keeping time—oil and shortening	4.80
(57) Kjeldahl protein	2.05
(58) Linolenic acid	12.00
(59) Lipid phosphorus	5.75
(60) Loss on heating (oil)	1.35
(61) Lysine from fortification	5.00
(62) Lysine from hydrolysis of protein	10.00
(63) Macaroni—checked and broken units	2.65
(64) Maltose value—flour	2.80
(65) Marine oil in vegetable oil—qualitative	2.20
(66) Melting point—Wiley	2.60
(67) Moisture—distillation	2.15
(68) Moisture—oven	1.45
(69) Moisture and volatile matter—oil and shortening	1.35
(70) Neutral oil loss	5.50
(71) Nitrogen solubility index	2.60
(72) Odor, appearance and flavor of oil	1.10
(73) Oil content—oilseed	3.50
(74) pH—Hydrogen ion concentration	1.70
(75) Peroxide value	1.75
(76) Peroxide value after 8 hours AOM	4.80
(77) Phosphorus	3.65
(78) Popping value—popcorn	1.50
(79) Potassium bromate—qualitative	.85
(80) Potassium bromate—quantitative	3.25
(81) Protein—Kjeldahl	2.05
(82) Reducing sugars	8.40
(83) Refractive index	1.20
(84) Riboflavin	6.60
(85) Rope spore count	11.10
(86) Salt content	3.50
(87) Saponification number	3.05
(88) Sieve test	2.20
(89) Smoke point	1.40
(90) Softening point	4.30
(91) Solid fat index	9.90
(92) Solubility in alcohol—oil	1.10
(93) Specific baking volume—prepared mix	3.05
(94) Specific gravity—oils	2.95
(95) Spreadfactor—cookies	5.00
(96) Test weight per bushel—other than grain	1.20
(97) Unsaponifiable matter	5.80
(98) Urease activity	2.25
(99) Viscosity—flour	5.00
(100) Viscosity—Gardner-Holdt	1.50
(101) Water soluble protein	2.60
(102) Xanthydrol test for rodent urine	2.50
(If a requested analysis or test is on the basis of a specified moisture content, a charge for an oven moisture test will also be made.)	
Lentil inspection: (See Bean inspection).	
Minimum fee for services covered by hourly rates—a minimum fee for 2 hours per man, per service request, will be assessed at the applicable hour rate.	
New inspection—fees and charges to be based on services requested.	
Pea inspection: (See Bean inspection).	
Sampling per man-hour	[3] 11.20
Special inspection service per man-hour	[3] 11.20
Split pea inspection: (See Bean inspection).	
Standby time per man-hour	11.20
Straw inspection: (See Hay inspection).	

[1] The applicable grading or laboratory analysis or testing charge. Minimum fee, if any, $11.20.

[2] Applicable sampling charge, if any, plus applicable grading, or laboratory analysis or testing fee.

[3] Only one fee will be charged for these services whether performing singly or concurrently. (But see minimum fee requirement.)

[4] Plus all travel costs associated with the performance of the demonstration grading service.

NOTE: See footnotes at end of table.

The need for increases in the fees for services and the amount thereof are dependent upon facts within the knowledge of the Agricultural Marketing Service. The additional services provided for in this document are voluntary in nature. The provisions, therefore, do not require any action by any member of the public but make available services for which there is a public need. Therefore, under the administrative procedure provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, it is found upon good cause that notice and other public rule making procedures on the amendments are impractical and unnecessary.

(Sec. 203, 205, 60 Stat. 1087, 1090, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1622, 1624)

This amendment shall become effective on April 29, 1973.

Done at Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1973.

E. L. PETERSON,
Administrator,
Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.73-4186 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CHAPTER III—ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PART 301—DOMESTIC QUARANTINE NOTICES

Subpart—Japanese Beetle

EXEMPTIONS

This document revises the Japanese Beetle Quarantine supplemental regulation concerning exemptions to add potting soil to the list of articles exempted from certification, permit, or other requirements. It also changes the conditions under which used mechanized soil-moving equipment is exempt. Used mechanized soil-moving equipment is now exempt if cleaned of all loose noncompacted soil. Various other changes were made.

Pursuant to the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and section 106 of the Federal Plant Pest Act (7 U.S.C. 161, 162, 150ee), and § 301.48-2 of the Japanese Beetle Quarantine regulations (7 CFR 301.48-2, as amended), a supplemental regulation granting exemption from specified requirements of the regulations is hereby issued to appear in 7 CFR 301.48-2b as set forth below. The Deputy Administrator of Plant Protection and Quarantine Programs has found that facts exist as to the pest risk involved in the movement of such articles which make it safe to relieve the requirements as provided therein.

§ 301.48-2b Exempted articles.[1]

The following articles are exempt from the certification, permit, or other requirements of this subpart if they meet the applicable conditions prescribed in paragraph (a) through (d) of this section and have not been exposed to infestation after cleaning or other handling as prescribed in said paragraphs:

(a) Compost, decomposed manure, humus, and peat, if dehydrated, ground, pulverized, or compressed.

(b) True bulbs, corms, rhizomes, and tubers (other than clumps of dahlia tubers) of ornamental plants, if free of soil.

(c) Used mechanized soil-moving equipment, if cleaned of all loose, noncompacted[2] soil.

(d) Potting soil, if commercially prepared, packaged, and shipped in original containers.

(Secs. 8 and 9, 37 Stat. 318, as amended, sec. 106, 71 Stat. 33; 7 U.S.C. 161, 162, 150ee; 37 FR 28464, 28477; 37 FR 24327, 7 CFR 301.48-2)

This list of exempted articles shall become effective on March 8, 1973, when it shall supersede the list of exempted articles in 7 CFR 301.48-2b which became effective July 1, 1970.

Inasmuch as this revision relieves certain restrictions presently imposed, it should be made effective promptly in order to be of benefit to the persons subject to the restrictions that are being relieved. Accordingly, it is found, under the administrative procedure provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, that notice and other public procedure with respect to this revision are unnecessary and contrary to the public interest, and good cause is found for making it effective less than 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 2d day of March 1973.

LEO G. K. IVERSON,
Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection and Quarantine Programs.

[FR Doc.73-4500 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

PART 301—DOMESTIC QUARANTINE NOTICES

Subpart—Pink Bollworm

REGULATED AREAS

This document amends the list of areas regulated because of the pink bollworm by adding under suppressive areas the following previously nonregulated counties and parish: Conway, Faulkner, Franklin, Jackson, Johnson, Little River, Logan Miller, Woodruff, and Yell Counties in Arkansas; and Caddo Parish in Louisiana.

Pursuant to the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of the Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912, as amended, and section 106 of the Federal Plant Pest Act (7 U.S.C. 161, 162, 150ee), and § 301.52-2 of the Pink Bollworm Quarantine regulations, 7 CFR 301.52-2, as amended, a supplemental regulation designating regulated areas. 7 CFR 301.52-2a, is hereby amended as follows:

A. In § 301.52-2a relating to the State of Arkansas, under suppressive area, the entire description for that State is changed to read as set forth below.

B. In § 301.52-2a relating to the State of Louisiana, under suppressive area, the entire description for that State is changed to read as set forth below.

§ 301.52-2a Regulated areas; suppressive and generally infested areas.

* * * * *

ARKANSAS

(1) *Generally infested area.* None.
(2) *Suppressive area.*
Conway County. The entire county.
Faulkner County. The entire county.
Franklin County. The entire county.
Jackson County. The entire county.
Jefferson County. That portion of the county lying east of the Arkansas River and north of U.S. Highway 79.
Johnson County. The entire county.
Lafayette County. The entire county.
Little River County. The entire county.
Logan County. The entire county.
Lonoke County. That portion of the county lying south of Interstate 40.
Miller County. The entire county.
Woodruff County. The entire county.
Yell County. The entire county.

* * * * *

LOUISIANA

(1) *Generally infested area.* None.
(2) *Suppressive area.*
Caddo Parish. The entire parish.
Rapides Parish. The entire parish.

* * * * *

(Secs. 8 and 9, 37 Stat. 318, sec. 106, 71 Stat. 33; 7 U.S.C. 161, 162, 150ee; 37 FR 28464, 28477; 32 FR 16385, 7 CFR 301.72-2)

This amendment shall become effective March 8, 1973, when it shall supersede 7 CFR 301.52-2a effective June 7, 1972.

The Deputy Administrator of the Plant Protection and Quarantine Programs has determined that infestations of the pink bollworm exist or are likely to exist in the civil divisions or parts of civil divisions listed above, or that it is necessary to regulate such localities because of their proximity to infestations or their inseparability for quarantine enforcement purposes from infested localities.

The Deputy Administrator has further determined that each of the quarantined States, wherein only portions of the State have been designated as regulated areas, is enforcing a quarantine or regulation with restrictions on intrastate movement of the regulated articles substantially the same as the restrictions on the interstate movement of such articles imposed by the quarantine and regulations in this subpart, and that designation of less than the entire State as a regulated area will otherwise be adequate to prevent the interstate spread of the pink bollworm. Therefore, such civil divisions and parts of civil divisions listed above are designated as pink bollworm regulated areas.

This amendment imposes restrictions necessary to prevent the spread of the pink bollworm and it should be made effective promptly to accomplish its purpose in the public interest. Accordingly, it is found upon good cause, under the administrative procedure provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553, that notice and other public

[1] The articles hereby exempted remain subject to applicable restrictions under other quarantines.

[2] Compacted soil is defined as soil attached to equipment which cannot be removed by brisk brushing and/or washing with water under normal city water pressure.

procedure with respect to this amendment are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and good cause is found for making it effective less than 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 2d day of March 1973.

LEO G. K. IVERSON,
Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection and Quarantine Programs.

[FR Doc.73-4501 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CHAPTER VII—AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE (AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCHAPTER B—FARM MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

PART 730—RICE

Subpart—1973–74 Marketing Year

PROCLAMATION OF RESULT OF MARKETING QUOTA REFERENDUM

Section 730.1508 is issued to announce the results of the rice marketing quota referendum for the marketing year August 1, 1973, through July 31, 1974, under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The Secretary proclaimed a marketing quota for rice for the 1973–74 marketing year and announced that a referendum would be held during the period January 22 to 26, 1972, each inclusive, by mail ballot in accordance with Part 717 of this chapter.

Since the only purpose of § 730.1508 is to announce the referendum results, it is hereby found and determined that compliance with the notice, public procedure, and 30-day effective date provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553 is unnecessary.

§ 730.1508 Proclamation of the result of the rice marketing quota referendum for the marketing year 1973–74.

In a referendum of farmers engaged in the production of rice of the 1972 crop held by mail ballot during the period January 22 to 26, 1973, each inclusive, 11,422 voted. Of those voting 10,768, or 94.3 percent favored quotas for the marketing year beginning August 1, 1973. Therefore rice marketing quotas will be in effect for the 1973–74 marketing year.

(Secs. 354, 375, 52 Stat. 61, as amended, 66, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1354, 1375)

Effective date: March 8, 1973.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on: March 2, 1973.

KENNETH E. FRICK,
Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

[FR Doc.73-4185 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CHAPTER VIII—AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE (SUGAR), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCHAPTER B—SUGAR REQUIREMENTS AND QUOTAS

[Sugar Reg. 811, Amdt. 2]

PART 811—CONTINENTAL SUGAR REQUIREMENT AND AREA QUOTAS

Requirements, Quotas, and Quota Deficits for 1973

Basis and purpose and bases and considerations. This amendment is issued pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (61 Stat. 922, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1101), hereinafter referred to as the "Act." The purpose of this amendment to Sugar Regulation 811 is to revise the determination of sugar requirements for the calendar year 1973, establish quotas and prorations consistent with such requirements and to determine and prorate or allocate the deficits in quotas established pursuant to the Act.

Section 201(a) of the Act requires a determination of the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States whenever necessary to attain the price objectives set forth in section 201(b) of the Act.

Section 202(g)(3) of the Act, which sets forth the procedure to use in attaining such price objective, provides that whenever the simple average of prices of raw sugar for 7 consecutive market days ending after October 31 and before March 1 is 3 percent or more above or below the average price objective for the preceding 2 calendar months, the determination of requirements of consumers shall be adjusted to the extent necessary to attain such price objective.

For the 7 consecutive market days ended February 27, the simple average of the daily price of raw sugar was 9.08 cents per pound and was at least 3 percent below the average price objective of 9.49 cents per pound. Therefore, a downward adjustment in sugar requirements is considered appropriate at this time to meet the requirements of the Act.

A decrease in requirements of 100,000 short tons, raw value, is necessary to obtain the price objective set forth in the Act. Accordingly, total sugar requirements for the calendar year 1973 are hereby decreased by 100,000 short tons, raw value, to a total of 11.5 million short tons, raw value.

Section 204(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, provides in part that "The Secretary shall, at the time he makes his determination of requirements of consumers for each calendar year and on December 15 preceding each calendar year, and as often thereafter as the facts are ascertainable by him but in any event not less frequently than each 60 days after the beginning of each calendar year, determine whether, _____ any area or country will not market the quota for such area or country."

It was previously determined in Sugar Regulation 811 that the Domestic Beet Sugar Area would be unable to market in excess of 3,500,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar in 1973. Accordingly, deficits were determined in the quota for the Beet area of 96,667 tons representing the amount its quota exceeded 3,500,000 tons. Since this amendment decreases the quota for that area by 47,667 tons, the deficit previously determined in the 1973 quota for the Domestic Beet Sugar Area is reduced by 47,667 short tons, raw value, to 49,000 tons. If production exceeds the present estimates for the Domestic Beet Area, the marketing opportunities for that area within the total quota for that area will not be limited as a result of the deficit determination and proration provided herein.

It is hereby determined that deficits previously declared and that declared herein constitute all known deficits on which data are currently ascertainable by the Department.

Section 202(a)(3) of the Act provides that whenever the sugar produced in Hawaii or Puerto Rico in any year is prevented from being marketed or brought into the continental United States in that year for reasons beyond the control of the shipper or producer of such sugar, the quota for the immediately following year shall be increased by an amount equal to the amount of sugar so prevented from being marketed or brought into the continental United States _____. It is hereby determined that 75,000 tons of 1972 Hawaiian quota sugar were not shipped to the United States due to a west coast shipping strike which lasted from October 24, to December 12, 1972. On the basis of information available to the Department such undershipment is herein determined to be beyond the control of the shipper. Therefore, the 1973 quota for Hawaii has been increased herein by 75,000 tons.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by the Act, Part 811 of this chapter is hereby amended by amending §§ 811.20, 811.21, 811.22, and 811.23 as follows:

1. Section 811.20 is amended to read as follows:

§ 811.20 Sugar requirements, 1973.

The amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States for the calendar year 1973 is hereby determined to be 11.5 million short tons, raw value.

2. Section 811.21 is amended by amending paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 811.21 Quotas for domestic areas.

(a) (1) For the calendar year 1973, domestic area quotas limiting the quantities of sugar which may be brought into or marketed for consumption in the continental United States are established, pursuant to section 202(a) of the Act, in column (1) and the amounts of such quotas for offshore areas that may be filled by direct-consumption sugar are established, pursuant to section 207 of the Act in column (2) as follows:

Area	Quotas	Direct consumption limits
	(1)	(2)
	(Short tons, raw value)	
Domestic beet sugar	3,549,000	No limit
Mainland cane sugar	1,591,000	No limit
Texas cane sugar	20,000	No limit
Hawaii	1,185,000	40,356
Puerto Rico	855,000	169,000

(2) It is hereby determined pursuant to section 204(a) of the Act that for the calendar year 1973, the Domestic Beet Sugar Area and Puerto Rico will be unable by 49,000 and 650,000 short tons, raw value, respectively, to fill the quotas established for such areas in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph. Pursuant to section 204(b) of the Act the determination of such deficits shall not affect the quotas established in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph.

* * * * *

3. Section 811.22 is amended by amending paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 811.22 Proration and allocation of deficits in quotas.

(a) The total deficits determined in quotas established under section 202 of the Act for the Domestic Beet Area and Puerto Rico of 699,000 short tons, raw value, is hereby prorated and allocated pursuant to section 204(a) of the Act, by allocating 30.08 percent or 210,259 short tons, raw value, to the Republic of the Philippines and by prorating the remaining 488,741 short tons, raw value, to Western Hemisphere countries on the basis of quotas determined herein pursuant to section 202.

* * * * *

4. Section 811.23 is amended by amending paragraphs (b) and (c) to read as follows:

§ 811.23 Quotas for foreign countries.

* * * * *

(b) For the calendar year 1973, the quota for the Republic of the Philippines is 1,347,591 short tons, raw value, representing 1,126,020 short tons, established pursuant to section 202(b) of the Act, 210,259 short tons established pursuant to section 204(a) of the Act, and 11,312 short tons established pursuant to section 202(d) of the Act. Of the quantity of 1,126,020 short tons established pursuant to section 202(b) of the Act, only 59,920 short tons, raw value, may be filled by direct-consumption sugar pursuant to section 207(d) of the Act.

(c) For the calendar year 1973, the prorations to individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines pursuant to section 202 of the Act are shown in columns (1) and (2) of the following table. Deficit prorations previously established in this Sugar Regulation 811 are shown in column (3). New deficit prorations established herein are shown in column (4). Total quotas and prorations are shown in column (5).

Countries	Basic quotas	Temporary quotas and prorations pursuant to Sec. 202(d) [1]	Previous deficit prorations	New deficit prorations	Total quotas and prorations
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	(Short tons, raw value)				
Dominican Republic	405,584	137,103	110,096	−7,025	645,698
Mexico	358,689	121,250	97,313	−6,212	571,040
Brazil	349,817	118,252	94,906	−6,059	556,916
Peru	250,322	84,618	67,913	−4,336	398,517
West Indies	130,548	44,130	35,418	−2,261	207,835
Ecuador	51,649	17,459	14,012	−894	82,226
Argentina	48,480	16,389	13,153	−840	77,182
Costa Rica	43,727	14,782	11,863	−757	69,615
Colombia	43,053	14,567	11,691	−746	68,565
Panama	40,875	13,818	11,090	−708	65,075
Nicaragua	40,875	13,818	11,090	−708	65,075
Venezuela	38,974	13,175	10,574	−675	62,048
Guatemala	37,390	12,639	10,144	−648	59,525
El Salvador	27,250	9,211	7,393	−472	43,382
British Honduras	21,547	7,284	5,845	−373	34,303
Haiti	19,645	6,641	5,330	−340	31,276
Honduras	7,605	2,570	2,063	−131	12,107
Bolivia	4,119	1,393	1,118	−72	6,558
Paraguay	4,119	1,393	1,118	−72	6,558
Australia	159,065	46,144			208,209
Republic of China	66,224	19,212			85,436
India	63,689	18,476			82,165
South Africa	44,994	13,053			58,047
Fiji Islands	34,855	10,112			44,967
Mauritius	23,448	6,802			30,250
Swaziland	23,448	6,802			30,250
Thailand	14,576	4,228			18,804
Malawi	11,724	3,401			15,125
Malagasy Republic	9,506	2,758			12,264
Ireland	5,351				5,351
Total	2,381,188	781,480	522,070	−33,329	3,651,409

[1] Proration of the quotas withheld from Cuba, Southern Rhodesia, Bahamas, and Uganda.

* * * * *

(Secs. 201, 202, 204, and 403; 61 Stat. 923, as amended, 924, as amended, 925, as amended, 932; and 7 U.S.C. 1111, 1112, 1114, and 1153)

Effective date. This action decreases requirements and quotas for the calendar year 1973 by 100,000 tons and revises deficit determinations and allocations. In order to promote orderly marketing, it is essential that this amendment be effective immediately so that all persons selling and purchasing sugar for consumption in the continental United States can promptly plan and market under the changed marketing opportunities. Therefore, it is hereby determined and found that compliance with the notice, procedure, and effective date requirements of 5 U.S.C. 533 is unnecessary, impracticable, and contrary to the public interest and this amendment shall be effective when filed for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on March 2, 1973.

KENNETH E. FRICK,
Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

[FR Doc.73-4323 Filed 3-2-73;11:41 am]

[Valencia Orange Reg. 420]

PART 908—VALENCIA ORANGES GROWN IN ARIZONA AND DESIGNATED PARTS OF CALIFORNIA

Limitation of Handling

This regulation fixes the quantity of California-Arizona Valencia oranges that may be shipped to fresh market during the weekly regulation period March 9–March 15, 1973. It is issued pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and Marketing Order No. 908. The quantity of Valencia oranges so fixed was arrived at after consideration of the total available supply of Valencia oranges, the quantity of Valencia oranges currently available for market, the fresh market demand for Valencia oranges, Valencia orange prices, and the relationship of season average returns to the parity price for Valencia oranges.

§ 908.720 Valencia Orange Regulation 420.

(a) *Findings.* (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 908, as amended (7 CFR Part 908), regulating the handling of Valencia oranges grown in Arizona and designated part of California, effective under the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), and upon the basis of the recommendations and information submitted by the

Valencia Orange Administrative Committee, established under the said amended marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found that the limitation of handling of such Valencia oranges, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(2) The need for this section to limit the respective quantities of Valencia oranges that may be marketed from District 1, District 2, and District 3 during the ensuing week stems from the production and marketing situation confronting the Valencia orange industry.

(i) The committee has submitted its recommendation with respect to the quantities of Valencia oranges that should be marketed during the next succeeding week. Such recommendation, designed to provide equity of marketing opportunity to handlers in all districts, resulted from consideration of the factors enumerated in the order. Prices at auction have averaged $3.49 per carton for the season to date.

(ii) Having considered the recommendation and information submitted by the committee, and other information, the Secretary finds that the respective quantities of Valencia oranges which may be handled should be fixed as hereinafter set forth.

(3) It is hereby further found that it is impracticable and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rule making procedure, and postpone the effective date of this section until 30 days after publication hereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) because the time intervening between the date when information upon which this section is based became available and the time when this section must become effective in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act is insufficient, and a reasonable time is permitted, under the circumstances, for preparation for such effective time; and good cause exists for making the provisions hereof effective as hereinafter set forth. The committee held an open meeting during the current week, after giving due notice thereof, to consider supply and market conditions for Valencia oranges and the need for regulation; interested persons were afforded an opportunity to submit information and views at this meeting; the recommendation and supporting information for regulation during the period specified herein were promptly submitted to the Department after such meeting was held; the provisions of this section, including its effective time, are identical with the aforesaid recommendation of the committee, and information concerning such provisions and effective time has been disseminated among handlers of such Valencia oranges; it is necessary, in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act, to make this section effective during the period herein specified; and compliance with this regulation will not require any special preparation on the part of persons subject hereto which cannot be completed on or before the effective date hereof. Such committee meeting was held on March 6, 1973.

(b) *Order.* (1) The respective quantities of Valencia oranges grown in Arizona and designated part of California which may be handled during the period March 9, 1973, through March 15, 1973, are hereby fixed as follows:

(i) District 1: Unlimited;

(ii) District 2: Unlimited;

(iii) District 3: 200,000 cartons.

(2) As used in this section, "handled," "District 1," "District 2," "District 3," and "carton" have the same meaning as when used in said amended marketing agreement and order.

(Secs 1–19, 18 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601–674)

Dated: March 7, 1973.

PAUL A. NICHOLSON,
Acting Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.73-4662 Filed 3-7-73;2:05 pm]

Proposed Rule Making

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

[21 CFR Part 278]

CONTROL OF ELECTRONIC PRODUCT RADIATION; ASSEMBLY OF DIAGNOSTIC X-RAY SYSTEMS

Notice of Proposed Rule Making

Correction

In FR Doc. 73-3499 appearing at page 5349 in the issue of Wednesday, February 28, 1973, make the following changes in § 278.102:

1. In the 11th line of paragraph (a), "§ 278.213-1(a)(2)", should read "278.213-1(d)(2)".

2. In paragraph (b):

a. In the ninth line, immediately after "§ 278.213-1(d)(1)", insert the conjunction "or".

b. In the last line, put a period after "§ 278.213-1(d)(2)", and delete "if the components so".

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[14 CFR Part 71]

[Airspace Docket No. 72-NW-17]

TRANSITION AREA

Proposed Alteration

Correction

In FR Doc. 73-3758 appearing on page 5482 in the issue of Thursday, March 1, 1973, in the 11th line of the second paragraph, change the date "March 2, 1973", to read "April 2, 1973".

Federal Aviation Administration

[14 CFR Part 71]

[Airspace Docket No. 73-SO-13]

TRANSITION AREA

Proposed Alteration

The Federal Aviation Administration is considering an amendment to Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations that would alter the Nashville, Tenn., transition area.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration, Southern Region, Air Traffic Division, Post Office Box 20636, Atlanta, GA 30320. All communications received on or before April 9, 1973, will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Administration officials may be made by contacting the Chief, Airspace and Procedures Branch. Any data, views, or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received.

The official docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Federal Aviation Administration, Southern Region, Room 724, 3400 Whipple Street, East Point, GA.

The Nashville transition area described in § 71.181 (38 FR 435) would be amended as follows:

"* * * long. 86°18'55" W.) * * *" would be deleted and " * * * long. 86°18'55" W.); within an 8-mile radius of Murfreesboro Municipal Airport (lat. 35°52'32" N., long. 86°22'45" W.); within 3 miles each side of the 007° bearing from Lascassas RBN (lat. 35°52'18" N., long. 86°22'37" W.), extending from the 8-mile-radius area to 8.5 miles north of the RBN * * *" would be substituted therefor.

The proposed alteration is required to provide controlled airspace protection for IFR operations at Murfreesboro Municipal Airport, Murfreesboro, Tenn. A prescribed instrument approach procedure to this airport, utilizing the Lascassas (private) nondirectional radio beacon, is proposed in conjunction with the alteration of this transition area.

(Sec. 307(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1958, 49 U.S.C. 1348(a); sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, (49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in East Point, Ga., on February 26, 1973.

PHILLIP M. SWATEK,
Director, Southern Region.

[FR Doc.73-4415 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[14 CFR Part 71]

[Airspace Docket No. 73-SO-14]

TRANSITION AREA

Proposed Alteration

The Federal Aviation Administration is considering an amendment to Part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations that would alter the Chattanooga, Tenn., transition area.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration, Southern Region, Air Traffic Division, Post Office Box 20636, Atlanta, GA 30320. All communications received on or before April 9, 1973, will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendment. No hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Administration officials may be made by contacting the Chief, Airspace and Procedures Branch. Any data, views, or arguments presented during such conferences must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received.

The official docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Federal Aviation Administration, Southern Region, Room 724, 3400 Whipple Street, East Point, GA.

The Chattanooga transition area described in § 71.181 (38 FR 435) would be amended as follows:

"* * * 030° bearing from Lovell Field * * *" would be deleted and "* * * 030° bearing from Lovell Field; within a 6.5-mile radius of Hardwick Field, Cleveland, Tenn. (lat. 35°13'20" N., long. 84°49'58" W.); within 3 miles each side of the 221° bearing from Hardwick RBN (lat. 35°09'13" N., long. 84°54'21" W.), extending from the 6.5-mile-radius area to 8.5 miles southwest of the RBN * * *" would be substituted therefor.

The proposed alteration is required to provide controlled airspace protection for IFR operations at Hardwick Field, Cleveland, Tenn. A prescribed instrument approach procedure to this airport, utilizing the Hardwick (private) nondirectional radio beacon, is proposed in conjunction with the alteration of this transition area.

(Sec. 307(a), Federal Aviation Act of 1958, 49 U.S.C. 1348(a); sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in East Point, Ga., on February 26, 1973.

PHILIP M. SWATEK,
Director, Southern Region.

[FR Doc.73-4414 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[40 CFR Part 50]

PREPARATION, ADOPTION, AND SUBMITTAL OF IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making

On August 14, 1971 (36 FR 15486), the Administrator of the Environmental

Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated as 40 CFR Part 420, regulations for the preparation, adoption, and submittal of State implementation plans under § 110 of the Clean Air Act, as amended. These regulations were republished November 25, 1971 (36 FR 22398), as 40 CFR Part 51. Section 110(a)(2)(B) of the Clean Air Act and 40 CFR 51.12 require that State implementation plans provide for maintenance as well as for attainment of the national standards.

On January 31, 1973, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit issued an order in the case of Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., et al. v. Environmental Protection Agency (Case No. 72–1522) and seven related cases. That order directed the Administrator of EPA to again review all implementation plans which were approved on May 31, 1972 (37 FR 10842, et seq.), to determine if they contain measures necessary to insure maintenance of the standards.

Such review has been completed and the Administrator has determined that it is necessary for State plans to contain, as a minimum, procedures whereby the State can review, prior to construction or modification, the location both of sources of pollution and of other facilities which may cause an increase in air pollution because of activities associated with such facilities, in order to insure that the national standards will be maintained; 40 CFR 51.18 imposes a review requirement with respect to stationary sources of air pollution. However, it does not require the review of facilities to determine the effect on air quality caused by associated activity, such as increased motor vehicle traffic. Because the implementation plans did not contain such a provision, they are being disapproved with regard to maintenance of the standards.

Notice is hereby given that the Administrator will propose an amendment to 40 CFR 51.18 which will extend the requirements for review set forth therein to apply to facilities which may cause an increase in air pollution because of activity associated with such facilities. The States will be required to have legally enforceable procedures reviewing, prior to construction or modification, the location of such facilities and for preventing such construction or modification where it would result in interference with the attainment or maintenance of a national standard. The Administrator is presently considering the types of facilities to be covered by such procedures and the factors to be considered in determining the impact such facilities will have on air quality. The amendment to 40 CFR 51.18 will be proposed by April 15, 1973.

The reasons for the regulation and the general form of it are more specifically discussed in the preamble to the Administrator's disapproval of the maintenance provisions of State plans which is published in 38 FR 6279. This advance notice of proposed rule making is published with the intention of informing the public of the Agency's actions and plans in this important area, and for the purpose of providing States notice of an impending change in the implementation plan regulations which will require the adoption and submission to the Administrator of additional plan provisions. States should begin now to determine whether they have adequate legal authority to adopt such a regulation and, if they do not, take steps to secure such legal authority.

Dated: March 2, 1973.

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Administrator,
Environmental Protection Agency.

[FR Doc.73–4404 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[13 CFR Part 121]

SMALL BUSINESS SIZE STANDARDS

Definition of Affiliates as Affecting Licensed Small Business Investment Companies and Certain Other Registered Companies

The purpose of this notice is to give the public an opportunity to comment on a proposal by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to amend the definition of the term "affiliates" as used in the small business size standards regulation to exclude licensed small business investment companies (SBIC) and investment companies registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, from being considered as affiliates for size determination purposes, notwithstanding the fact that there may be common ownership, common management, or contractual relationship between such companies and an applicant for SBA assistance.

Section 121.3–2(a) of the currently effective size standards regulation provides that concerns are affiliated if one concern other than an investment company licensed under the Investment Company Act of 1958 or registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 controls or has the power to control both. Concerns also are affiliated if the same third party, other than an SBIC or investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, controls or has the power to control both. However, the regulation does not except from affiliation the situation wherein a third party controls or has the power to control both an SBIC (or an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940) and another concern. Thus, an otherwise small concern might lose its small business size status just because the party which controls or has the power to control it, also controls or has the power to control an SBIC (or an investment company registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940).

It is the view of the Small Business Administration that, to preclude a concern from receiving SBA assistance under the above circumstances would be contra to the intent and spirit of the Small Business Act in that it would discourage the formation of companies designed to assist small business and in many instances also prevent the Government from assisting concerns which are really small and need such assistance.

Accordingly it is proposed to amend Part 121 of Chapter I of Title 13 of the Code of Federal Regulations by revising § 121.3–2(a) to read as follows:

§ 121.3–2 Definition of terms used in this part.

(a) Affiliates: Concerns, other than investment companies licensed under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 or registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, are affiliates of each other when either directly or indirectly (1) one concern controls or has the power to control the other, or (2) a third party or parties controls or has the power to control both. In determining whether concerns are independently owned and operated and whether or not affiliation exists, consideration shall be given to all appropriate factors, including common ownership, common management, and contractual relationships: *Provided, however,* That restraints imposed on a franchisee by its franchise agreement shall not be considered in determining whether the franchisor controls or has the power to control and, therefore, is affiliated with the franchisee, if the franchisee has the right to profit from his effort, commensurate with ownership, and bears the risk of loss or failure. Where a concern is a subcontractor pursuant to section 8(a)(2) of the Small Business Act and, in connection therewith, is the subject of a divestiture agreement approved by SBA for the benefit of socially or economically disadvantaged individuals, the receipts, employment, and other factors of the concern attributable to the section 8(a)(2) subcontract shall not be included in determining the size of either concern during the term of such divestiture agreement. Other contracts and business of such subcontractor may also be excluded in determining the size if, in the judgment of SBA, substantial beneficiaries of such other contracts and business will be the socially or economically disadvantaged individuals in question.

* * * * *

Interested persons may file with the Small Business Administration on or before April 9, 1973, written statements of facts, opinions, or arguments concerning the proposal.

All correspondence shall be addressed to:

William L. Pellington, Director, Office of Industry Studies and Size Standards, Small Business Administration, 1441 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20416.

Dated: February 26, 1973.

THOMAS S. KLEPPE,
Administrator.

[FR Doc.73–4461 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

Notices

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Comptroller of the Currency

COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY'S CONSULTING COMMITTEE OF BANK ECONOMISTS

Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463), notice is hereby given that a closed meeting of the Comptroller of the Currency's Consulting Committee of Bank Economists will be held at 9:30 a.m. on March 28, 1973.

The purpose of this meeting is to provide assistance to the Comptroller of the Currency through informal discussions on those banking issues and problems that lend themselves to economic analysis. The Committee functions as a subgroup of the National Advisory Committee on Banking Policies and Practices.

It is hereby determined pursuant to section 10(d) of Public Law 92-463 that the meeting is concerned with matters listed in section 552(b) of title 5 of the United States Code and particularly with exceptions (3), (4), and (8) thereof, and is therefore exempt from the provisions of sections 10 (a)(1) and (a)(3) of the Act (Public Law 92-463) relating to open meetings and public participation therein.

Dated: March 5, 1973.

[SEAL] WILLIAM B. CAMP,
Comptroller of the Currency.

[FR Doc.73-4498 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Fiscal Service

[Dept. Circ. 570, 1972 Rev., Supp. No. 14]

INA REINSURANCE COMPANY

Surety Company Acceptable on Federal Bonds

A Certificate of Authority as an acceptable surety on Federal bonds has been issued by the Secretary of the Treasury to the following company under sections 6 to 13 of title 6 of the United States Code. An underwriting limitation of $2,452,000 has been established for the company.

Name of company, location of principal executive office, and State in which incorporated:

INA Reinsurance Company
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Delaware

Certificates of Authority expire on June 30 each year, unless sooner revoked, and new Certificates are issued on July 1 so long as the companies remain qualified (31 CFR Part 223). A list of qualified companies is published annually as of July 1 in Department Circular 570, with details as to underwriting limitations, areas in which licensed to transact fidelity and surety business and other information. Copies of the Circular, when issued, may be obtained from the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, Audit Staff, Washington, D.C. 20226.

Dated: March 5, 1973.

[SEAL] JOHN K. CARLOCK,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4497 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

NOTICE OF ADVISORY GROUP ON ELECTRON DEVICES

Meeting

The Department of Defense Advisory Group on Electron Devices will meet in closed session at 201 Varick Street, New York, NY, March 15, 1973.

MAURICE W. ROCHE,
Director, Correspondence and Directives Division, OASD (Comptroller).

[FR Doc.73-4490 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Office of the Attorney General

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SECURITY PROGRAM

Removal of Organizations From the List

In compliance with the order of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia dated January 26, 1973, issued in the case Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade et al. v. The Attorney General, et al.:

Order No. 12-53 of the Attorney General dated April 29, 1953, published at 18 FR 2741-42 concerning the "Designation of Organizations in Connection with the Federal Employee Security Program" as provided by Executive Order No. 10450 is amended by removing from the consolidated list of organizations set forth therein the names "Abraham Lincoln Brigade" and "Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade."

Dated: February 15, 1973.

RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Attorney General.

[FR Doc.73-4460 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[CA 167]

CALIFORNIA

Notice of Proposed Withdrawal and Reservation of Lands

FEBRUARY 28, 1973.

The Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, has filed an application, Serial No. CA 167, for the withdrawal of national forest lands described below from appropriation under the mining laws (30 U.S.C., Ch. 2), but not from leasing under the mineral leasing laws.

The lands are located within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest and have been open to entry under the general mining laws. The lands contain developed campsites and administrative sites and any disturbance to these areas would adversely affect their value for public purposes. The Forest Service has made application to withdraw the lands from mining in order to protect their value for present and future public purposes.

On or before April 9, 1973, all persons who wish to submit comments, suggestions, or objections with the proposed withdrawal may present their views in writing to the undersigned officer of the Bureau of Land Management, Room E-2841, Federal Office Building, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825.

The Department's regulations provide that the authorized officer of the Bureau of Land Management will undertake such investigations as are necessary to determine the existing and potential demand for the lands and their resources. He will also undertake negotiations with the applicant agency with the view of adjusting the application to reduce the area to the minimum essential to meet the applicant's needs, to provide for the maximum concurrent utilization of the lands for purposes other than the applicant's, to eliminate the lands needed for purposes more essential than the applicant's, and to reach agreement on the concurrent management of the lands and their resources.

The authorized officer will also prepare a report for consideration by the Secretary of the Interior who will determine whether or not the lands will be withdrawn as requested by the applicant agency.

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

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

The lands involved in the application are:

MOUNT DIABLO MERIDIAN

SHASTA-TRINITY NATIONAL FOREST

T. 29 N., R. 10 W.,
Sec. 11, SW¼SW¼SW¼;
Sec. 14, S½SE¼, NW¼SE¼, S½NE¼SE¼;
Sec. 23, N½N½NE¼.

The area described aggregates 190 acres of land in Shasta and Trinity Counties.

WALTER F. HOLMES,
Chief, Branch of Lands and Minerals Operations.

[FR Doc.73-4441 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

GRAIN STANDARDS

Pennsylvania Inspection Point

Statement of considerations. The Grain and Hay Exchange of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., has proposed that, effective April 1, 1973, its designation under section 3(m) of the U.S. Grain Standards Act (sec. 3, 39 Stat. 482, as amended, 82 Stat. 762; 7 U.S.C. 75(m)) to operate an official grain inspection agency at Pittsburgh, Pa., be canceled. Therefore, the Agricultural Marketing Service proposes to cancel the designation of said exchange as the official grain inspection agency at Pittsburgh, effective on said date.

Interested organizations and persons are hereby given opportunity to make application for designation to operate an official inspection agency at Pittsburgh, Pa., according to the requirements in § 26.97 of the regulations (7 CFR 26.97) under the U.S. Grain Standards Act.

NOTE: Section 7(f) of the Act (sec. 3, 39 Stat. 482, as amended, 82 Stat. 764; 7 U.S.C. 79(f)) provides generally that not more than one inspection agency shall be operative at any one time for any one city, town, or other area.

Members of the grain industry who wish to submit views and comments are requested to include the name of the person or agency which they recommend to be designated to operate an official inspection agency at Pittsburgh, Pa., if they believe such an agency is needed there.

Opportunity is hereby afforded all interested persons to submit written data, views, or arguments with respect to this matter to the Hearing Clerk, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250. All written submissions shall be in duplicate and shall be mailed to the hearing clerk not later than April 9, 1973. All submissions made pursuant to this notice will be made available for public inspection at the office of the hearing clerk during regular business hours (7 CFR 1.27(b)). Consideration will be given to the written data, views, or arguments so filed with the hearing clerk and to other information available to the U.S. Department of Agriculture before final determination is made with respect to this matter.

Done in Washington, D.C., on March 5, 1973.

E. L. PETERSON,
Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.73-4499 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Forest Service

STANISLAUS FOREST-WIDE LIVESTOCK ADVISORY BOARD

Notice of Meeting

The Stanislaus Forest-Wide Livestock Advisory Board will meet at 7:30 p.m., March 29, 1973, at 542 West Stockton Road, Sonora, CA 95370.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the following agenda items:

1. May a Livestock Advisory Board member serve on more than one Livestock Advisory Board.
2. Review of the status of off-road vehicle use regulations.
3. Recommendations on setting of deer season dates.
4. Patrol of permittee range areas.
5. Clarification of Forest Service views on supplemental feeding on livestock ranges.
6. Request by Mr. Carl Dell'Orto for a joint Livestock Advisory Board-Forest Service range inspection tour of the Mattley grazing allotment.
7. Discuss comments Livestock Advisory Board members have on bylaws adopted for the Advisory Board.
8. Discuss potential impacts on livestock grazing of white water touring on the Tuolumne River.

The meeting will be open to the public. Written statements may be filed with the Board before or after the meeting.

The Board has established the following rules for public participation:

To the extent that time permits, members of the public may make oral statements on agenda items following completion of discussion of the agenda by the Advisory Board.

Dated: February 28, 1973.

GARY E. CARGILL,
Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc.73-4444 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of East-West Trade

[Case 442]

OTTO F. JOKLIK AND INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY AND BIOTECHNOLOGY

Order Denying Export Privileges

In the matter of Otto F. Joklik, trading as Institute of Advanced Technology and Biotechnology, Haarlem University, Gersthoferstrasse 120, A-1180 Vienna 18, Austria (respondent).

By charging letter dated December 4, 1972, the Director, Compliance Division, Office of Export Control, charged the above respondent with violations of the regulations under the Export Administration Act of 1969.[1] The charging letter was duly served and the respondent having failed to answer, was held in default pursuant to § 388.4 of the Export Control Regulations. In accordance with the usual practice an informal hearing was held before the Hearing Commissioner (on Feb. 2, 1973) at which evidence in support of the charges was presented on behalf of the Compliance Division.

There are two charges. Charge I alleges in substance that the respondent ordered certain strategic laser equipment from the West German affiliate of a U.S. company and represented that the equipment was for use in his laboratory in Vienna; that in reliance on respondent's representations an export license was issued authorizing the exportation; that on arrival of the equipment in Austria the respondent reexported and diverted it to U.S.S.R., an unauthorized destination. Charge II alleges in substance that in the course of an official investigation as to the disposition of the equipment (after respondent had reexported it to U.S.S.R.) the respondent falsely stated that he had not imported the equipment but expected to do so the following month and that he did not know where the equipment was at that time but assumed that it was at some customs area.

The Hearing Commissioner, after considering the evidence in the case, reported the findings of fact and concluded that the violations had occurred and he recommended the sanction hereinafter set forth be imposed.

After considering the evidence in the case, I adopt the Hearing Commissioner's findings of fact as follows:

Findings of fact. 1. The respondent, Otto F. Joklik, at the time here material, resided in Vienna, Austria. In the transaction that is the subject of the charging letter and in other transactions relating to the ordering and purchasing of U.S.-origin commodities the respondent has used letterheads imprinted as follows: "Prof. Otto F. Joklik, Ph. D., Institute of Advanced Technology and Biotechnology, Haarlem University." Some of these letterheads also bore an address in Vienna which is the residence apartment of respondent.

2. The respondent has represented that "Haarlem University" is located in Haarlem, The Netherlands. According to the Dutch Ministry of Education "Haarlem University" does not exist as a recognized institution. In the "World of Learning" (22d Ed. 1971–1972, Europa Publications, Ltd., London, England), a well recognized and authoritative publication that lists universities, learned societies, research institutes, etc., throughout the world, neither "Haarlem University" nor "Institute of Advanced Technology and Biotechnology" (hereinafter IATB) is shown to exist in The Netherlands or Austria.

The respondent acknowledged that his degree and title (of professor) stem from

[1] This Act has been amended by the Equal Export Opportunity Act, Public Law 92-412, 86 Stat. 644, approved Aug. 29, 1972.

"Haarlem University." He also acknowledged that IATB does not have a laboratory or plant.

3. On June 25, 1970, the respondent on a letterhead of the type described in Finding 1, ordered from a firm in Frankfurt, West Germany, certain strategic laser equipment and accessories valued at approximately $6,800. The Frankfurt firm is an affiliate of a company in New York City.

4. On August 14, 1970, the respondent sent to the Frankfurt firm an export control document showing that IATB/Joklik intended to import into Austria the laser articles in question, which were to be exported from the United States by the aforementioned New York company. The document showed that the articles were to be used by Joklik/IATB in their own laboratory for research purposes. The respondent knew that the export control document would be used by the exporter in support of an application for an export license.

5. The Frankfurt firm forwarded the export control document to the New York company. By application dated September 10, 1970, the New York company applied to the Office of Export Control (OEC) for an export license to export the articles in question, to be used by IATB in Vienna in its laboratory. In support of the application the New York company furnished to OEC the above-mentioned export control document. In reliance on the representations in the application for export license and in the said document, OEC on September 22, 1970, issued a license authorizing the New York company to export the articles in question for ultimate destination Austria.

6. On October 6, 1970, the New York company exported the articles in question, under the above-mentioned license, to the Frankfurt firm as intermediary consignee and for IATB, Vienna, as ultimate consignee. The shipment arrived in Frankfurt and was on-forwarded to Vienna where it arrived on or about October 16, 1970.

7. On or about October 19, 1970, the respondent instructed his freight forwarder in Vienna, who had possession of the articles, to on-forward them to a destination in Moscow, U.S.S.R. No authorization for such reexportation was obtained. The freight forwarder on or about October 19, 1970, shipped the articles to U.S.S.R. in accordance with respondent's instructions.

8. In the course of a postshipment investigation, under authority of the Export Administration Act of 1969, to determine the disposition of the above-mentioned laser equipment, the respondent on March 1, 1971, was interviewed by an official of the U.S. Embassy in Vienna. On this occasion respondent stated that he had not yet imported the equipment in question but expected to do so the following month. He also stated that he did not know where the equipment was but assumed that it must be at some customs area. He further stated that he did not know who his shipping agent was for the equipment. At the time the respondent made these statements he knew that they were false. He knew that the equipment had arrived in Vienna on or about October 16, 1970, and that in accordance with his instructions to his freight forwarder the equipment had been on-forwarded to U.S.S.R.

Based on the foregoing, I have concluded that the respondent: (a) Violated § 387.6 of the Export Control Regulations in that without authorization from the Office of Export Control he knowingly diverted and reexported U.S.-origin commodities from Austria to the U.S.S.R. contrary to the terms and conditions of export control documents and contrary to prior representations; and (b) violated § 387.5 of said regulations in that during the course of an investigation instituted under authority of the Export Administration Act of 1969 he made false statements to and concealed material facts from an official of the U.S. Government concerning the disposition of U.S. origin commodities.

The Hearing Commissioner has recommended that the respondent be denied export privileges for the duration of export controls.

Now after considering the record in the case and the recommendation of the Hearing Commissioner, and being of the opinion that his recommendation as to the sanction that should be imposed is fair and just and calculated to achieve effective enforcement of the law:

It is hereby ordered, That:

I. All outstanding validated export licenses in which respondent, or Institute of Advanced Technology and Biotechnology, or Haarlem University appear or participate in any manner or capacity are hereby revoked and shall be returned forthwith to the Bureau of East-West Trade for cancellation.

II. So long as export controls are in effect the respondent is hereby denied all privileges of participating, directly or indirectly, in any manner or capacity, in any transaction involving commodities or technical data exported from the United States, in whole or in part, or to be exported, or which are otherwise subject to the Export Regulations. Without limitation of the generality of the foregoing, participation prohibited in any such transaction either in the United States or abroad, shall include participation: (a) As a party or as a representative of a party to any validated export license application; (b) in the preparation or filing of any export license application or reexportation authorization, or document to be submitted therewith; (c) in the obtaining or using of any validated or general export license or other export control documents; (d) in the carrying on of negotiations with respect to, or in the receiving, ordering, buying, selling, delivering, storing, using, or disposing of any commodities or technical data; (e) in the financing, forwarding, transporting, or other servicing of such commodities or technical data.

III. Such denial of export privileges shall extend not only to the respondent, but also to his agents, employees, representatives, and partners, and to any person, firm, corporation, institution or organization with which he now or hereafter may be related by affiliation, ownership, control, position of responsibility, or other connection in the conduct of trade or services connected therewith. Included as related parties are Institute of Advanced Technology and Biotechnology and Haarlem University.

IV. No person, firm, corporation, partnership, institution, or other organization, whether in the United States or elsewhere, without prior disclosure to and specific authorization from the Bureau of East-West Trade, shall do any of the following acts, directly or indirectly, in any manner or capacity, on behalf of or in any association with the respondent or other party denied export privileges within the scope of this order, or whereby said respondent or such other party may obtain any benefit therefrom or have any interest or participation therein, directly or indirectly: (a) Apply for, obtain, transfer, or use any license, Shipper's Export Declaration, bill of lading, or other export control document relating to any exportation, reexportation, transshipment, or diversion of any commodity or technical data exported or to be exported from the United States, by, to, or for said respondent or other party denied export privileges within the scope of this order; or (b) order, buy, receive, use, sell, deliver, store, dispose of, forward, transport, finance, or otherwise service or participate in any exportation, reexportation, transshipment, or diversion of any commodity or technical data exported or to be exported from the United States.

This order shall become effective on March 8, 1973.

Dated: March 1, 1973.

RAUER H. MEYER,
Director, Office of Export Control, Bureau of East-West Trade.

[FR Doc.73-4259 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

Maritime Administration

[Report No. 121]

FREE WORLD AND POLISH FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN CUBA

List

SECTION 1. The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate Departments the following list of vessels which have arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through October 31, 1972, exclusive of those vessels that called at Cuba on U.S. Government-approved noncommercial voyages and those listed in section 2. Pursuant to established U.S. Government policy, the listed vessels are ineligible to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States.

Flag of Registry and Name of Ship	Gross tonnage
Total—all flags (168 ships)	1,282,323
Cypriot (84 ships)	698,455
Aegis Banner	9,024
Aegis Eternity	8,814
Aegis Fame	9,072
Aegis Hope (previous trips to Cuba as the Huntsmore—British)	5,678
**Aegis Legend (previous trips to Cuba—Greece	8,925
Aegis Loyal	10,405
Aegis Strength	9,305
Aftadelfos	8,136
Aghios Ermolaos	7,208
Aghios Nicolaos	7,254
Alamar	11,929
Alda	7,292
*Alexandros Skoutaris	8,280
Alfa	7,388
Alma	9,097
Alpa	9,159
Amarilis	8,959
Anemone	7,168
Annunication Day	8,047
Antigoni	3,174
Areti	8,406
Arion	3,570
Aris II	9,561
Armar	9,559
Artigas	5,841
Aurora	8,380
Baracoa	9,242
Begonia	6,576
Byron	8,720
Camelia	8,111
Castalia	7,641
Cleo II	7,590
Cleopatra	8,079
Degedo	9,000
Dorine Papalios (previous trips to Cuba as the Formentor—British)	8,424
E. D. Papalios	9,431
Elpida	8,296
**Eftyhia (trips to Cuba—Greek)	10,347
Free Trader (previous trips to Cuba—Lebanese)	7,061
Gardenia	9,744
George	7,378
George N. Papalios	9,071
Georgios C. (previous trips to Cuba as the Huntsfield—British and Cypriot)	9,483
Georgios T	9,646
Giannis	7,490
Goodluck	6,952
Happy Land	9,080
Herodemos	7,356
Hymettus	11,771
Ilena (previous trips to Cuba—Lebanese)	5,925
Iris	8,479
June	9,357
Kentavoras	10,173
Kitsa	9,519
Magnolia	7,176
Master George	7,334
May	8,853
Mimis N. Papalios	9,069
Mimosa	8,618
Miss Papalios	9,072
Mitera Irini (previous trips to Cuba as the Soclyve—British and Maltese)	7,291
Nea Hellas	9,241
Nedi 2	7,679
**Newheath (trips to Cuba—British)	7,643
Nike	9,505
Noelle (previous trips to Cuba—Lebanese)	7,251
Cypriot—Continued	
Pantazis Calas	9,618
Petunia	7,843
Protoapostolos	8,130
Protoklitos	6,154
Ravens	8,036
Reifens	8,071
Rothens	8,113
Salvia	8,522
Silver Coast	7,328
Silver Hope	5,313
Stavros T	10,407
Successor	11,471
Telenikis	12,303
Theoskepasti	6,618
Torenia	8,077
Venturer	9,000
Zaira	8,032
Zinnia	7,114
British (17 ships)	136,135
Arctic Ocean	8,791
Athelmonarch (tanker)	11,182
Cheung Chau	8,566
Carol Islands	9,060
Golden Bridge	7,897
Ho Fung	7,121
Ivory Islands	9,718
Magister	2,239
**Rosetta Maud (trips to Cuba as the Ardtara—British)	5,795
Sea Amber	10,421
Sea Coral	10,421
Sea Empress	9,841
Sea Moon	9,085
Seasage	4,330
**Shun Wah (trip to Cuba as the Vercharmian—British)	7,265
Steed	8,989
Yugiutaton	5,414
Polish (16 ships)	114,650
Baltyk	6,984
Bytom	5,967
Chopin	9,231
Chorzow	7,237
Energetyk	10,876
Grodziec	3,379
Huta Labedy	7,221
Huta Ostrowiec	7,179
Huta Zgoda	6,840
Hutnik	10,847
Kopalnia Czladz	7,252
Kopalnia Siemianowice	7,165
Kopalnia Wujek	7,033
Piast	3,184
Rejowiec	3,401
Transportowiec	10,854
Somali (16 ships)	129,518
**Atlas (trip to Cuba—Finnish)	3,916
Ber Sea	8,269
Dimitrakis	7,829
Feihang	8,924
Feita	8,903
**Fortune Enterprise (trips to Cuba—British)	7,696
Hemisphere (previous trips to Cuba—British)	8,718
Jade Islands	10,270
**Kinvross (previous trips to Cuba—British)	5,388
Marbella	8,409
Nebula (previous trips to Cuba—British)	8,907
**New East Sea (previous trips to Cuba—British)	9,679
**Oriental (trips to Cuba as the Oceantramp—British)	6,185
Eastglory (previous trips to Cuba—British)	8,995
**Jollity (trips to Cuba—British)	8,819
**Venice (trips to Cuba—British)	8,611
Yugoslav (8 ships)	56,740
Agrum	2,449
Bar	8,776
Cetinje	8,229
Niksic	10,067
Piva	7,519
Plod	3,657
Ulcinj	8,602
Tara	7,441
Greek (5 ships)	34,282
Andromachi (previous trips to Cuba as the Penelope—Greek)	6,712
**Anna Maria (trips to Cuba as the Helka—British)	2,111
Ariadne	6,487
**Lambros M. Patsis (trips to Cuba as the Lahortensia—British)	9,486
**Pothiti (trips to Cuba as the Huntsville—British)	9,486
French (5 ships)	10,966
**Atlanta (trip to Cuba as the Enee—French)	1,232
Circe	2,874
Danae	3,486
**Urdazuri II (trips to Cuba as the Meike—Netherlands)	500
Nelie	2,874
Italian (4 ships)	45,261
Alderamine (tanker)	12,505
Elia (tanker)	11,021
San Nicola	12,451
San Francisco	9,284
Netherlands (4 ships)	3,860
*Gerda	1,190
*Markab II	768
Rochab	787
Tempo	1,115
Moroccan (2 ships)	4,739
*El Mansour Billah	1,525
Marrakech	3,214
Singapore (2 ships)	17,287
**Hwa Chu (trips to Cuba—British	9,091
Tong Hoe	8,196
Guinean (1 ship)	852
**Drame Oumar (trip to Cuba as the Neve—French)	852
Lebanese (1 ship)	6,259
Antonis	6,259
Maltese (1 ship)	5,333
Timios Stavros (previous trips to Cuba—British and Greek)	5,333
Pakistani (1 ship)	8,708
**Maulabaksh (trips to Cuba as the Phoenician Dawn and East Breeze—British)	8,708
Panama (1 ship)	9,278
**Kika (trips to Cuba as the Santa Lucia—Italian)	9,278

See footnotes at end of document.

SEC. 2. In accordance with approved procedures, the vessels listed below which called at Cuba after January 1, 1963, have reacquired eligibility to carry U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance:

(a) That such vessels will not, thenceforth, be employed in the Cuban trade so long as it remains the policy of the U.S. Government to discourage such trade; and

(b) That no other vessels under their control will thenceforth be employed in the Cuban trade, except as provided in paragraph (c); and

(c) That vessels under their control which are covered by contractual obligations, including charters, entered into prior to December 16, 1963, requiring their employment in the Cuban trade shall be withdrawn from such trade at the earliest opportunity consistent with such contractual obligations.

FLAG OF REGISTRY AND NAME OF SHIP

a. Since last report:
None.

b. Previous reports:

Flag of Registry:	Number of ships
British	49
Cypriot	10
Danish	1
Finnish	4
French	4
Germany (West)	1
Greek	31
Israeli	1
Italian	15
Japanese	1
Kuwaiti	1
Lebanese	9
Liberia	1
Moroccan	2
Norwegian	5
Singapore	1
Somali	1
Spanish	6
Sweden	1
Yugoslav	2
Total	146

SEC. 3. The following number of vessels have been removed from this list since they have been broken up, sunk, or wrecked.

a. Since last report:

	Gross tonnage
Alitric (Cypriot)	7,564
Ardena (Cypriot)	7,261
Arendal (Cypriot)	7,265
Astir (Lebanese)	5,324
Azalea (Cypriot)	9,506
Calypso (Cypriot)	12,883
Costiana (Cypriot)	7,199
Diamando (Cypriot)	7,067
Kopalnia Meichowice (Polish)	7,223
Platres (Cypriot)	7,244
Sophia (Cypriot)	7,030

b. Previous reports.

Flag of Registry:	Broken up, sunk, or wrecked
British	33
Cypriot	65
Finnish	6
French	1
Greek	19
Italian	4
Japanese	1
Lebanese	36
Maltese	2
Polish	4
Monaco	1
Moroccan	1
Norwegian	1
Pakistan	1
Panamanian	9
Singapore	1
Somali	1
South Africa	2
Swedish	1
Yugoslav	7
Total	196

SEC. 4. The ships listed in sections 1 and 2 have made the following number of trips to Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through October 31, 1972.

Flag of registry	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972 Jan.–May	1972 June–Oct.	Total
British	133	180	136	101	78	62	45	53	18	5	3	814
Cypriot		1	17	27	42	68	115	199	173	45	33	720
Lebanese	64	91	58	25	16	16	4	1				275
Greek	99	27	23	27	29	7			1	1		214
Italian	16	20	24	11	11	10	15	13	9			129
Yugoslav	12	11	15	10	14	9	6	7	9	2		95
French	8	9	9	10	10	4	2	5	2			59
Finnish	1	4	5	11	12	8	2	1				44
Spanish	9	17										26
Norwegian	14	10										24
Moroccan	9	13	1								1	24
Maltese		2	6	1	4	8	1	2				24
Somali					2	11	7	4	6	2	2	34
Netherlands		4	2								5	11
Sweden	3	3										6
Kuwaiti		2	1									3
Israeli			2									2
Japanese	1					1						2
Danish	1											1
German (West)	1											1
Haitian			1									1
Monaco				1								1
Singapore									1			1
Subtotal	371	394	290	224	218	204	197	285	219	55	44	2,501
Polish	18	16	12	10	11	7	2	3	4			83
Grand total	389	410	302	234	229	211	199	288	223	55	44	2,584

NOTE: Trip totals in section 4 exceed ship totals in sections 1 and 2 because some of the ships made more than one trip to Cuba. Monthly totals subject to revision as additional data becomes available.

*Added to Report No. 120 appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of November 4, 1972.

**Ships appearing on the list which have made no trips to Cuba under their present registry.

Dated: January 22, 1973.

By order of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs.

AARON SILVERMAN,
Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4399 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

National Bureau of Standards

FEDERAL INFORMATION PROCESSING STANDARDS COORDINATING AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to Public Law 92-463 and Executive Order 11686, notice is hereby given that the Federal Information Processing Standards Coordinating and Advisory Committee (FIPSCAC) will hold a meeting from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., on Tuesday, March 27, 1973, in Room B-255, Building 225, of the National Bureau of Standards in Gaithersburg, Md.

The purpose of the meeting is to review the actions of the Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) Task Groups and to consider other matters relating to Federal information processing standards.

The public will be permitted to attend, to file written statements, and, to the extent that time permits, to present oral statements. Persons planning to attend should notify the Office of Information Processing Standards, Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C. 20234, phone 301—921-3551.

Dated: March 5, 1973.

RICHARD W. ROBERTS,
Director.

[FR Doc.73-4439 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

[DESI 10493; Dockets Nos. FDC-D-293; NDA 10-493; FDC-D-336; NDA 11-686]

SCHERING CORP. AND LEDERLE LABORATORIES

Metreton and Aristomin, Steroid Combination Preparations for Oral Use; Final Order on Objections and Request for Hearing Regarding Withdrawal of Approval of New Drug Applications

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 29, 1970 (35 FR 13802), the Food and Drug Administration announced its evalua-

tion of a report received from the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Drug Efficacy Study Group, on seven combination antihistamine/glucocorticoid drugs for oral administration, including Metreton Tablets (NDA 10-493 held by Schering Corp.) and Aristomin Capsules (NDA 11-686 held by Lederle Laboratories Division, American Cyanamid Co.).

The announcement stated the conclusion of the Food and Drug Administration that there is a lack of substantial evidence of effectiveness of these fixed dosage combination drugs for the conditions of use prescribed in their labeling. Accordingly, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs announced his intention to initiate action to withdraw approval of the new drug applications for these drugs. The Commissioner invited holders of new drug applications and any other interested persons who might be adversely affected by the removal of these drugs from the market, to submit, within 30 days, adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations to be considered in support of the effectiveness of these drugs.

On September 24, 1970, Schering Corp. (Schering) submitted information concerning the effectiveness of Metreton Tablets. This material was evaluated, but failed to provide substantial evidence, derived from adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations, of the effectiveness of the drug. Subsequently, on March 31, 1971, there was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (36 FR 5928) a notice of opportunity for hearing in which the Commissioner proposed to issue an order under section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 355(e), withdrawing approval of the new drug application for Metreton Tablets and all amendments and supplements applying thereto, on the ground that there was a lack of substantial evidence that the drug would have the effect it purports or is represented to have for the conditions of use recommended in its labeling. Thirty days were allowed for filing a written appearance requesting a hearing, giving the reasons why approval of the new drug application should not be withdrawn, together with a well-organized and full factual analysis of the clinical and other investigational data in support thereof, showing that a genuine and substantial issue of fact requires a hearing.

On September 25, 1970, Lederle Laboratories (Lederle) submitted its response to the initial notice of August 29, 1970. This submission was reviewed and evaluated and failed to provide any evidence, derived from adequate and well-controlled clinical studies, of the effectiveness of the drug. Thus, on May 27, 1971, there was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (36 FR 9670) a notice of opportunity for hearing in which the Commissioner proposed to issue an order under the provisions of section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 355(e), withdrawing approval of the new drug applications for Aristomin and five other fixed-dosage steroid combination preparations of similar composition, and all amendments and supplements thereto. Thirty days were allowed for filing a written appearance requesting a hearing by any interested person, giving the reasons why approval of the new drug application should not be withdrawn, together with well-organized and full factual analysis of the clinical and other investigational data in support thereof, showing that a genuine and substantial issue of fact requires a hearing.

On June 30, and June 24, 1971, respectively, Schering (Metreton Tablets, NDA 10-493) and Lederle (Aristomin Capsules, NDA 11-686) filed written appearances and requested a hearing. None of the holders of the other five glucocorticoid/antihistamine combinations listed in the FEDERAL REGISTER notice of August 29, 1970, filed a written appearance. Their failure to file is construed as an election not to avail themselves of the opportunity for a hearing. Accordingly, on September 29, 1972 (37 FR 20343), pursuant to section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 355(e), the Commissioner withdrew approval of these new drug applications and all amendments and supplements thereto. The Commissioner found that there was a lack of substantial evidence that the drugs would have the effects recommended in their labeling. The Commissioner further concluded that the drugs were not appropriate for administration as fixed-dose combinations established in guidelines in the Statement of General Policy on Fixed Combination Prescription Drugs for Humans, 21 CFR 3.86, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of October 15, 1971 (36 FR 20037).

The requests for hearing by Schering (Metreton) and Lederle (Aristomin) have been considered, including the medical presentation of Schering, and the Commissioner concludes that there is no genuine and substantial issue of fact requiring a hearing and that the legal arguments offered are insubstantial.

I. *The drugs*—A. *Metreton Tablets.* Metreton is a fixed-combination steroid-antihistamine compound consisting of prednisone (2.5 mg. per tablet), chlorpheniramine maleate (2.0 mg. per tablet) and ascorbic acid (75.0 mg. per tablet).

B. *Aristomin Capsules.* Aristomin is a fixed-combination steroid-antihistamine compound consisting of triamcinolone (1 mg. per capsule), chlorpheniramine maleate (2 mg. per capsule), and ascorbic acid (75.0 mg. per capsule).

II. *Recommended uses and rationale.* A. Metreton is recommended in its labeling for severe hay fever, severe chronic asthma or seasonal asthma, perennial allergic rhinitis, angioedema, urticaria, drug reactions, serum sickness due to penicillin or other causes; for use in the control of the exudative and inflammatory phases of occular disorders as allergic conjunctivitis, keratitis, nongranulomatous iritis, iridocyclitis, choroditis, chorioretinitis, and uveitis. Metreton is also recommended for difficult cases of atopic dermititis, poison ivy dermititis, exfoliative dermititis and, in dentistry, to reduce postoperative sequelae.

An initial dosage of Metreton is four to eight tablets per day, which dosage would provide 10 to 20 milligrams of prednisone and 8 to 16 milligrams of chlorpheniramine maleate, plus 300 to 600 milligrams of ascorbic acid (Vitamin C) per day.

In its written appearance requesting a hearing, Schering suggests that the rationale underlying the Metreton formulation is twofold: First, that a reduction of the quantity of the glucocorticoid component (prednisone) is made possible by the addition of the antihistamine component (chlorpheniramine maleate), which reduction decreases the frequency and severity of adverse reactions attributable to oral glucocorticoid therapy; and second, that antihistamine and glucocorticoids exert their antiallergic effects by different means thereby complementing one another.

B. Aristomin is recommended in its labeling for perennial asthma, drug reaction, seasonal and perennial rhinitis, allergic rhinitis, and for treatment of generalized pruritus.

The initial dosage recommendation for Aristomin Capsules is 3 to 6 capsules per day, which dosage would provide 3 to 6 milligrams of triamcinolone and 6 to 12 milligrams of chlorpheniramine maleate, plus 225 to 450 milligrams of ascorbic acid per day.

Lederle, in its written appearance and request for a hearing, suggests that the rationale for Aristomin is the effect of the antihistamine component (chlorpheniramine maleate) in permitting a lower dosage of the glucocorticoid component (triamcinolone).

III. *Medical documentation to support claims of effectiveness.*—A. *The individual components.* Schering, in its request for a hearing on the proposal to withdraw approval for Metreton, submitted brief summaries of several articles dealing with the action of two of the three components—prednisone and chlorpheniramine maleate—separately in the treatment of various indications, including allergic symptoms. The Commissioner does not question the effectiveness of these drugs, when used separately, for certain conditions. However, their effectiveness in independent treatment does not provide substantial evidence to support the claimed advantages of the fixed combination Metreton formulation. Thus, these articles are irrelevant and raise no genuine and substantial issue of fact concerning the effectiveness of Metreton which would require a hearing. United States v. An Article of Drug * * * Furestrol Vagina Suppositories, 294 F. Supp. 1307 (N.D. Ga., 1968), aff'd 415 F. 2d 390 (C.A. 5, 1969); United States v. 7 Cartons * * * Ferro-Lac, 293 F Supp. 660, 664 (S.D. Ill., 1968), aff'd 424 F. 2d 1364 (C.A. 7, 1970); United States v. 1,048,000 Capsules * * * Methyltestosterone, 347 F. Supp. 768, 773 (S.D. Tex., 1972); United States v. Mykocert, 345 F. Supp. 571, 574-6 (N.D. Ill., 1972).

Schering and Lederle rely upon the findings of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council on the efficacy of prednisone, triamcinolone and chlorphenoramine maleate, the glucocorticoid and antihistamine components of Metreton and Aristomin.

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of October 21, 1970 (35 FR 16424), the Food and Drug Administration announced its evaluation of the report of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Drug Efficacy Study Group on certain corticosteroid drugs for oral use, including prednisone and triamcinolone. These oral corticosteroids have a large number of indications but with respect to those related specifically to the indications claimed for Metreton and Aristomin, prednisone and triamcinolone are indicated only for control of severe or incapacitating allergic conditions intractable to adequate trials of conventional treatment; severe, acute, and chronic allergic and inflammatory processes involving the eye and its adnexa; exfoliative dermatitis; and dental postoperative inflammatory reactions. The announcement further stated that dosage should be individualized according to the severity of the disease and the response of the patient, and that the severity, prognosis, and expected duration of the disease are primary factors in determining dosage.

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of June 18, 1971 (36 FR 11758), the Food and Drug Administration announced its evaluation of reports of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Drug Efficacy Study Group on antihistamine preparations for oral administration, including chlorpheniramine maleate. The Food and Drug Administration concluded that chlorpheniramine maleate was indicated for perennial and seasonal allergic rhinitis, mild, uncomplicated allergic skin manifestations of urticaria and angioedema, mild, local allergic reaction to insect bites, physical allergies, and minor drug and serum reaction characterized by pruritis.

In its written appearance, Schering readily acknowledges the increased risk from the concomitant administration of glucocorticoid and antihistamine drugs when administered together in a fixed combination. The Commissioner concludes that the fixed combination of an antihistamine, known to be symtomatically effective for only mild to moderate forms of allergic disease, with high-risk glucocorticoid, indicated only for severe or incapacitating allergic conditions intractable to adequate trials of conventional treatment, is therapeutically irrational. The antihistamine is useless for severe conditions and thus its presence is unjustified; the potent glucocorticoid is unnecessary in mild cases and thus its presence adds substantial and unwarranted risk.

In summary, the Commissioner does not question the effectiveness of the individual glucocorticoid and antihistamine components of Metreton and Aristomin, when administered separately for the appropriate conditions contained in the new labeling now approved by the Food and Drug Administration for these individual drugs. The sole issue is whether, in a fixed combination, there is substantial evidence of their effectiveness for the labeled conditions of use. Such evidence must meet the statutory standard of "adequate and well-controlled investigations" required by 21 U.S.C. 355(d), as elucidated in 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), and must satisfy the requirements for fixed combination drugs established in 21 CFR 3.86. The medical documentation with respect to Metreton and Aristomin as fixed combination drugs is discussed below.

B. *The fixed combination.* Schering presented brief articles reporting two studies purporting to establish the effectiveness of Metreton as a fixed combination. The Commissioner has reviewed these submissions and concludes that they are not adequate and well controlled as required by 21 U.S.C. 355(d) and 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5) and thus cannot constitute substantial evidence of efficacy, and that they do not satisfy the requirements of 21 CFR 3.86 with respect to the type of proof needed specifically for fixed combination drugs.

1. Rudolph S. Lackenbacher, "Treatment of Pruritic Dermatoses with Chlorpheniramine Maleate and Prednisone in Combination (Metreton)", Annals of Allergy 15:409–413, 1957. Eighty-seven patients, ranging from ages 9 to 83 years and having nine different diagnoses, were given Metreton after treatment with chlorpheniramine maleate alone was unsuccessful. This study claims that "excellent" and "good" responses were observed in approximately 80 percent of the patients. However, no control group of patients similarly nonresponsive to initial antihistamine treatment alone was utilized in order to permit quantitative evaluation of the apparent success of the Metreton treatment, as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*). Hence, no statistical analysis or other scientific evaluation could be made. This, in itself precludes the usefulness of this study to establish effectiveness under the statutory standard.

In addition to the absence of a control group, the diagnosis of the substantial number of the patients in the study indicated that they did not have conditions for which Metreton is recommended in its labeling. Moreover, the dosage schedule under this study was different than that recommended in the labeling of Metreton, since, in this study, two tablets were given after breakfast and two at bedtime, whereas the labeling for Metreton recommends that the tablets be taken one after each meal and at bedtime.

Moreover, the study does not adequately explain the variables measured in assessing the response of the subjects, as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*3*). For example, patients were evaluated as having "good" response "if 70 to 85 percent improvement" occurred, which improvement was measured by relief of inflammation or pruritis, or both.

Rather than establishing the complementary effect of the steroid and antihistamine factors, the study indicates that in cases of severe dermatosis where antihistamine is ineffective, the introduction of a steroid component yields more successful results. In order to establish the complementary nature of the steroid and antihistamine components, the study would need to have included a control group which received prednisone alone where prior antihistamine was unsuccessful. Such a control group did not exist in this study.

2. Nathan E. Silbert, "Steroid, Antihistamine, and Vitamin C, A synergism of Therapeutic Agents in the Treatment of Allergic Disease", Acta Allergologica 15 (Supp. 7): 518–525, 1960. Like the Lackenbacher study, this study lacks any control group in order to permit evaluation of claimed safety and effectiveness of Metreton tablets, as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*). In the absence of a control group, it is impossible to determine whether any specific amount of antihistamine alone, glucocorticoid alone, or a specific combination of the two ingredients, other than that fixed in Metreton, would have yielded similar or better results. This study is neither adequate nor well controlled and fails to meet the statutory standard. Moreover, the study purported to evaluate the use of Metreton for diagnoses not recommended in its labeling, such as "uncomplicated pollen hay fever," since Metreton is recommended only for severe hay fever. It is noteworthy that the study, even with its major methodological flaws, revealed that Metreton was of very limited success in cases of severe bronchial asthma.

C. *Additional studies.* In addition to the above two studies, several other studies were also submitted that, while not directly related to the effectiveness of Metreton, were offered by Schering in support of the medical rationale of Metreton and Aristomin.

1. "Repository Pollen Therapy," Mayer A. Green, Annals of Allergy, June 1963, p. 308. This study is not designed to evaluate the effectiveness of a fixed combination of glucocorticoid and antihistamine for any of the indications listed in the labeling of either Metreton or Aristomin. Rather, this study appears to constitute some evidence that antihistamine tablets containing prednisolone reduce the number of local reactions in patients receiving repository pollen injection therapy. Moreover, the study is not designed to make any conclusion as to whether it was the antihistamine or the prednisolone element which may account for the relative infrequency of local reactions and does not constitute evidence of synergistic qualities between the glucocorticoid and the antihistamine components.

2. "Repository Pollen Therapy," Mayer A. Green, Annals of Allergy, April 1964, p. 187. This study, like the study reported by Dr. Green in June 1963, does not purport to support the proposition that corticosteroid and antihistamine are effective for the indications on the labeling of Aristomin and Metreton but rather

is further evidence of their effect in reducing reactions to repository pollen therapy. The objective of the study was to determine the effect of steroid-antihistamine dosage on reaction rates associated with the use of emulsified antigens in allergy therapy and to determine the effectiveness of prophylactic administration of such medication given concurrently and separately with placebos. Contrary to the position adopted by the manufacturers of Aristomin and Metreton that a fixed dosage of corticosteroid and antihistamine is a rational medical approach, this study concludes that particularity in dosage has a critical effect in evaluating a steroid-antihistamine product.

3. "Steroids and Antihistaminics Combined in Long-Term Therapy of Chronic Bronchial Asthma," M. M. El-Mehairy and N. El-Tarabichi, Annals of Allergy, January 1963, p. 10. The study reported in this article has several significant procedural defects, such as inadequate diagnostic criteria in the selection of subjects. 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(2). In addition, the specific corticosteroid-antihistamine ingredients used in this study were significantly different than those in either Aristomin or Metreton, since the steroid component was 0.75 mgm. of dexamethasone, with 25 mgm. of the antihistamine in each tablet.

Significantly, the study shows that while a regimen of three antihistamine tablets alone resulted in no improvement in the patients, the addition of increasing amounts of a corticosteroid component resulted in direct and increasing improvement (group one). Where patients received an initial regimen of three tablets of the corticosteroid component alone, significant improvement was shown, and when one of the corticosteroid tablets was replaced by one antihistamine tablet, improvements reduced (group two). Thus, contrary to the theory suggested by the manufacturers of Aristomin and Metreton, the study appears to support the effectiveness of corticosteroid therapy alone in treatment of "severe" cases. This is the conclusion one would expect. Moreover, in direct conflict with the rationale presented for the use of fixed doses of glucocorticoids and antihistamines in Aristomin and Metreton, the authors of this article state that "patients required careful handling and proper interplay of both doses of steroids and antihistamanics * * * preference was given to the use of steroids and antihistamines separately and not in a united, compressed tablet." In both study groups, no placebo controls were used, as is required in 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*)(*ii*).

4. "Studies of Cyproheptadine Combined with Dexamethasone," Ashton L. Welsh, and Mitchell Ede, The Journal of New Drugs, July–August, 1962, p. 223. This article reports a study involving a combination of cyproheptadine with dexamethasone, which article suggests that the cyproheptadine would exert a "steroid-sparing effect" and permit use of lower dosage of dexamethasone for initial suppression of symptoms as well as for maintenance therapy. This study demonstrates that glucocorticoid therapy creates a substantial risk of side effects and that unwarranted increases of the glucocorticoid component in combination with antihistamine will similarly increase side effects. However, this proposition is well established in medicine and is an important factor in the conclusion of the Commissioner and the NAS–NRC panels that Metreton and Aristomin are ineffective as a fixed combination.

In addition, the study does not show a synergistic action between the antihistamine component and the corticosteroid component. To create evidence for such a proposition, the study would have to compare the dosages given in the study groups with a placebo dose. The need for such control or placebo group is required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*)(*ii*). The authors conclude that the corticosteroid component, dexamethasone, enhances the antiallergic properties of the cyproheptadine. However, increased corticosteroid in one study group (Series 1) resulted in a lower percentage of improvement as measured by the investigators.

5. "Dexamethasone in Allergy," Cecil M. Kohn and William C. Grater, Annals of Allergy, May–June 1959, p. 385. This study could not support the rationale suggested for a fixed combination of glucocorticoid and antihistamine since the study "was undertaken in an attempt to evaluate the usefulness of dexamethasone [alone] in the treatment of allergic disorders." In addition, the article does not state the method of selection of patients for the study and thus there is no adequate assurance that they are suitable for inclusion in this study. Nor were diagnostic criteria of the conditions of such patients stated; neither were confirmatory diagnostic tests reported. 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*1*) and (2). The most serious inadequacy of this study is the absence of a control group as is required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*). The methods of observation and recording of results, including the variables measured, were stated in broad and unspecific terms; "therapy was judged to have been satisfactory if both the patient and the physician agreed that the control of signs and symptoms outweighed any undesirable effects which may have occurred." 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*).

6. "A Possible Synergistic Effect Between Antihistamines and Corticosteroids," Blair Macaulay, Acta Allergologica, Supplement V, 1958, p. 159. This study involved only 12 patients who were on a maintenance dosage of corticosteroid therapy. The author claims that with the addition of an antihistamine component seven of the 12 patients "were able to reduce their dose of prednisolone by one tablet of 5 mg." In addition four asthmatic children, on maintenance corticosteroid therapy, were given an antihistamine component. The author reports that two were "able to reduce the dose of prednisolone." Neither the method of selection of the subjects nor the methods of observations and recording results, including the variables measured, are reported as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(2). In addition, the author states that the results "can give arise to no conclusion of value. The numbers are insufficient: controls are quite inadequate." 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*). Thus, the author's conclusion, that "it is apparent that they (antihistamines and corticosteroids) have inhibiting action at differing levels of the histamine release mechanism" is totally without substantiation.

7. "Dexamethasone-Phenyltoloxamine in Bronchial Asthma," H. D. Ogden, Medical Times, October 1963. This study is wholly inadequate. The study group consisted of only 11 patients. Moreover, many of the essential criteria required to establish the adequacy of a clinical investigation, as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*), were not satisfied. And as with several other of the studies submitted by Schering the corticosteroid and antihistamine components in this study are not the same as those present in either Metreton or Aristomin tablets. This difference is particularly important with regard to the corticosteroid component, since the potency of dexamethasone is significantly greater than that of prednisone or triamcinolone. (As pointed out by Kohn and Grater, in "Dexamethasone in Allergy," submitted by Schering, 0.75 mg. of dexamethasone "would compare favorably" with 5 mg. of prednisone or prednisolone and 4 mg. of triamcinolone.)

8. "Investigations Into the Combined Action of Glucocorticoids and an Antihistaminic Agent Against Histamine and Allergic Processes," K. Credner and E. M. Schelske, Arzneimittel Forschung, Volume 14, 940–943, August 1964. This paper reported three experiments with laboratory animals. The first experiment dealt with allergically induced contraction of guinea pig ileum. The experiment reveals that for a given concentration of the antihistamine component, denominated in the study as WV 761, the antiallergic effect is strengthened by the addition of a steroid component. However, since the effect was dose related, increased inhibition could also be obtained by increasing the concentration of the antihistamine alone.

A second experiment concerned the effect of antihistamine and steroid in decreasing rat paw swelling. Here, neither 2.5 mg./kg. of WV 761 (antihistamine) nor 8 mg./kg. prednisolone (steroid) significantly reduced the swelling, whereas both 5 mg./kg. of WV 761 alone and a combination of 2.5 mg./kg. of WV 761 and 4 mg./kg. of prednisolone were effective in reducing the swelling.

In the third experiment, guinea pigs were sensitized to have a bronchial asthmatic allergic reaction. In this case, 10 mg./kg. of WV 761 offered slight protection to the sensitized animals whereas 100 mg./kg. of prednisolone had no effect. The combination of these amounts of antihistamine and steroid yielded clear reduction of the asthmatic symptoms. However, a higher dose of the

antihistamine alone was not tested to determine whether comparable reduction in symptoms could have been achieved without the large dosage of the steroid component.

The authors of the report on these experiments conclude that "the additional dose of adrenal cortex hormones (steroids) is indeed able to intensify the antihistamine-induced reduction of allergic phenomena. An explanation of this occurrence is difficult." In the models tested, the presence of steroid increased the response obtained with a given antihistamine dose. A similar response, however, could be obtained by increasing the dose of antihistamine alone, as was shown in the rat paw experiment. Thus, these animal studies merely show that steroids increase the response obtained with a given antihistamine dose. This is predictable in light of the extremely high potency of steroids, especially at the dosage levels utilized in these experiments. Moreover, the extremely high amount of antihistamine and steroid administered in these experiments are of questionable comparability to the dosage levels in Metreton or Aristomin.

9. "Pharmacological and Toxicological Expertise On Celestamine," P. Bouyard, unpublished paper, 1961. The product which was the subject of this essay, Celestamine, contained 0.25 mg. betamethasone, 2 mg. dexachlorpheniramine maleate, 0.15 mg. erythrosine, 4.91 mg. powdered gelatin, 19.65 mg. corn starch, 172.13 mg. lactose, and 1 mg. magnesium stearate. This study compared the effectiveness of the combination (Celestamine) with the steroid (betamethasone) alone in reducing inflammation of swelling in rat paws. The percentage of diminution of the inflammatory phenomena was almost indistinguishable between the combination and the steroid alone; 77 percent with four tablets of Celestamine and 74 percent with the same dosage of betamethasone alone.

Two other experiments are reported in this study; one dealing with the effectiveness of Celestamine on inflammatory granuloma and another on its antihistamine properties. Both of these experiments showed increased effectiveness and/or toxicity with increased dosages of the combination. But neither study included a control group to determine and compare the effect of the combination with the antihistamine and steroid components alone. Indeed, in his conclusions section, the author does not mention any evidence of synergism developed by the study.

10. "Report on the Clinical Experiments on the Preparation 'Celestamine' Tablets," Luigi Bruni, Unpublished Report, January 1966. This study dealt with Celestamine tablets, a fixed combination of .25 mg. of the steroid betamethasone and 2 mgs. of the antihistamine dextrochlorpheniramine maleate. In "some" of the 65 patients, therapy was started with betamethasone alone and the purpose of the study was merely to establish whether the combination preparation would be effective in maintaining the results already obtained in steroids alone. In "other cases," the number of which is not revealed in the Bruni article, treatment was started with the combination, Celestamine, using an initial daily dose containing half the amount of steroid which would have been used alone. However, the ratio of antihistamine and steroid in Celestamine is significantly different from the ratios fixed in both Aristomin and Metreton tablets.

The study has several significant methodological defects, including inadequate data on the method of selection of subjects, since the patients included in the study were those for whom steroids were contra-indicated or who had been treated as outpatients with steroids at too low or too high dosages (21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*2*)); the absence of criteria upon which the study concluded that the treatment result was either "good," "excellent," or "moderate" (21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*3*)); and a complete absence of a control group so as to permit quantitative evaluation (21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*)).

D. *Summary.* It is clear that the medical evidence submitted by Schering does not meet the statutory standard of "adequate and well controlled investigations" required by 21 U.S.C. 355(d), as elucidated in 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), and does not satisfy the requirements for a fixed combination drug for human use established in 21 CFR 3.86.

Schering has submitted no data at all on the effectiveness, or indeed the purpose, of the Vitamin C present in each tablet of Metreton. There has been presented no controlled study whatever on the use of the Metreton formulation of glucocorticoid and antihistamine for the conditions for which the drug is recommended in its labeling.

Reports of several studies were submitted by Schering to support its rationale for Metreton, namely, that glucocorticoid and antihistamine have a synergistic effect which permits a reduction in the quantity of the glucocorticoid component, which reduction decreases the frequency and severity of adverse reaction attributable to oral glucocorticoid therapy. However, these studies are wholly unsuccessful in establishing the firm's claimed rationale. Indeed, in direct conflict with the rationale suggested by Schering for Metreton, one article submitted by the firm concludes that patients require proper interplay of both doses of glucocorticoids and antihistamines and that preference was given to the use of steroids and antihistamines separately and not in a fixed combination. In addition, some of the studies clearly revealed that they were not designed to evaluate the effectiveness of a fixed combination of glucocorticoids and antihistamines for any of the indications listed on the labeling of either Metreton or Aristomin. In sum, these studies are marked by insufficient and inadequate controls, as one author unabashedly admits. Thus, it is clear that none of the medical documentation complies with the requirements of 21 U.S.C. 355(d), 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5) or 21 CFR 3.86.

In addition, the rationale for the Metreton combination has been considered by the NAS–NRC expert panels in allergy, respiratory disturbances, dentistry, ophthalmology, and dermatology, as part of the Drug Efficacy Study Project. The panel on Drugs Used in Allergy stated that if antihistamine or corticosteroids are indicated in the management of any allergic condition they should be given separately and that in light of the side effects of each of the compounds, particularly the potent corticosteroids, the two compounds should be adjusted independently so as not to encourage indiscriminate medical use of corticosteroids. The panel on Drugs Used in Dermatology II warned that the fixed dosage form does not allow the flexibility required by clinical usage for dermatological conditions.

Thus, it is clear that there is a lack of substantial medical evidence that Metreton has the effect it purports and is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed in its labeling. Moreover, there has not been submitted to the Commissioner adequate and well-controlled investigations which could establish a rationale for the use of glucocorticoid and antihistamine in fixed combination.

IV. *Legal Arguments*—A. *Metreton.* Schering states that, prior to the withdrawal of the new drug application for its Metreton Tablets, it is entitled to outside peer group review of the data demonstrating the effectiveness of the drug. Such a review has already been conducted by the NAS–NRC expert panels in allergy, respiratory disturbances, dentistry, ophthalmology, and dermatology, as part of the Drug Efficacy Study Project. Schering argues that since Metreton received an initial rating of "effective but" from three of these panels, the drug should be returned to the NAS–NRC for clarification. This second review has already occurred, with the result that the drug was found ineffective as a fixed combination. In addition, Metreton has been reviewed by the Fixed Combination Drug Committee of the Food and Drug Administration.

Schering states that holders of approved new drug applications have an unqualified right to a public hearing upon the proposed withdrawal of such application. This contention is without merit. Ciba-Geigy Corporation v. Richardson, 446 F. 2d 466 (C.A. 2, 1971); Upjohn Company v. Finch, 422 F. 2d 944 (C.A. 6, 1970). See Diamond Laboratories, Inc. v. Richardson, 452 F. 2d 803 (C.A. 8, 1972). The Commissioner has authority to establish criteria for adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations necessary to demonstrate effectiveness of drug products on the market and may condition the holding of an evidentiary hearing on a showing by a sponsor firm that a genuine issue exists as to the effectiveness of a drug product for its recommended uses. 21 CFR 130.14(b); Ciba-Geigy Corp. v. Richardson, supra; Pfizer,

Inc. v. Richardson, 434 F. 2d 536 (C.A. 2, 1970); Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association v. Richardson, 318 F. Supp. 301 (D. Del., 1970).

Schering admits that these withdrawal procedures may be legally proper if the data, reasons and facts cited in support of the effectiveness of the drug are accepted as true for the purpose of determining if a factual issue exists and if such determination is made by an independent hearing examiner rather than by the Commissioner. The Commissioner has accepted the data submitted by Schering as true. It is patently clear, however, that none of the data meet the statutory standard of adequate and well-controlled investigations. The Commissioner is not required to submit that issue to a hearing examiner, since the statute requires him to make the decision. Thus, no genuine and substantial issue of fact exists on which to hold a hearing. 21 CFR 130.14(b).

Schering argues that Metreton is no longer a new drug because the drug was generally recognized as safe for its intended purposes on October 9, 1962, and thereby it is exempted from the effectiveness provisions of the 1962 Drug Amendments by the "grandfather clause". Public Law 87-781, section 107(c)(4). This argument is without merit. Section 107 (c)(4)(C) provides that if a drug was covered by an effective new drug application under 21 U.S.C. 355 on October 9, 1962, the exemption from the 1962 Drug Amendments does not apply. USV Pharmaceutical Corp. v. Richardson, 461 F. 2d 223 (C.A. 4, 1972).

The new drug application for Metreton has been effective since 1956. It has never been disapproved or withdrawn by the Food and Drug Administration. The fact that Schering received a letter dated October 6, 1959, from the Food and Drug Administration to the effect that Metreton was no longer considered a new drug is irrelevant, since all such informal and formal opinions have been revoked by 21 CFR 130.39, and in any event that letter did not withdraw or disapprove the new drug application.

In its written request for a hearing, Schering suggests that the new drug application for Metreton be allowed to remain in effect: *Provided*, That (a) the ascorbic acid (Vitamin C) is either deleted from the product or that the product is labeled in such a way as to indicate that the ascorbic acid is but an inactive ingredient for which no therapeutic claims are made, and (b) that the labeling indications for the product be limited to "the symptomatic relief of allergic rhinitis". Neither of these proposals can substitute for the requirement that Schering submit substantial evidence that Metreton is effective as a fixed combination for the uses recommended in its labeling.

In this connection, Schering suggests that the Commissioner is required by section 9(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 558(c)(2), to permit the firm an opportunity to "demonstrate or achieve compliance with all lawful requirements" by permitting the new drug application for Metreton to remain in effect under the new labeling proposed by the firm. The reliance on 5 U.S.C. 558(c)(2) here is misplaced. First, this statutory provision does not apply in cases in which public health, interest or safety requires otherwise. Moreover, the firm has had substantial opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the law by initiating adequate and well-controlled studies that will satisfy the statutory standard, and has failed to do so.

Schering suggests that the only issue raised by the NAS-NRC panels was whether the effectiveness of the Metreton combination is greater than that of the corticosteroid component alone. With reference to this remark, Schering argues that the issue in the evaluation of Metreton is not relative efficacy. The Commissioner agrees. The NAS-NRC and the Commissioner have concluded that Metreton is ineffective as a fixed combination. Each component of Metreton must make a contribution to the claimed effectiveness of the drug and the dosage of each component must be such that the combination is safe and effective for the uses recommended in its labeling. 21 CFR 3.86. Thus, for example, the NAS-NRC panel on drugs used in allergy stated "If antihistamines and corticosteroids are indicated in the management of any allergic condition, they should be given separately, so that the effects and side effects of the two classes of compounds can be adjusted independently. The physician may be unable to give a proper dose of either active ingredient with this type [fixed combination] of product. Furthermore, it seems to the panel that this this type of product encourages indiscriminate use of corticosteroids."

B. *Aristomin.* Lederle submits that its new drug application for Aristomin should not be withdrawn because clinical experience with Aristomin has demonstrated its effectiveness. The firm notes that over 170 million capsules have been sold. However, the number of capsules sold cannot substitute for the requirements of law that there must be substantial evidence, consisting of adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations, that a drug product is effective for the uses recommended in its labeling. The marketing history of a drug does not constitute a genuine and substantial issue of fact regarding the existence of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use recommended in its labeling.

Lederle also states that the Commissioner has acted unreasonably and arbitrarily in not granting Lederle's request for an opportunity to conduct clinical investigations of the effectiveness of Aristomin prior to initiating proceedings to withdraw approval of its new drug application. Lederle has always been free to proceed with protocols which it feels may establish the effectiveness of Aristomin for the uses suggested in its revised labeling. The criteria for adequate and well-controlled clinical studies necessary to develop such data are set out in 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5). However, the pursuit of such investigation is irrelevant to the withdrawal of the new drug application for Aristomin since the law requires that such adequate and well-controlled clinical studies establishing the safety and effectiveness of Aristomin for its labeled uses must support the new drug application that is in effect. Development of this data at a later date may be pertinent only to a submission for reapproval of the new drug application.

V. *Findings.* On the basis of review of the documentation and legal arguments offered to support the claims of effectiveness for Metreton and Aristomin, the Commissioner finds that there is a lack of substantial evidence that these drugs have the effect they purport or are represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in their labeling, that the legal arguments are insubstantial, and that the petitioners have failed to set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine and substantial issue of fact requiring a hearing.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 505(e), 52 Stat. 1052, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 355(e)) and under the authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), the request for hearing is denied, and the approval of the new drug applications of Metreton (NDA 10-493) and Aristomin (NDA 11-686) and all amendments and supplements thereto, are withdrawn. Withdrawal is effective on the date of publication of this order.

Dated: March 5, 1973.

SAM D. FINE,
Associate Commissioner for Compliance.

[FR Doc.73-4537 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Docket No. FDC-D-475; NDA 10-157; DESI 10157]

SCHERING CORP.

Sigmagen Tablets; Final Order on Objections and Request for a Hearing Regarding Withdrawal of Approval of New Drug Application

In the FEDERAL REGISTER of March 14, 1972 (37 FR 5309), the Food and Drug Administration announced its evaluation of a report received from the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Drug Efficacy Study Group, on the product Sigmagen Tablets (NDA 10-157; DESI 10157). The holder of the new drug application is Schering Corp., Galloping Hill Road, Kenilworth, N.J. 07033.

The announcement stated the conclusion of the Food and Drug Administration that there is a lack of substantial evidence that this fixed combination drug will have the effect that it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling, and that each component of such drug will contribute to the total effects claimed. Accordingly, the announcement stated that

the Commissioner intended to initiate proceedings to withdraw approval of the new drug application. The holder or any interested persons were invited to submit, within 30 days, pertinent data bearing on the proposal. The announcement stated that to be acceptable for consideration in support of the effectiveness of the drug, any such data must be previously unsubmitted, well organized, and include data from adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations as described by regulations, 21 CFR 130.12 (a)(5). No data were submitted.

A notice was thereafter published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of June 29, 1972 (37 FR 12856), in which the Commissioner proposed to withdraw approval of the new drug application for Sigmagen Tablets, pursuant to section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(e)), on the ground that new information before him with respect to the drug, evaluated together with the evidence available to him when the application was approved, shows that there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effects it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling. Thirty days were allowed for any interested person to file a written appearance requesting a hearing, giving the reasons why approval of the new drug application should not be withdrawn, together with a well-organized and full-factual analysis of the clinical and other investigational data they were prepared to prove in support of their opposition.

A request for hearing was submitted by Schering Corp. on July 27, 1972. The request has been considered, and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs concludes that there is no genuine and substantial issue of fact requiring a hearing and that the legal arguments offered are insubstantial, all as explained in more detail below.

I. *The Drug.* Sigmagen is a tablet containing a fixed combination of 0.75 mg. prednisone, 325 mg. aspirin, 20 mg. ascorbic acid, and 75 mg. aluminum hydroxide.

II. *Recommended uses.* This product is recommended for use in the treatment of mild cases of rheumatoid arthritis, mild cases of spondylitis, subacute or interval gout, bursitis, myositis, fibrositis, and neuritis. The recommended dose is four to 12 tablets daily, in divided doses.

III. *The data to support claims of effectiveness.* In response to the notice, Schering Corp. filed a narrative statement, citing several medical publications, in which it asserts that a combination of prednisone and aspirin is effective for symptomatic relief of mild to moderate rheumatoid arthritis. Schering did not submit any data or studies concerning the drug Sigmagen, nor any drug consisting of a combination of prednisone, aspirin, ascorbic acid, and aluminum hydroxide, nor did it submit data to establish the efficacy of any such drug for the treatment of spondylitis, subacute or interval gout, bursitis, myositis, fibrositis, and neuritis. Schering stated that it was willing to delete ascorbic acid and aluminum hydroxide from the Sigmagen formula, to limit the recommended uses of the product to symptomatic relief of mild to moderate rheumatoid arthritis, and to undertake new studies to prove that a prednisone-aspirin combination drug is safe and effective for symptomatic relief of mild to moderate rheumatoid arthritis.

If the proposed new studies do in fact establish safety and effectiveness for such a product for such a condition of use, nothing prevents Schering from filing another new drug application for its proposed newly formulated and labeled product. However, since Schering has presented no data concerning the effectiveness of Sigmagen as presently formulated, for the conditions of use as presently labeled, no genuine issue of fact has been presented requiring a hearing on whether there is a lack of substantial evidence of effectiveness of the presently formulated and labeled product. Approval of Sigmagen must be withdrawn where there is a lack of substantial evidence of effectiveness within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. 355(e).

Nevertheless, Schering contends that a combination prednisone-aspirin tablet is effective in the treatment of mild to moderate rheumatoid arthritis, and that the combination is justified in that the aspirin component enhances the safety of prednisone by allowing a lower dosage of prednisone to be used (and thus minimizing the risk of side effects of prednisone) without reducing the effectiveness of the treatment, and vice versa. In effect, Schering is requesting a hearing on a supplemental new drug application in advance of formal filing. Even if substantial evidence of effectiveness in fact existed with respect to the proposed product, a hearing would not be required to determine whether approval of the present new drug application should be withdrawn; but in any event, Schering has not raised a genuine and substantial issue of fact even with respect to the existence of substantial evidence of effectiveness of its proposed product.

To raise an issue of fact as to the existence of substantial evidence of effectiveness of a prednisone-aspirin fixed combination drug, Schering must identify the existence of adequate, well-controlled clinical investigations which show that the combination is effective in the treatment of mild to moderate rheumatoid arthritis, as required by section 505 of the Act and 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5). And further, since Schering's attempted justification of the combination in terms of safety is grounded on the premise that the components may be combined without reducing the therapeutic effect, it is necessary that such studies establish that each ingredient of the combination contributes to the effectiveness of the drug, as required by 21 CFR 3.86.

None of the medical articles cited by claimant consitute substantial evidence of effectiveness, as explained below:

a. *The articles cited by the NAS-NRC panel.* Schering cites 14 medical articles which had been cited by the NAS-NRC panel in its review of Sigmagen. All of these articles are concerned with the effectiveness of various steroids used alone in the treatment of rheumatic diseases, and not with a fixed combination of prednisone and aspirin, and are thus irrevelant to whether Sigmagen or a fixed combination of prednisone and aspirin is effective for any condition (21 CFR 3.86).

b. Schoger, Von G. A., "Zur Beurteilung der Wirkung einer Kombination von Salicylaten und Prednisolon bei rheumatischen Erkrankurgen," Arzneimittel-Forschung, 18:758–760, June 1968. The article is a report of 164 patients with "a rheumatic form of disease," of whom 27 patients were subjects of a double-blind study, treated with four different preparations: (1) A combination of 2.5 mg. prednisolone, 175 mg. Al acetylosalicylicum, and 100 mg. athoxybenzamid, in an enteric coating; (2) 2.5 mg. prednisolone alone; (3) 175 mg. Al acetylosalicylicum plus 100 mg. athoxybenzamid; and (4) a placebo. The results were measured by patient report of change in pain. The greatest number of "no pain" reports came from patients receiving the combination drug.

This is not an adequate and well-controlled clinical study as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5). Although 164 patients are first discussed, the only portion of the study that was controlled dealt with only 27 patients, which is too small a number to permit statistically significant conclusions. Since the specific disease conditions of the patients in the double-blind study are not given, it is impossible to evaluate the effectiveness of the combination for a specific condition such as rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, etc. Since no details are given concerning the sequence of administration of the various preparations, the duration of the treatment with each preparation, the length of time between each treatment, the exact diagnosis of the test subjects, and information concerning the severity and duration of the disease, age, sex, etc., a reasonable analysis is impossible, and the study is little better than a testimonial. Further, the criterion of "no pain," "insignificant pain," "constant pain," and "more severe pain" is subjective and is not, standing alone, adequate to allow any valid conclusion to be drawn in this type of disease. The only other criterion reported, blood sedimentation rate, was only measured in 20 patients and showed no advantage to the combination. Finally, the combination utilized in the study differs both in formulation and dosage from the 0.75 mg. prednisone-325 mg. aspirin combination of Sigmagen.

c. Graber-Durvernay, J., Leroy, Martingay, Fauconnier, and Van Moorleghem, "L'Association Medicamenteuse Delta-1-Dehydrocortisone et Acide Acetylsalicylique dans le Traitement des Maladies Rheumatismales," Rheumatologie 3:127–31, 1956. The article reports that 228 cases of various rheumatic diseases were treated with a combination cortisone (1 mg.) and aspirin (5 grains)

drug in the form of a cachet (powder). The article does not state if any of the patients were suffering from rheumatoid arthritis. The study is uncontrolled, as there was no comparison of the combination with cortisone alone or with aspirin alone, and thus does not meet the requirements of 21 CFR 3.86 or 130.12(a)(5). Furthermore, the subject drug contained different ingredients, in different dosage, and in a different form than the prednisone-aspirin components of Sigmagen, and thus cannot be accepted as evidence of the effectiveness of Sigmagen.

d. Jick, H., R. S. Pinals, R. Ullian, D. Sloane, and H. Muench, "Dexamethasone-aspirin in the treatment of chronic rheumatoid arthritis," Lancet 2:1203–1205, 1965; and Gum, O. B., "A controlled study of two preparations, paramethasone, propoxyphene, and aspirin and propoxyphene and aspirin in the treatment of arthritis," Amer. J. Med. Sci. 251:328–332, 1966, are cited by Schering in support of their statement that a combination of a salicylate drug with a steroid drug has the advantage of allowing a lower dosage of steroid (thus minimizing the risk of adverse effects of the steroid) without sacrificing the therapeutic benefits. However, these studies are not adequate since no comparison was made of the combination with a larger dose of aspirin alone, and thus they do not show adequately whether the side-effect liability of the combination is less than that of aspirin alone when compared at equal therapeutic doses. Further, the studies did not utilize prednisone, but rather dexamethasone or paramethasone, as the steroid. While a steroid-aspirin combination study may be supportive of the rationale of a prednisone-aspirin combination it cannot substitute for the full reports of adequate and well-controlled investigations on the Sigmagen combination itself, which are required by section 505 of the Act.

e. Platt, W. D., and Steinberg, I. H., "Prednisone Alone And In Combination With Salicylates and Phenylbutazone in the Treatment of Rheumatoid Arthritis," New England J. Med. 256:823–827, 1957. In this study 16 patients with rheumatoid arthritis were treated with prednisone alone, and subsequently with aspirin and prednisone or with phenylbutazone and prednisone. The maintenance dose of prednisone was reduced by the addition of aspirin or phenylbutazone. Twelve out of sixteen patients thought that aspirin caused a decrease in pain and an increase in joint mobility.

The study is not well-controlled, as there is no "blinding" technique to minimize bias on the part of the observers and the analysts of the data, and for the further reason that there was no comparison of the combination with aspirin alone, as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5). The aspirin was given separately and not in a fixed combination with prednisone, and thus has no bearing on the effectiveness of a fixed combination of 0.75 mg. prednisone and 325 mg. aspirin, since in the study, the dosages of each component were varied for each patient. Such variation and titration cannot be accomplished with a fixed combination. Further, the number of patients is too small for any statistical significance to be attached to the study. Finally, the criteria for evaluation of effectiveness (patient-reported pain or joint mobility) is too subjective for adequate evaluation of drug effectiveness. As the authors state, "[t]he results of any therapy combining two medications in a disease having a fluctuating course are difficult to evaluate." This study fails to meet the criteria of 21 CFR 3.86 or 130.12(a)(5) and is not adequate to support the conclusion that prednisone-aspirin is effective or that addition of aspirin allows a lower dose of prednisone without a reduction in therapeutic effect.

f. Szucs, Petraglia, and Galose, "Clinical Evaluation Of Newer Anti-Inflammatory Steroids, II—A Comparative Study In 350 Cases With Prednisolone," Ohio Medical Journal 53:1418–1420, 1957. In this study, 350 patients with rheumatoid arthritis and miscellaneous other inflammatory conditions were divided into three groups, one group receiving a combination prednisolone (0.5 mg.) and aspirin (300 mg.) preparation, another receiving 2.5 mg. prednisolone alone, and the third receiving 5 mg. prednisolone alone.

The study is not adequate and well controlled and it fails to meet the criteria of 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5). No data is given so as to assure that the control groups were comparables in terms of age, sex, duration, and severity of the disease and previous treatment. The size of the group receiving 2.5 mg. prednisolone is too small. The criteria for differential diagnosis was not given, i.e., it is not explained how the diagnoses of the different types of arthritis were made. Although the article states that a control group received a placebo of a sugar tablet, no data concerning this group is included in the study. The classification of results is not adequate for proper evaluation of effectiveness, because the terms used, i.e., "moderate," "slight," "intensive," "average," are not defined. The study is not well controlled in that there is no comparison between the combination and aspirin alone, nor with 0.5 mg. prednisolone alone. The study was not performed with Sigmagen or a fixed combination of 0.75 mg. prednisone and 325 mg. aspirin, but rather with a combination of prednisolone and aspirin. Finally, the authors themselves state: "only fair results were obtained (with the combination) in rheumatoid arthritis and miscellaneous bursitis."

g. Peterson, Block, and Bunim, "Salicylates and Adrenocortical Functions in Man," Arth. Rheum. 1:29–37, 1958. This study on five normal subjects and four patients with rheumatoid arthritis was for the purpose of determining the effects of salicylates on plasma and urine steroids, and does not purport to establish the effectiveness of a fixed combination prednisone-aspirin drug. One of the patients received a combination of triamcinolone and aspirin, and was reported to respond better to the combination than to either triamcinalone or aspirin alone. An isolated case report on one patient may not be considered (21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(c)). Further, the response to a triamcinolone-aspirin drug does not establish the effectiveness of a fixed combination of prednisone and aspirin.

h. Szucs, Holanko, Forester, and Nalogan, "Evaluation of Combined Prednisolone-Aspirin Therapy in the Treatment of Arthritis," Ohio Med. J. 52:722–723, 1956. This article reports on the clinical response of 200 patients with rheumatoid arthritis to treatment with a combination of 300 mg. aspirin and 0.5 mg. prednisolone. The authors conclude, based on subjective evaluation of the responses, that the combination is of value in treating rheumatoid arthritis, although they state that the evaluation is "preliminary in nature" and "firm conclusions cannot be drawn" from it.

The study is completely uncontrolled, fails to meet the criteria of 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), and is little more than a testimonial. There is no comparison of the effects of the combination with aspirin alone or with prednisolone alone. Further, the study is not adequate since the effectiveness of a drug containing 300 mg. aspirin and 0.5 prednisolone, even if properly established, would not be conclusive of the effectiveness of a fixed combination of 325 mg. aspirin and 0.75 mg. prednisolone, as contained in Sigmagen.

i. Schering cites four references in support of its statement that salicylates have a steroid-sparing effect (Glynn, J. H.; Merck, E.; Kersley, T. D.; and Cope, C. L.). These references do not constitute substantial evidence of effectiveness since they are not clinical studies, but only narrative statements, and no data is submitted in support of the statements. It is interesting to note, however, that Kersley states, at page 99 that "Many compounds containing largely aspirin and a little delta steroid are also appearing, but it is much better and cheaper to use the steroids and aspirin as separate tablets and adjust the dosage combination for the particular patient."

j. Tillis, H. H., "Prednisolone-Buffered Salicylates in the Treatent of Non-Articular Rheumatism.", J. Med. Soc. N.J. 53–177–180, 1956, does not constitute substanital evidence of the effectiveness of Sigmagen and does not meet the criteria of 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), since the study is uncontrolled, prednisolone, rather than prednisone, was the steroid utilized, the drugs were not given as a fixed combination but were administered separately and the condition treated was nonarticular rheumatism, and thus any data generated, even if well controlled, would not be adequate to establish the effectiveness of a drug intended for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis.

k. Holt, Illingsworth, Lorber, and Rendle-Short, "Cortisone and Salicylates in Rheumatic Fever," Lancet 2:1144–1148, 1954, does not cnostitute substantial evidence of the effectiveness of Sigmagen within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. 355(e), and 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), since the study was conducted on children with acute

rheumatic fever, not rheumatoid arthritis, aspirin and corsitone were given separately and titrated acocrding to the needs of the individual patient, and thus the results are not applicable to a fixed combination of prednisone and aspirin, nad tehre was no comparison of the combination with a steroid alone.

1. Salem, J. E., Methylprednisolone—Aspiring in Orofacial Surgery: Controlled Clinical Trial," J. Amer. Dent. Assoc. 68–188–190, 1964. In this study, aspirin was compared to a combination of aspirin and methylprednisolone in treatment of pain and swelling of orofacial surgery patients. Again, this study is irrelevant to sigmagen since the study involved methylprednisolone and aspirin in treatment of orofacial surgery patients, and did not concern a fixed combination predisone-aspirin drug in treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Furthermore, the authors concluded that the differences in the results obtained were not statistically significant.

m. Zuckner, Uddin, and Ramsey, "Adrenal-Pituitary Relationships with Prolonged Low Dosage Steroid Therapy in Rheumatoid Arthritis," Missouri Med. 66:649–659, 1969. The article refers to an uncompleted, unpublished study on 20 patients with rheumatoid arthritis to test the effectiveness of a paramethasone-propoxyphene HCl-aspirin combination as compared with aspirin alone. This study cannot be accepted as substantial evidence of the effectiveness of Sigmagen within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. 355(e) and 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), because the combination utilized differs from the Sigmagen combination, it is not well controlled in that there is no comparison of the combination to a steroid alone or to a placebo, and the criteria to evaluate effectiveness is purely subjective, and in any event in only 11 of 20 patients did the combination prove superior to aspirin alone.

n. Winter, L., "A Controlled Evaluation Of Methylprednisolone—Aspirin Tablets in Oral Surgery," N.Y. State Dent. J. 29:103–105, 1963. The author found that a combination of methylprednisolone (1.5 mg.) and aspirin (500 mg.) was markedly more effective than the dose of aspirin alone in achieving pain relief in pre- and post-operative oral surgery. This study is not substantial evidence of the efficacy of Sigmagen within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. 355(e) and 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), since it involved a different drug and was used to treat pain in oral surgery patients, which is not a recommended use of Sigmagen, and pain relief is entirely subjective and is not an adequate basis, alone, upon which to evaluate drug effectiveness.

o. Roskam, J., and Van Carvenberge, H., "Cortisone, ACTH and Salicylates in the Treatment of Inflammatory Rheumatism and Similar Conditions," Presse Medicale, Paris 60:1344–1347, 1952 (abstracted in JAMA 151:248, 1953). This study fails to meet the criteria of 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5), and is not adequate to establish the effectiveness of Sigmagen because it involved high doses (from 25 to 1,000 mg.) of ACTH or cortisone plus aspirin and is thus not applicable to the prednisone-aspirin fixed combination as in Sigmagen, it is not well controlled since 50 patients received high aspirin to which cortisone was later added, and is thus not a double-blind study, nor is there any comparison of the combination to a steroid alone, and the study involved patients with rheumatic fever, not rheumatoid arthritis or any other condition for which Sigmagen is recommended.

p. Hersko, C., and Izak, G., "Anemia in Rheumatic Fever," Israel Med. Sci. J. 1:43–49, 1965. The authors noted that the addition of prednisone to aspirin markedly improved rheumatic fever patients' response to therapy as determined by increments in hemoglobin as compared with the same daily dosage of aspirin alone, or in combination with ferrous sulfate. This study fails to meet the criteria of 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5) and does not apply to Sigmagen, which is recommended for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis, and is not recommended for rheumatic fever. The study is not well controlled, as there is no comparison with prednisone alone, nor with a placebo. Finally, the effect on hemoglobin is not an adequate criteria for evaluation of the effectiveness of the drug.

q. Coste, F. et al., "Le Traitement des Rhumatismes Inflammatories pour de Nouveaux Steroids Synthetiques," La Semaine de Hospitaux de Paris 31: 1–8, 1955, is not adequate since it concerns only one patient and the steroid and aspirin were administered separately and not in a fixed combination. For the same reasons, the case report of one patient reported by Medvel, V. C., "Cortisone in Rheumatoid Arthritis," Lancet 2:1102, 1953, does not constitute substantial evidence of effectiveness of a fixed combination prednisone-aspirin drug.

None of the studies cited by Schering are adequate and well controlled in accordance with the criteria set forth at 21 CFR 3.86 and 130.12(a)(5), to establish that a fixed combination drug containing 0.75 mg. prednisone and 325 mg. aspirin is effective in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis, and further that the combination is at least as effective as prednisone alone or as aspirin alone. In fact, only one article (Platt and Steinberg) was concerned with a prednisone-aspirin combination in treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. No plan or protocol for any of the studies, or the report of the results of the effectiveness of the test drug, provide adequate assurance that the subjects were always suitable for the purposes of the study, or that the subjects were assigned to test groups in such a way as to minimize bias, or that comparability of pertinent variables in test and control groups was assured. Finally, no data was submitted to establish the effectiveness of a fixed combination prednisone-aspirin drug, the dosage of which cannot be titrated or adapted to the needs of the individual patient.

IV. *Legal objections.* The Commissioner has authority to establish criteria for adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations necessary to demonstrate effectiveness of drug products on the market, and may condition holding of an evidentiary hearing on a showing by Schering Corp., that reasonable grounds exist therefor. (Ciba-Geigy Corporation v. Richardson, 446 F. 2d 466 (C.A. 2, 1971); Pfizer Inc., v. Richardson, 434 F. 2d 536 (C.A. 2, 1970); Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Assn. v. Richardson, 318 F. Supp. 301 (D. Del., 1970)). Thus, the objections of Schering Corp. on these grounds are unfounded.

Since Schering Corp. has submitted no adequate and well-controlled clinical studies establishing the effectiveness of Sigmagen for its recommended uses or of the drug as proposed to be reformulated and relabeled, no hearing on the withdrawal of the NDA of Sigmagen is justified as no genuine issue exists as to the material question of the existence of substantial evidence of effectiveness of Sigmagen for its recommended uses. [(21 CFR 3.86, 130.12(a)(5)(ii), 130.14(b), and 130.27(b)(3); Ciba-Geigy Corp. v. Richardson, supra; Upjohn Co. v. Finch, 422 F. 2d 944 (C.A. 6, 1970)].

The contention of Schering Corp., that Sigmagen Tablets are exempt from the effectiveness provision of the new drug definition, 21 U.S.C. 321(p), in that it is protected by the grandfather provisions of the 1962 Drug Amendments (Sec. 107(c)(4) of Public Law 87–781) is likewise unfounded. A drug subject to an NDA prior to October 9, 1962, does not qualify for an exemption from the new drug provisions of the Act under the grandfather provisions of the 1962 Drug Amendments. USV Pharmaceutical Corporation v. Richardson, 461 F. 2d 223 (C.A. 4, 1972).

Finally, Schering's contention that Sigmagen is not now a new drug, in that it is generally recognized as safe and effective under the conditions of use recommended in its labeling, does not require a hearing. Schering did not present any data or other evidence to establish that Sigmagen is not a new drug within the meaning of the statute, nor did it submit adequate, well-controlled published studies on Sigmagen upon which experts could conclude that Sigmagen is generally recognized among qualified experts to be safe and effective. Thus, Schering has not raised a genuine and substantial issue of fact requiring a hearing on whether Sigmagen is presently a new drug.

V. *Findings.* The Commissioner, based on the review of the medical documentation offered to support the claims of effectiveness for Sigmagen in the treatment of mild to moderate rheumatoid arthritis, mild cases of spondylitis, subacute or interval gout, bursitis, myositis, fibrositis, and neuritis, and to support the claims of effectiveness for a prednisone-aspirin combination drug for symptomatic relief of mild to moderate rheumatoid arthritis, finds that there is a lack of substantial evidence that this fixed combination drug will have the effect that it purports and is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in

its labeling and that each component of the drug contributes to the total effects claimed, and that Schering Corp. has failed to set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine and substantial issue of fact requiring a hearing. No objections or documentation were presented by any other firms, and, in accordance with the provisions of 21 CFR 130.15, this failure is construed as an election by any other firm not to avail itself of the opportunity for the hearing.

The Commissioner further finds that the approval of the new drug application heretofore approved for Sigmagen (NDA 10-157) should be withdrawn on the basis of a lack of substantial evidence of effectiveness.

Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (§§ 505, 701, 52 Stat. 1052-1053, 1055-1056, as amended, and 76 Stat. 781-785, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 355, 371), and under authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), the request for a hearing is denied, and notice is given that the approval of the new drug application for Sigmagen tablets (NDA 10-157) and all amendments and supplements thereto is withdrawn, effective on the date of publication of this document.

Dated: March 6, 1973.

SAM D. FINE,
Associate Commissioner for Compliance.

[FR Doc.73-4539 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[DESI 8530; Docket No. FDC-D-141; NDA Nos. 10-613 and 8-530]

WINTHROP PRODUCTS, INC., AND WINTHROP LABORATORIES

Alevaire; Notice of Withdrawal of Approval of New Drug Application

In an announcement published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of July 17, 1968 (33 FR 10227), Winthrop Products, Inc., holder of new drug application No. 10-613 for Alevaire (tyloxapol 0.125 percent) and Winthrop Laboratories, Division of Sterling Drug, holder of NDA No. 8-530 for Alevaire (tyloxapol 0.125 percent), were notified of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Drug Efficacy Study Group's evaluation of the article as ineffective, and of the Food and Drug Administration's concurrence with the evaluation and its conclusions that there is a lack of substantial evidence that Alevaire will have the effect it purports and is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in its labeling. Accordingly, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs noted his intent to initiate action to withdraw approval of the new drug applications for Alevaire, and invited holders of the NDA's to submit any pertinent data.

After the announcement, Winthrop met with representatives of the Food and Drug Administration on August 13, 1968, to present arguments and additional evidence in support of the claimed effectiveness of Alevaire. The arguments and data were evaluated, but failed to provide any evidence of effectiveness derived from adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations. On December 6, 1969, there was, therefore, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (34 FR 19389), a notice of opportunity for hearing in which the Commissioner of Food and Drugs proposed to issue an order under the provisions of section 505(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(e)) withdrawing approval of NDA's Nos. 10-613 and 8-530 for Alevaire, and all amendments and supplements thereto, on the ground that there was a lack of substantial evidence to support the claims of effectiveness for the drug for the conditions for which it is prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling.

Winthrop Products, Inc., holder of NDA No. 10-613; Winthrop Laboratories, Division of Sterling Drug, Inc., holder of NDA No. 8-530; and Breon Laboratories, Inc., a firm marketing Alevaire in the United States, filed a written appearance and request for hearing on January 20, 1970.

Submitted with the request was a statement of grounds, including the medical documentation relied upon, arguments which contended that there was an unqualified right to a hearing, and the affidavits of six physicians and scientists attesting to the drug's effectiveness. Additional medical documentation was submitted by a letter dated May 7, 1970.

On June 5, 1970, in response to the May 8, 1970, FEDERAL REGISTER publication of procedural and interpretative regulations, a supplemental election for hearing was submitted, included in which, was further medical documentation and a reiteration of the argument and reasons for a hearing as stated in the initial request for hearing. On August 13, 1970, one final medical document was submitted as a supplement to the January 20, and June 5 filings, and on March 1, 1971, the affidavit of the medical director of Breon Laboratories was received.

On June 21, 1971, a revision of an earlier submitted study was forwarded along with five affidavits. On August 12, 1971, a submission was made containing argument and two affidavits. Finally, on January 28, 1972, petitioners made a final submission containing raw data sheets on two previously submitted studies.

On September 11, 1971, a final order was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (37 FR 17229) denying requests for a hearing and withdrawing approval of NDA's Nos. 10-613 and 8-530 on the grounds that there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug, Alevaire, is effective for its recommended uses.

After preparation of the order, but prior to its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER, the data received on June 21 and August 12, 1971, as set forth above, was received and due to inadvertence, was not considered prior to publication of the final order.

On January 11, 1972, upon being advised by the Government of the inadvertence, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit set aside the order of September 11, 1971, and remanded the proceeding to the Food and Drug Administration for reconsideration of the requests of hearing in light of the data not considered.

The additional data, as well as the medical documentation reviewed by the NAS-NRC panel and the medical documentation contained in both NDA's have been considered. The Commissioner of Food and Drugs concludes that there is no genuine and substantial issue of fact requiring a hearing and that the legal arguments are insubstantial.

REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL

1. *The drug.* Alevaire is an aqueous solution of 0.125-percent tyloxapol, 2-percent sodium bicarbonate, and 5-percent glycerin.

It is recommended in the treatment of patients "with diseases and disorders of the lungs accompanied, or complicated, by excessive or thickened bronchopulmonary secretions," and is indicated also for persons having pulmonary diseases where "* * * the normal mechanism for elimination of secretions is diminished or absent * * * or depressed."

The rationale for Alevaire has been variously described. At the time of initial NDA approval, it was offered as a "mucolytic" detergent aerosol which exerted a liquefying effect on excessive or thickened mucous secretions, thereby aiding the patient in their expulsion. The rationale, as reflected in the labeling submitted for review by the NAS-NRC panel, is that the drug acts as a detergent aerosol facilitating the removal of the pulmonary secretions allowing for excretion by normal processes by lowering or reducing the surface and interfacial tensions and reducing their viscosity.

Alevaire is recommended for administration in an undiluted form by an aerosol nebulizer delivering a fine mist to the patient in an open tent, croup tent, or incubator. Where short periods of therapy are indicated, 10-20 ml. are recommended to be administered by a face mask, positive pressure breathing machines, or oral or nasal spray apparatus.

2. *Medical documentation.* Petitioners have presented summaries and/or copies of 19 reports and have cited nine additional articles which they contend establish Alevaire's effectiveness. The Commissioner has reviewed these submissions and concludes that they include no adequate and well-controlled studies of the type required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5). These studies were generally discussed in the Commission's September 11, 1971, order and are discussed individually below.

(a) *Nine cited articles.* These articles are all mentioned in the submission of January 20, 1970. These articles, except No. (8) below, all contain mere passing references to Alevaire. They are not adequate and well-controlled studies since none of them, except No. (8), involved the use of any control whatever, in violation of section 505 of the act, 21 CFR

3.86, and 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*). Nor is No. (8) an adequate and well-controlled study, as detailed below.

(1) S. Bloom "Case Report: Tracheostomy in Status Asthmaticus," Annals of Allergy, 23:538 (1965). As suggested in the title, this article is a discussion of a case history of a patient. The patient was given several drugs including Alevaire in the course of his treatment, and no mechanism was used to compare the effects of the various treatments.

(2) R. M. Cherniak "The Recognition and Management of Respiratory Insufficiency," Anesthesiology 25:209 (1964). As suggested in the title, this article is a discussion of respiratory insufficiency. It is not a controlled comparison of the effects of drugs.

(3) D. E. Frank "WR 1339 Inhalations in the Treatment of Asthmatic Attacks and Chronic Asthma—A Pilot Study," Annals of Allergy 13:313 (1955). In this test, patients suffering from an asthma attack were treated with Alevaire for 15 minutes, but Alevaire was not compared to any control.

(4) O. C. Hansen-Pruss et al., "Emphysema in the Aged," Journal of the American Geriatric Society 2:153 (1954). This article is a general report concerning emphysema based on the observation of 24 uncontrolled patients and contains a single unsupported statement that Alevaire is an effective expectorant.

(5) M. Joannides, Jr., "Chronic Obstructive Emphysema," Journal of the American Medical Association 192:105 (1965). This article, rather than studying Alevaire, discusses aspects of the treatment of emphysema by surgery. The article recommends that expectorant therapy, preferably Alevaire, be used as preoperative preparation. It is not a controlled study of Alevaire's efficacy.

(6) F. Marchetta et al., "A Method of Tracheotomy Care," Archives of Otolaryngology 65:296 (1957). As suggested by the title, this article is not a controlled study of Alevaire. Its only mention of Alevaire is to suggest Alevaire's administration as a method of postoperative care for tracheotomy.

(7) T. H. McGavack et al., "Metabolic Emergencies Common in the Elderly," The West Virginia Medical Journal 61: 109 (1965). This article, rather than being a study of Alevaire, discusses metabolic emergencies commonly affecting older persons. It says, in passing, that while the various detergents and enzymes have been used to thin tenacious bronchial secretions, none has been too successful, but that Alevaire has been the most satisfactory detergent aerosol.

(8) J. H. Modell et al., "The Effects of Wetting and Antifoaming Agents on Pulmonary Surfactant," Anesthesiology 30:164 (1969). This study purports to compare the in vitro and in vivo effects of Alevaire (a wetting agent) and ethyl alcohol (an antifoaming agent) on normal canine pulmonary surfactant. This does not constitute adequate and well-controlled study since Alevaire was compared to ethyl alcohol, not to a proper control, i.e., Alevaire minus the active ingredient tyloxapol, in other words, a mixture of 2 percent sodium bicarbonate, 5 percent glycerin and 93 percent water, and the test was conducted on healthy dogs, not on human patients suffering from conditions for whose treatment Alevaire is recommended.

(9) J. E. Ruben "Alevaire as an Adjunct for Preventing Pulmonary Complications after Toracotomy (A Comparative Study of 200 Cases)," Anesthesiology 16:801 (1955). The title explains the subject of this article and indicates that no control was used, which is borne out by reading the article.

b. *Nineteen summarized or copied articles.* The first 14 of the articles discussed below were summarized in the submission of January 20, 1970. The other five were submitted as indicated.

1. R. Denton et al., "Mist-O_2-Gen Therapy and Postural Drainage for Respiratory Difficulties of the Newborn Infant: A Preliminary Report," Journal of Pediatrics 42:551 (1953). This article is a discussion of Mist-O_2-Gen—an apparatus for the administration of aerosol treatment to newborn infants suffering from respiratory difficulties. In passing, the authors suggest that the apparatus can be used to administer Triton-A-20, a former designation for tyloxapol, the active ingredient in Alevaire and one of a group of chemicals which the authors say has "proved chemically valuable." This article does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since it was not a comparison of Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.13(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*).

2. B. Gans, "Acute Bronchiolitis treated with Detergent Aerosols," Lancet 1:1011 (1954). This article concerns the treatment of infant victims of two epidemics of bronchiolitis. During the first epidemic the mortality rate was 21.9 percent; during the second epidemic patients were treated with three detergents, including Alevaire, and none died. This is not an adequate and well-controlled study since there were no stated diagnostic criteria on the condition treated as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(2)(*i*) and (*iii*), the article did not state the method of observation and recording of results including variables measured and quantitation as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*3*) and the article makes no effort to define or explain the possible effects of environmental factors. This third reason is important when one considers that the patients were in London and the first epidemic occurred between November 1952 and February 1953, dates which include the severe fog of December 5–9, 1952. The author admits that "some [patients] may well have had a more severe type of illness as a result of their exposure [to the fog]." (1 Lancet at p. 1012). Most importantly, there was no comparison of Alevaire with a control, e.g., a product containing Alevaire's components minus tyloxapol.

3. C. J. Heinberg, "Laryngitis in Children," Southern Medical Journal 50:383 (1957). This article discusses laryngitis in children generally, and its purpose "is to plead for teamwork early in order to prevent anoxemia and toxemia of severe impact" (50 Southern Medical Journal at 383). The article mentions Alevaire as an aid in treatment of acute laryngatracheobronchitis. This article does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*).

4. M. Holmes-Siedle et al., "Acute Laryngotracheobronchitis Treated with 0.125 percent Superinone," British Medical Journal 2:777 (1958). This article relates to five cases of acute laryngotracheobronchitis in which Alevaire was used as part of the therapy. It is not an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*).

5. H. N. Kenwell et al., "Problems of Preoperative and Postoperative Cases," American Practitioner and Digest of Treatment 7:597 (1956). The title of this article indicates its concern. The article says that Alevaire is effective, inter alia, in liquifying bronchial secretions and should be used in preoperative and postoperative therapy in certain cases. This article merely mentions Alevaire. It is not an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5(ii)(*a*)(*4*).

6. D. M. Little, Jr., "Fetal Salvage in Cesarian Section—The Pediatric Viewpoint," New York State Journal of Medicine 53:2776 (1953). This article deals with methods to lower the mortality rate of infants delivered by cesarian section especially by aiding respiration. The article, in passing, makes the statement that Alevaire has been an effective detergent. This article, containing statements about Alevaire made in passing, does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*).

7. J. B. Miller et al., "Alevaire Inhalation for Eliminating Secretions in Asthma, Sinusitis, Bronchitis and Bronchiectasis of Adults: A Preliminary Report," Annals of Allergy 12:611 (1954). This article makes suggestions concerning how Alevaire might be administered. In addition the article contains case reports of seventeen people with respiratory diseases and their response to treatment with Alevaire. This article is not an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*). In fact, the study itself says: "This does not pretend to be a controlled study." 12 Annals of Allergy at 624.

8. W. F. Miller, "Chronic Inflammatory Bronchopulmonary Disorders: A Physiologically Oriented Approach to Treatment," Archives of Internal Medicine 107:589 (1961). As suggested by the title, this article deals with the treatment of chronic inflammatory bronchopulmonary disorders. In passing the article says that Alevaire alleviates airway obstructions. This article, containing the living organism, the article does not

constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(4).

9. S. F. Ravenel, "New Techniques of Humidification in Pediatrics," Journal of the American Medical Association 151:707 (1953). This article claims to contain the results of an in vitro experiment in which Alevaire was shown to lower the viscosity of saliva, bronchiectatic pus and amniotic fluid by 10 percent, 19 percent, and 24 percent respectively while water produced no thinning. The article also states that Alevaire has helped those with various respiratory conditions. The results of the in vitro study does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study of Alevaire's effectiveness since in vitro tests do not assure that the same results will occur in the living organisms, the article does not explain quantitation and how variables were measured as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(3), the article does not present a summary of the methods of analysis and an evaluation of data derived from the study as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(5), and the article is conclusory and lacks detail, data and an explanation of experimental technique. In addition, Alevaire was not compared to a proper control, e.g. Alevaire minus tyloxapol.

10. M. S. Sadove et al., "Postoperative Aerosol Therapy," Journal of the American Medical Association 156:759 (1954). This article gives the views of the authors on the place of aerosol therapy in the care of patients after operation. The article mentions that Alevaire may be used for such therapy and offers testimonials of its effectiveness. This article does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(4).

11. M. S. Segal et al., "Treatment of Chronic Pulmonary Emphysema," American Rev. Tuberculosis 69:915 (1954). The title of this article indicates its contents. Alevaire is mentioned as an aid in treatment. This article does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(4).

12. A. Smessaert et al., "Aerosol Administration of Alevaire: II. Clinical Evaluation," New York State Medical Journal 55:1587 (1955). This article summarizes the reactions of 300 patients to Alevaire. The therapeutic response was listed in the article under four groups: good, appreciable, fair and poor. These responses were based on consideration of the following factors: volume, color, and viscosity of sputum or secretions; temperature and pulse; changes in the respiratory effort and in the auscultatory signs; radiologic appearance before and after therapy; and the general condition of the patient. The test found that 204 of the patients (70 percent) were in the "good" and "appreciable" category. This article does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(4).

13. F. C. Stiles, "Aerosol Therapy in Children," the Wisconsin Medical Journal 52:543 (1953). This article talks about the use of Alevaire and other aerosols for various respiratory conditions. It is not an adequate and well-controlled study since it did not compare Alevaire to a control as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(4).

14. M. L. Tainter et al., "Alevaire as a Mucolytic Agent," the New England Journal of Medicine 253:764 (1955). This article summarizes the conclusions of previous articles on Alevaire. The authors say that they have carried out in vitro experiments to measure surface tension effects of Alevaire on sputum. Alevaire was found to lower surface tension by 20 percent, whereas it was found that water did not lower surface tension. Other tests showed that when a glass plate was coated with Alevaire and set at a 45° angle and sputum was dropped into it, the time required for the sputum to slide a distance of 15 cm. was about one-third the time the sputum took to slide off of a glass plate which was water-wetted and held at a 45° angle. This article does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since in vitro results cannot be extrapolated to the living organism, the tests conducted do not show that Alevaire is effective for its recommended use since it does not show that patients with pulmonary diseases can better eliminate bronchial secretions, and it did not compare Alevaire to a proper control, e.g. Alevaire minus tyloxapol.

15. B. M. Cohen, "Ultrasonic Nebulization of Water and Mucoevacuant Solutions in Patients with Obstructive Lung Disease: Volumetric and Ventilatory Responses to Acute Administration." This study was summarized in the submission of January 20, 1970, submitted as exhibit 19 of the submission of June 5, 1970 and resubmitted as revised in the submission of June 21, 1971. This test involved 15 patients with obstructive ventilatory diseases (bronchial asthma and chronic bronchitis) and retained secretions. The effects of Alevaire and distilled water were measured. The test measured several indices and concluded that Alevaire was more effective than water. This test is not an adequate and well-controlled study since the diagnostic criteria for identifying bronchial asthma and chronic bronchitis patients were not stated as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(2)(i), the method of patient selection is not explained, the study did not state the steps taken to assess subjective response and minimize bias on the part of the subject and observer as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(3), the test did not document the levels and method of blinding as required by 21 CFR 130.13(a)(5)(ii)(a)(4), and the administration of the water and Alevaire was preceded by the inhalation of a bronchodilator, meaning the effects of water and Alevaire cannot be separated from the effects of the bronchodilator. Most importantly, the test did not compare Alevaire to a proper control, e.g. Alevaire minus tyloxapol, in other words a solution of 2 percent sodium bicarbonate, 5 percent of glycerine and 93 percent water. In addition the statistical support claimed for alevaire is not valid since the design of the experiment, although a crossover, was not analyzed as such, the baseline differences between treatment groups and patients were not adequately taken into account; nor were the summary tables submitted adequate to measure improvement for all volumetric and ventilatory responses taken, and the specific analytical model was not presented in a complete fashion. In particular, the definition of replication in the applicant's model and the magnitude of the error term and scientific degrees of freedom were not presented.

16. G. Beck, untitled and uncompleted study comparing Alevaire to isotonic saline. A description of this test was given in January 20, 1970. A summary of its progress was submitted on June 5, 1970. On June 21, 1971 Food and Drug Administration was told that Dr. Beck was having troubles finding proper patients for his study. On August 12, 1971, Food and Drug Administration was again informed of the difficulties encountered with completing this test along with Dr. Beck's affidavit concerning those difficulties. An incomplete test of this nature cannot constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since the information provided is too sketchy to evaluate.

17. W. F. Miller and P. Paez "Blind Comparison among Normal Saline, Distilled Water and Two Surface Active agents in Sputum Evacuation." This study was mentioned in the submission of January 20, 1970. A completed version was submitted as exhibit 18 of the submission of June 5, 1970. In this test 20 patients with a variety of bronchopulmonary diseases were each tested with four different substances. The test is not an adequate and well-controlled study since patient selection reflected variable disease conditions contrary to 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(2)(i), and as a consequence the variability of sputum volume and retention qualities precluded uniform measurement of effectiveness, the test did not assure comparability in test and control groups of pertinent variables such as age, sex, severity, or duration of disease, and use of drugs other than the test drugs as required by 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(2)(iii), the assessment of subjective response was not stated as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(3), an important factor in these cases where there is some question of whether patients are capable of accurate evaluation of their own sputum consistency, the study does not explain the method of observation and recording of results as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(3), the study does not explain the steps taken to minimize bias on the part of the subject and observer as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(3) and (4), the study did not provide a comparison of the results of diagnosis and treatment with a control in such a fashion as to

permit the quantitative evaluation required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(3), and the test did not document levels and methods of blinding as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(4). In addition the statistical analysis was not valid since Alevaire was administered to only half the number of patients who received normal saline and distilled water, the spirometric test is complicated by the use of Bronkometer aerosol which also has mucoevacuant properties, and the data lack adequate detail to permit trend analysis or comprehension of methodology. Most importantly, this test is inadequate since it did not compare Alevaire to a proper control, e.g. Alevaire minus tyloxapol, in other words a solution of 2 percent sodium bicarbonate, 5 percent glycerin and 93 percent water.

18. R. E. Goldhammer et al., "Effects of a Mucoevacuant on Mucus and Respiratory Tract Fluid: A Control Study in Immature Cats," Archives of Environmental Health 20:586 (1970). This article was mentioned in the submission of January 20, 1970, was submitted on May 7, 1970, and resubmitted as exhibit 16B of the submission of June 5, 1970. This article does not constitute an adequate and well-controlled study since there were no indications of the steps taken to minimize bias by the observer as required by 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5)(ii)(a)(3) and (4), and cats are poor animals to use to support claims of efficacy of Alevaire in humans because the respiratory tract of a cat is short compared to the human, thereby minimizing the "fallout" of large droplets. In addition Alevaire was not compared to a proper control, e.g., Alevaire minus tyloxapol, in other words a solution of 2 percent sodium bicarbonate, 5 percent glycerine and 93 percent water.

19. J. W. Polk et al., "A Comparative Study of Alevaire and a New Mucolytic Agent, Acumist in Postoperative Patients," the Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Monthly 49:30 (1970). This article was submitted on August 13, 1970, and compares Alevaire to Acumist and concludes that Acumist is a more effective mucolytic agent. This article is not an adequate and well-controlled study demonstrating Alevaire's effectiveness since it did not compare Alevaire to a proper control, e.g., Alevaire minus tyloxapol.

3. *Affidavits concerning Alevaire's effectiveness.* On January 20, 1970, petitioners submitted six affidavits which contend that clinical experience has shown Alevaire to be effective for its recommended uses and that criteria for adequate and well-controlled clinical studies prescribed by FDA regulations should be deemed inapplicable to aerosol medication.

Despite the expressed opinions that Alevaire is effective, in only four of the affidavits (Cohen, Miller, Beck, and Ravenel) is anything more than general clinical experience relied upon to justify such a conclusion. The conclusions of Cohen, Miller, Beck, and Ravenel are based on general clinical impressions and upon studies, which have not been shown to be adequate and well controlled, that each has conducted upon Alevaire, and which therefore do not constitute a valid basis for their final conclusions.

The affidavits also argue that the regulations requiring adequate and well-controlled studies of effectiveness as a prerequisite for a hearing should not be applied to Alevaire because of the special properties of aerosol drugs. It is contended that patients cannot be properly blinded because Alevaire tastes, looks, and foams and has a consistency different than water thereby allowing the patient to recognize which preparation he is receiving. It is also said that the disease states of patients vary from day to day. These contentions do not obviate the need for compliance with the regulations. Alevaire must be compared to its own vehicle, in other words, to a product containing the ingredients of Alevaire minus tyloxapol, i.e. a solution of 2 percent sodium bicarbonate, 5 percent glycerin and 93 percent water. A patient could not detect the difference between such a compound and Alevaire. And while the severity of a disease on any given day may vary from day to day or even minute to minute, a documentation of symptom trends over a period of time could be employed so as to reduce this obstacle. An adequate and well-controlled clinical study is therefore entirely feasible.

On June 21, 1971, petitioner submitted five additional affidavits. These affidavits stated that the affiants reviewed the Miller-Paez article and the Cohen article and concluded that these articles constituted adequate and well-controlled studies as defined by FDA regulations. This conclusion can have no basis in fact and does not require a hearing since, as pointed out above, the Cohen and Miller-Paez studies do not conform to several requirements of the FDA regulations defining adequate and well-controlled studies, and, most importantly, do not even compare Alevaire to a proper control, as pointed out in the discussions of two tests, supra.

On August 12, 1971, petitioners submitted two additional affidavits. Both affidavits state that they have been unable to complete the studies they had agreed to perform either due to lack of personnel or a proper patient population. In addition, one concludes that there is "substantial evidence" that Alevaire is effective based, in part, on the Cohen and Miller-Paez studies. The other concludes that the Cohen and Miller-Paez studies fall within the FDA regulation for adequate and well-controlled studies. These conclusions have no basis in fact and do not require a hearing since, as pointed out above, the Cohen and Miller-Paez studies do not conform to several requirements of the FDA regulations defining adequate and well-controlled studies, and, most importantly, do not even compare Alevaire to a proper control, as pointed out in the discussions of the two tests, supra.

4. *Legal arguments*—a. *Alevaire is not a "grandfathered" drug.* In the submission of January 20, 1970, petitioners claimed that Alevaire is not subject to the requirements found in the 1962 New Drug Amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act that "new drugs" must be generally recognized as safe and effective. Petitioners base their claim of exemption on the ground that they are "grandfathered," that is that Alevaire is not a "new drug" since it falls within the exemption found in section 107(c)(4) of the 1962 Amendments, Public Law 87-781. The contention that Alevaire is not subject to the efficacy review of the 1962 Amendments to the Act is insubstantial since the drug was covered by an effective application under 21 U.S.C. 355 on the day preceding the enactment date of the 1962 Amendments and the NDA was never withdrawn or disapproved by FDA. A drug subject to an NDA prior to October 9, 1962, does not qualify for an exemption from the new drug provisions of the Act under the grandfather provisions of the 1962 New Drug Amendments. USV Pharmaceutical Corp. v. Richardson, 461 F. 2d 223 (C.A. 4, 1972).

b. *The right to a hearing is not unconditional.* In their submission of January 20, and June 5, 1970, petitioners contend that they have an unconditional right to a hearing concerning whether Alevaire is effective. This contention is without merit. Courts in several cases have held that there is no such unconditional right. Diamond Laboratories, Inc. v. Richardson, 452 F. 2d 803 (C.A. 8, 1972), Ciba-Geigy Corp. v. Richardson, 446 F. 2d 466 (C.A. 2, 1971); Upjohn Co. v. Finch, 422 F. 2d 944 (C.A. 6, 1970), Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Ass'n. v. Richardson, 318 F. Supp. 301 (D. Del. 1970). These cases recognize that those petitioning for a hearing must demonstrate that they have substantial evidence of the effectiveness of their drug as evidenced by adequate and well-controlled studies. Petitioners, as pointed out above, have not presented such evidence.

5. *Summary.* Before petitioners request for hearing may be granted, the information submitted as part of the request must show there is substantial evidence that Alevaire will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended or suggested in the labeling. 21 U.S.C. 355(e); 21 CFR 130.12(a)(5). Certain principles have been developed by the scientific community as essentials of adequate and well-controlled clinical investigations. They provide the basis for establishing that there is substantial evidence to support claims of effectiveness.

A well-controlled clinical investigation should provide for comparison of the results of treatment with a control which permits quantitative evaluation. The precise nature of the control must be stated and an explanation of the methods used to minimize bias on the part of observers and the analysts of the data. The level and method of "blinding" techniques must be documented.

In the case of Alevaire, a comparison of the results of use of the drug itself with an inactive preparation designed to

resemble Alevaire must be utilized. Thus, to establish effectiveness, the studies relied on would have to at least compare Alevaire to a product containing an aqueous solution of 2 percent sodium bicarbonate and 5 percent glycerin. None of the studies or articles cited make such a comparison. Moreover, the Palmer study cited by the NAS–NRC panel establishes that Alevaire containing tyloxapol, 2 percent sodium bicarbonate, and 5 percent glycerin was no more effective than the control solution containing no tyloxapol, which evidence petitioners have not refuted. Therefore, petitioners contention is without merit.

c. *The NAS–NRC report warrants institution of withdrawal procedures.* In their submission of January 20, 1970, petitioners argue that the NAS–NRC report does not warrant the institution of withdrawal proceedings against Alevaire since, inter alia, the NAS–NRC panel was not familiar with the clinical use of Alevaire, the Commissioner did not conduct an independent review of Alevaire's effectiveness, and the NAS–NRC panel apparently misunderstood the true physiological effects of Alevaire. This objection is insubstantial. The NAS–NRC reviewed medical literature on Alevaire determining that it did not contain substantial evidence of its effectiveness. To the contrary, the study by Palmer, "The effect of an aerosol detergent in chronic bronchitis," Lancet 1:611–613 (1957), clearly established that Alevaire containing a detergent and sodium bicarbonate was no more effective than the control solution containing sodium bicarbonate but no detergent. The Commissioner conducted an independent evaluation of the NAS–NRC conclusions, the material in Alevaire's new drug application and other scientific literature relating to Alevaire. On the basis of this evaluation the Commissioner concurred that there was a lack of substantial evidence that the addition of the small amount of tyloxapol which is found in Alevaire increases the effectiveness of the product. The NAS–NRC reviewed medical literature in light of the claims for Alevaire made by petitioners. It concluded and the Commissioner concurred that there was no substantial evidence that Alevaire had its labeled physiological effects.

d. *Other arguments.* In addition to the three legal arguments discussed above, petitioners state other reasons for granting a hearing for Alevaire. None of these, however, are of any merit.

5. *Findings.* The Commissioner, on the basis of the information before him and a review of the documentation, affidavits, and legal arguments offered to support the claims of effectiveness for Alevaire, finds that there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug has the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in its labeling, that the legal arguments are insubstantial, and that the petitioners have failed to set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine and substantial issue of fact requiring a hearing.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (section 505(e), 52 Stat. 1052, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 355(e)) and under the authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), the request for hearing is denied, and the approval of new drug application Nos. 10–613 and 8–530, and all amendments and supplements thereto, is withdrawn effective on the date of publication of this document.

Dated: March 2, 1973.

WILLIAM F. RANDOLPH,
Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.

[FR Doc.73–4538 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

National Institutes of Health

BREAST CANCER WORKING GROUP

Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the Breast Cancer Working Group of the Special Virus Cancer Program, March 30, 1973, at 9 a.m., National Institutes of Health, Building 31, Conference Room 7. This meeting will be open to the public from 9 a.m., March 30, 1973, to discuss the progress of the segment's program of breast cancer research during the previous 4 months and closed to the public from 9:30 a.m., March 30, 1973, in accordance with the provisions set forth in section 552(b)4 title V, United States Code and section 10(d) of Public Law 92–463. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

Mr. Frank Karel, Associate Director for Public Affairs, NCI, Building 31, Room 10A–31, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014, 301—496–1911, will furnish sumaries of the open/closed meeting and roster of committee members.

Dr. Ernest J. Plata, Executive Secretary, Building 41, Suite 300, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. 20014, 301—496–6178, will provide substantive program information.

Dated: February 28, 1973.

JOHN F. SHERMAN,
Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc.73–4473 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis on March 27, 1973, at the National Institutes of Health, Building 31, Conference Room 3. This meeting will be open to the public from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. and will continue the investigation into the most promising avenues for research leading to causes of and preventives and treatments for multiple sclerosis. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

Mrs. Ruth Dudley, Information Officer, NINDS, Building 31, Room 8A03, telephone 496–5751, will furnish summaries of the meeting, rosters of the Commission members, and Dr. Harry M. Weaver, Building 31, Room 8A34, telephone 496–3523, will give Commission activities information.

Dated: February 28, 1973.

JOHN F. SHERMAN,
Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc.73–4470 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

PERIODONTAL DISEASES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the Periodontal Diseases Advisory Committee, March 27, 1973, National Institutes of Health, Building 31–C, Conference Room 7. This meeting will be open to the public from 9:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. on March 27, to develop more specific advice to the National Institute of Dental Research in planning research strategies on periodontal disease. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

The Executive Secretary from whom substantive information may be obtained is Dr. Anthony A. Rizzo, Extramural Programs, National Institute of Dental Research, National Institutes of Health, Westwood Building, Room 506, Bethesda, Md. 20014.

Dated: February 28, 1973.

JOHN F. SHERMAN,
Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc.73–4472 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

SICKLE CELL DISEASE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the Sickle Cell Disease Advisory Committee, March 22 and 23, 1973, National Institutes of Health, Building 31, Conference Room 4. This meeting will be open to the public from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on both days. The agenda items will generate discussion on subcommittee reports and program staff reports. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

Mr. Hugh Jackson, Information Officer, NHLI, NIH Building 31, Room 4A10, phone 496–4236, will furnish summaries of the meeting and rosters of the committee members. Substantive information may also be obtained from the Executive Secretary, Mr. Howard F. Manly, NHLI, NIH Building 31, Room 5A03, phone 496–6931.

Dated: February 28, 1973.

JOHN F. SHERMAN,
Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health.

[FR Doc.73–4471 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

Office of the Secretary

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON MENTAL RETARDATION

Notice of Meeting

The President's Committee on Mental Retardation was established to provide advice and assistance in the area of mental retardation to the President including evaluation of the adequacy of the national effort to combat mental retardation; coordination of activities of Federal agencies; provision of adequate liaison between Federal activities and related activities of State and local governments, foundations, and private organizations; develop information designed for dissemination to the general public. The Committee will meet Friday and Saturday, March 16–17, 1973, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. in Washington, D.C., at the Watergate Hotel. The Committee will discuss health, education, services, and legal rights as they relate to the mentally retarded. These meetings are open to the public.

Dated: February 28, 1973.

FRED J. KRAUSE,
Executive Director, President's Committee on Mental Retardation.

[FR Doc.73-4489 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

SECRETARY'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF WOMEN

Notice of Meeting

The Secretary's Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women, which was established to review the policies, programs, and activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relative to women and to make recommendations to the Secretary on how to better the services of HEW's programs to meet these special needs of women, will meet Thursday and Friday, April 5–6, 1973. Thursday, April 5, the subcommittees will meet from 8:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the following rooms at HEW's North Building, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC: Health Subcommittee—Room 3058, Education Subcommittee—Room 3510, Internal Affairs Subcommittee—Room 4623, and Social Services and Welfare Subcommittee—Room 3131. Then from 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. the Committee will meet in Room 5131 in the HEW-North Building. To be admitted to the building for this portion of the meeting, interested individuals must contact Ms. Karen Keesling, Executive Secretary of the Committee, HEW-North Room 3062, 202—962-0996 prior to the April 5 meeting. Friday, April 6, from 8:30 a.m. to 12 noon and 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. the Committee will meet in Room 5169 in the HEW-North Building. The Committee will be discussing health, education, social services, welfare, and HEW employment policies as they relate to women. This meeting is open to the public.

Dated: March 2, 1973.

KAREN KEESLING,
Executive Secretary, Secretary's Advisory Committee on the Rights and Responsibilities of Women.

[FR Doc.73-4488 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-334]

DUQUESNE LIGHT CO., ET AL.

Notice of Hearing on a Facility Operating License

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the regulations in title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50, "Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities," and Part 2, "Rules of Practice," notice is hereby given that a hearing will be held at a time and place to be set in the future by an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, to begin in or in the vicinity of Beaver County, Pa., to consider the application filed under section 104(b) of the Act by Duquesne Light Co., Ohio Edison Co., and Pennsylvania Power Co. (applicants), for a facility operating license which would authorize the operation of the pressurized water nuclear reactor (the facility), identified as the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1, at reactor core power levels not to exceed 2,600 megawatts (thermal), at the applicants' site in Beaver County, Pa. The hearing will be conducted by an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board (Board) designated by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, consisting of Samuel W. Jensch, Esq. (Chairman), Dr. John C. Geyer, and Mr. Frederick C. Shon. Dr. David L. Hetrick has been designated a technically qualified alternate, and Edward Luton, Esq., has been designated as an alternate qualified in the conduct of administrative proceedings.

Construction of the facility was authorized by Construction Permit No. CPPR-75 issued by the Atomic Energy Commission (Commission) on June 26, 1970.

On November 10, 1972, a "Notice of Receipt of Application for Facility Operating License; Notice of Hearing; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License and Opportunity for Hearing" in the above matter appeared in the FEDERAL REGISTER (37 F.R. 23935). The notice advised that, within 30 days from the date of publication, "any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a petition for leave to intervene: (1) With respect to the issuance of the facility operating license; or (2) with respect to whether, considering those matters covered by Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50, the construction permit should be continued, modified, terminated, or appropriately conditioned to protect environmental values." A joint petition for leave to intervene in each aspect of this proceeding was thereafter filed by the city of Pittsburgh and Mayor Pete Flaherty, Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, Ernest J. Sternglass, David Marshall, Friends of the Earth, Environment Pittsburgh, and the Beaver County Citizens Conservation Corps (joint petitioners). Answers to the petition were filed by the applicants and the Commission's regulatory staff.

As set forth in a memorandum and order on this matter dated March 2, 1973, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on this petition has determined that a hearing with respect to the issuance of the facility operating license is warranted, that this hearing should be consolidated with the hearing on whether the construction permit should be continued, modified, terminated, or appropriately conditioned to protect any environmental values, and that, subject to acceptable clarification[1] of the interest of petitioner Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, all joint petitioners should be admitted jointly as intervenors party to the proceedings. The unopposed request of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to participate in this proceeding as an interested State pursuant to 10 CFR 2.715(c), was also granted.

A prehearing conference on conferences will be held by the Licensing Board, at a date and place to be set by it, to consider pertinent matters in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice. The date and place of the consolidated hearing will be set by the Board at or after the prehearing conference. Notices as to the dates and places of the prehearing conference and the consolidated hearing will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

The specific issues to be considered at the consolidated hearing will be determined by the Board in accordance with the cited memorandum and order.

The instant facility is subject to the provisions of section B of Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50, which sets forth procedures for environmental review of certain licenses to construct or operate production or utilization facilities issued in the period January 1, 1970, to September 9, 1971. In addition to deciding the matters in controversy among the parties, the Board will, in accordance with section A.11 of said Appendix D: (a) Determine whether the requirements of section 102(2) (C) and (D) of NEPA and Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50 of the Commission's regulations have been complied with in this proceeding; (b) independently consider the final balance among conflicting factors contained in the record of the proceeding with a view

[1] Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power is granted twenty (20) days to submit clarification.

toward determining the action to be taken; and (c) determine, after weighing the environmental, economic, technical, and other benefits against environmental costs and considering available alternatives, whether the construction permit should be continued, modified, terminated, or appropriately conditioned to protect environmental values.

Depending on the resolution of the issues specified by the Licensing Board, authorization for issuance of the operating license may be granted or denied, or the license may be authorized as appropriately conditioned. An operating license would be issued only after appropriate findings are made by the Director of Regulation on the matters set forth below which are not embraced by the Board's decision (and upon compliance with the applicable provisions of Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50 dealt with above):

1. Whether construction of the facility has been substantially completed in conformity with the construction permit and the application, as amended, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission.

2. Whether the facility will operate in conformity with the application, as amended, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission.

3. Whether there is reasonable assurance: (i) That the activities authorized by the operating license can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the regulations of the Commission.

4. Whether the applicant is technically and financially qualified to engage in the activities authorized by the operating license in accordance with the regulations of the Commission.

5. Whether the applicable provisions of 10 CFR Part 140, "Financial Protection Requirements and Indemnity Agreements," of the Commission's regulations have been satisfied.

6. Whether the issuance of the license will be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

For further details pertinent to the matters under consideration, see the application for the facility operating license docketed October 18, 1972, as amended, and the applicants' Environmental Report dated September 24, 1971, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC, and at the Beaver Area Memorial Library, 100 College Avenue, Beaver, PA 15009. As they become available, the following documents also will be available at the above locations: (1) The safety evaluation prepared by the Directorate of Licensing; (2) the Commission's draft detailed statement on environmental considerations pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix D; (3) the Commission's final detailed statement on environmental considerations; (4) the report of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards on the application for facility operating license; (5) the proposed facility operating license; and (6) the proposed technical specifications, which will be attached to the proposed facility operating license. To the extent of supply, copies of items (1), (3), (4), and (5) will be furnished upon request to Deputy Director for Reactor Projects, Directorate of Licensing, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545.

Any person who wishes to make an oral or written statement in this proceeding but who has not filed a petition for leave to intervene as noted above, may request permission to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR § 2.715 of the Commission's rules of practice. Limited appearances will be permitted at the time of the hearing in the discretion of the Licensing Board, within such limits and on such conditions as may be fixed by it. Persons desiring to make a limited appearance are requested to inform the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545, on or before April 9, 1973. A person permitted to make a limited appearance does not become a party, but may state his position and raise questions which he would like to have answered to the extent that the questions are within the scope of the hearing. A member of the public does not have the right to participate unless he has been granted the right to intervene as a party or the right of limited appearance.

An answer to this notice, pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR § 2.705 of the Commission's "rules of practice," must be filed by the parties to this proceeding (other than the regulatory staff) on or before March 28, 1973.

Papers required to be filed in this proceeding may be filed by mail or telegram addressed to the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545, Attention: Chief, Public Proceedings Branch, or may be filed by delivery to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC.

Pending further order of the Licensing Board, parties are required to file pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR § 2.708 of the Commission's "rules of practice," an original and 20 conformed copies of each such paper with the Commission.

Issued at Washington, D.C., this 2d day of March 1973.

THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD,
ELIZABETH S. BOWERS,
Chairman.

[FR Doc.73-4431 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Docket No. 50-219]

JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT CO.

Notice of Hearing on Facility Operating License

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the regulations in Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 50, Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities and Part 2, Rules of Practice, notice is hereby given that a hearing will be held at a time and place to be established in the future by an atomic safety and licensing board, commencing in the vicinity of Toms River, N.J., to consider the application filed by Jersey Central Power & Light Co. for a full-term facility operating license which would authorize the operation of a boiling water reactor (the facility) identified as the Oyster Creek Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, at steady-state power levels up to a maximum of 1,930 thermal megawatts at the applicant's site in Lacey Township, Ocean County, N.J. Construction of the facility was authorized by Provisional Construction Permit No. CPPR-15 issued on December 15, 1964. Provisional Operating License No. DPR-16 was issued on April 9, 1969, and the facility is presently operating under that license.

The hearing will be conducted by an atomic safety and licensing board (licensing board) designated by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, consisting of Dr. Hugh C. Paxton, Dr. Paul W. Purdom, and Robert M. Lazo, chairman. Frederick J. Shon has been designated as a technically qualified alternate, and Joseph F. Tubridy as an alternate qualified in the conduct of administrative proceedings.

A "notice of consideration of issuance of facility operating license and opportunity for hearing" was published by the Commission on November 28, 1972 (37 FR 25190). The notice provided that, on or before April 9, 1973, any person whose interest might be affected by the proceeding might file a petition for leave to intervene with respect to the issuance of a full-term operating license.

A joint petition for leave to intervene was thereafter filed by Sands Point Marina, Inc., Henry J. Kurtz and Mary A. Kurtz, doing business as Oyster Creek Marina, and Charles B. Mallie and Joseph P. DiPaolo, doing business as Briarwood Yacht Basin. A petition for leave to intervene was also filed by Kenneth B. Walton. A memorandum and order of this atomic safety and licensing board dated March 2, 1973, has directed that a public hearing be held, and that the joint petition of Sands Point Marina, Inc. and others be granted and that they be admitted as parties to the proceeding. That memorandum and order denied the petition for leave to intervene filed by Kenneth B. Walton.

A prehearing conference will be held by the board, at a date and place to be set by it, to consider pertinent matters in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice. The date and place of the hearing will be set by the board at or after the prehearing conference. Notices as to the date and places of the prehearing conference and the hearing will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

The facility is subject to the provisions of section A of Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50, which sets forth procedures applicable to review of environmental considerations for production and utilization facilities.

In accordance with paragraph 11 of section A of Appendix D, the atomic safety and licensing board will decide those matters in controversy among the parties and take such other action as may be appropriate. The specific issues to be considered at the hearing will be determined by the licensing board.

A full-term operating license would be issued only after appropriate findings are made by the Director of Regulation on the matters set forth below (and upon compliance with the applicable provisions of Appendix D to 10 CFR Part 50):

1. Whether construction of the facility has been substantially completed in conformity with the construction permit and the application, as amended, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission.

2. Whether the facility will operate in conformity with the application, as amended, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission.

3. Whether there is reasonable assurance: (i) That the activities authorized by the operating license can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the regulations of the Commission.

4. Whether the applicant is technically and financially qualified to engage in the activities authorized by the operating license in accordance with the regulations of the Commission.

5. Whether the applicable provisions of 10 CFR Part 140, "Financial Protection Requirements and Indemnity Agreements," of the Commission's regulations have been satisfied.

6. Whether the issuance of the license will be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

The application for the full-term facility operating license and other documents pertinent to the matters under consideration have been or will be deposited in the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC, and at the Ocean County Library, 15 Hooper Avenue, Toms River, NJ, where they will be available for inspection by members of the public. Copies of the safety evaluation by the Directorate of Licensing, and the proposed facility operating license, when available and to the extent of supply, may be obtained by request to the Deputy Director for Reactor Projects, Directorate of Licensing, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545.

Any person who wishes to make an oral or written statement in this proceeding setting forth his position on the issues specified, but who has not filed either a petition for leave to intervene or a request for a hearing as noted above, may request permission to make a limited appearance pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR § 2.715 of the Commission's rules of practice. Limited appearances will be permitted at the time of the hearing in the discretion of the board, within such limits and on such conditions as may be fixed by the board. A person desiring to make a limited appearance does not become a party, but may state his position and raise questions which he would like to have answered to the extent that the questions are within the scope of the hearing as specified in the issues set out above. A member of the public does not have the right to participate unless he has been granted the right to intervene as a party or the right of limited appearance.

An answer to this notice, pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR § 2.705 of the Commission's rules of practice, shall be filed by each party to the proceeding (other than the regulatory staff) on or before March 28, 1973. Papers required to be filed in this proceeding may be filed by mail or telegram addressed to the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545, Attention: Chief, Public Proceedings Branch, or may be filed by delivery to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC.

Pending further order of the board, parties are required to file, pursuant to 10 CFR § 2.708 of the Commission's rules of practice, an original and 20 copies of each such paper.

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 2d day of March 1973.

THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD,
SIDNEY G. KINGSLEY,
Chairman.

[FR Doc.73-4435 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

MATERIALS AND PLANT PROTECTION GUIDES

Notice of Issuance and Availability

The Atomic Energy Commision has issued three new guides, Regulatory Guide 5.3, "Statistical Terminology and Notation for Special Nuclear Materials Control and Accountability," Regulatory Guide 5.4, "Standard Analytical Methods for the Measurement of Uranium Tetrafluoride (UF_4) and Uranium Hexafluoride (UF_6)," and Regulatory Guide 5.5, "Standard Methods for Chemical, Mass Spectrometric, and Spectrochemical Analysis of Nuclear-Grade Uranium Dioxide Powders and Pellets," in its regulatory guide series. This series has been developed to describe and to make available to the public methods acceptable to the AEC regulatory staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations and, in some cases, to delineate techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents and to provide guidance to applicants concerning certain information needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

The new guides are in Division 5, "Materials and Plant Protection Guides," of the regulatory guide series. Regulatory Guide 5.3 deals with acceptable statistical terminology and notation applicable to nuclear material control and acountability systems. Regulatory Guide 5.4 identifies acceptable methods for subsampling and chemical and isotopic analysis of uranium tetrafluoride and hexafluoride which an applicant may specify as part of his procedures for accounting for special nuclear material. Regulatory Guide 5.5 identifies acceptable methods for chemical, isotopic, and impurity analysis which an applicant may specify as part of his procedures for accounting for special nuclear material.

Comments and suggestions for improvements in the guides are encouraged and should be sent to the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545, Attention: Chief, Public Proceedings Staff. Copies of issued guides may be obtained by request to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545, Attention: Director of Regulatory Standards.

Other Division 5 regulatory guides currently being developed include the following:

Nuclear Material Control Systems and Procedures for Conversion Facilities.
Standard Methods for Chemical, Mass Spectrometric and Spectrochemical Analysis of Nuclear Grade Plutonium Dioxide Powders and Pellets.
Guide for the Conduct of Nuclear Material Inventories.
Guide for Personnel Access Control.
Specification for Ge(Li) Detection and Data Acquisition Systems for Material Protection Measurements.
Methods for the Analytical Chemical Analysis of Nuclear-Grade Mixed Oxides ($(U, Pu)O_2$).

(5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Bethesda, Md., this 1st day of March 1973.

For the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

LESTER ROGERS,
Director of Regulatory Standards.

[FR Doc.73-4432 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[License No. 01-15494-01E]

SCI SYSTEMS, INC.

Notice of Issuance of Byproduct Material License

Please take notice that the Atomic Energy Commission has, pursuant to § 32.26 of 10 CFR Part 32, issued License No. 01-15494-01E to SCI Systems, Inc., 8620 South Memorial Parkway, Huntsville, AL 35802, which authorizes the distribution of Model 50C14 fire detectors to persons exempt from the requirements for a license pursuant to § 30.20 of 10 CFR Part 30.

1. The devices are designed to detect incipient fires by responding to the products of combustion produced by thermal decomposition of building materials or contents prior to the appearance of visible smoke, flame, or appreciable heat. The sensitive element of the detector is an ionization chamber in which air flowing into the chamber is made conductive by beta particles emitted by carbon 14.

2. The byproduct material incorporated in the detector is carbon in a polystyrene form contained in sources manufactured by International Chemical

and Nuclear Corp. (Model SCI–1). The nominal activity contained in the unit is 50 microcuries but the maximum activity is 56 microcuries.

3. Each exempt unit will have a label identifying the manufacturer (SCI Systems, Inc.) and the byproduct material (carbon 14) contained in the unit and recommending that the unit be returned to SCI Systems, Inc., for disposal.

A copy of the license and a safety evaluation containing additional information, prepared by the Directorate of Licensing, are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 1717 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Dated at Bethesda, Md., March 1, 1973.

For the Atomic Energy Commission.

S. H. SMILEY,
Deputy Director for Fuels and Materials, Directorate of Licensing.

[FR Doc.73–4433 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

[Docket No. 50–271]

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORP.

Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License

Pursuant to an initial decision of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, issued February 27, 1973, notice is hereby given that the Atomic Energy Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 5 to Facility Operating License No. DPR–28 to Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. (Vermont Yankee) which authorizes full-term operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (the facility) at steady-state power levels not to exceed 1,593 megawatts thermal in accordance with the technical specifications attached as appendixes A and B thereto. The facility is a single cycle, forced circulation, boiling water reactor located at the licensee's site in Windham County, Vt.

On March 21, 1972, the Commission issued Facility Operating License No. DPR–28 pursuant to an initial decision of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, issued March 14, 1972, which authorized fuel loading and low-power testing at power levels not to exceed 15.9 megawatts thermal (1 percent of the rated power level of the facility). Amendment No. 1, issued April 21, 1972, authorized receipt, possession, and use of additional source and special nuclear materials. Amendment No. 2, issued September 7, 1972, authorized temporary operation at thermal power levels not to exceed 318.6 (20 percent of the facility's rated power). Amendment No. 3, issued on October 12, 1972, authorized temporary operation of the facility at steady-state power levels not to exceed 1,593 megawatts thermal. Amendment No. 4, issued on January 8, 1973, authorized receipt, possession, and use of up to 3,300 kilograms of U–235 and 16 grams of plutonium in connection with the operation of the facility.

The Commission's regulatory staff has inspected the facility and has determined that, for operation as authorized by the amended license, the facility has been constructed in accordance with the application, as amended, the provisions of Provisional Construction Permit No. CPPR–36, as amended, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations. The licensee has submitted proof of financial protection in satisfaction of the requirements of 10 CFR Part 140.

The Board has concluded that the facility will operate in conformity with the application, as amended, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission and will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public and that Vermont Yankee is technically and financially qualified to engage in the activities authorized by the amended license. The Board, after weighing the environmental, economic, technical, and other benefits of the facility against environmental costs and considering available alternatives, concluded that issuance of the amended operating license (subject to the conditions for protection of the environment set forth therein) is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix D, of the Commission's regulations and that all applicable requirements of said Appendix D have been satisfied.

The license as amended is effective as of the date of issuance and shall expire at midnight on December 11, 2007.

Copies of (1) the initial decision, dated February 27, 1973; (2) Amendment No. 5 to Facility Operating License No. DPR–28 and the Technical Specifications attached as Appendixes A and B thereto; (3) the safety evaluation for the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, dated June 1, 1971, and Supplements 1 and 2, thereto, dated July 7, 1971, and July 19, 1971, respectively, and the report of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, dated March 9, 1971, and attached to the safety evaluation as Appendix A; (4) draft detailed statement on the environmental considerations related to the proposed issuance of an operating license to the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, dated April 7, 1972; and (5) the final environmental statement, dated July 1972, are available for public inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC and at the Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, VT. Copies of items (2), (3), and (5) may be obtained upon request addressed to the Atomic Energy Commission, Washington D.C. 20545, Attention: Deputy Director for Reactor Projects, Directorate of Licensing.

Dated at Bethesda, Md., this 28th day of February 1972.

For the Atomic Energy Commission.

WALTER R. BUTLER,
Chief, Boiling Water Reactors Branch 1, Directorate of Licensing.

[FR Doc.73–4434 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

CERTAIN MANMADE FIBER TEXTILE PRODUCTS PRODUCED OR MANUFACTURED IN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Entry or Withdrawal From Warehouse for Consumption

On October 4, 1972, there was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (37 FR 20883) a letter dated September 28, 1972, from the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements, to the Commissioner of Customs implementing those provisions of the bilateral Wool and Manmade Fiber Textile Agreement of January 4, 1972, between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Korea which establish specific export limitations on wool and manmade fiber textile products in certain categories, including manmade fiber textile Categories 210, 213, 219, 224, and part of 222 (only T.S.U.S.A. Nos. 380.0428 and 380.8165), and 240; Categories 200–205 and 241–243, as a group; and in Categories 214–240, as a group; produced or manufactured in the Republic of Korea and exported to the United States during the 12-month period beginning October 1, 1972, and extending through September 30, 1973. The levels of restraint applicable to Categories 210, 224, and part of 222 (only T.S.U.S.A. Nos. 380.0428 and 380.8165), and 240 were amended by directive of February 9, 1973 (38 FR 4015).

On March 2, 1973, notes were exchanged between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Korea further amending the levels of restraint applicable to manmade fiber textile products in Categories 210, 224, and part of 222 (only T.S.U.S.A. Nos. 380.0428 and 380.8165), and 240 and also amending the levels of restraint applicable to Categories 200–205 and 241–243, as a group; Categories 214–240, as a group; and individual Categories 213 and 219.

Accordingly, there is published below a letter of March 7, 1973, from the Chairman of the Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements to the Commissioner of Customs further amending the directive of September 28, 1972, to adjust the levels of restraint applicable to imports of manmade fiber textile products in Categories 200–205 and 241–243, as a group; Categories 214–240, as a group; and individual Categories 210, 213, 219, 224, and part of 222 (only T.S.U.S.A. Nos. 280.0428 and 280.8165), and 240 produced or manufactured in the Republic of Korea.

ARTHUR GAREL,
Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C. 20229.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: This directive further amends but does not cancel the directive issued to you on September 28, 1972, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements, regarding imports into the United States of wool and manmade fiber textile products in certain

categories, produced or manufactured in the Republic of Korea. The directive of September 28, 1972, was previously amended on February 7, 1973.

Under the provisions of the bilateral Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textile Agreements of January 4, 1972, between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Korea and in accordance with Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, you are directed to amend, effective as soon as possible, the levels of restraint established in the aforesaid directive of September 28, 1972, as amended, for manmade fiber textile products in Categories 200–205 and 241–243, as a group; Categories 214–240, as a group; and individual Categories 210, 213, 219, 224, and part of 222 (only T.S.U.S.A. Nos. 380.0428 and 380.8165), and 240, produced or manufactured in the Republic of Korea, as set forth below:

Category	Amended 12-month levels of Restraint [1]
200–205 and 241–243 (Group III).	31,498,882 square yards equivalent.
214–240 (Group I).	326,299,518 square yards equivalent.
210	156,521 square yards.
213	134,616 pounds.
219	3,634,293 dozen.
224 and part 222 (only T.S.U.S.A. Nos. 380.0428 and 380.8165).	1,670,226 pounds (of which not more than 673,077 pounds may be exported in T.S.U.S.A. No. 380.8160 during the period Mar. 1, 1973–Sept. 30, 1973).
240	217,687 pounds.

[1] The levels shown for Categories 210, 224, and part of 222 (only T.S.U.S.A. Nos. 380.0428 and 380.8165), and 240 have been adjusted to reflect entries through February 23, 1973. The levels for Categories 200–205 and 241–243, as a group; Categories 214–240, as a group; and individual Categories 213 and 219 have not been adjusted to reflect any entries on or after Oct. 1, 1972.

The actions taken with respect to the Government of the Republic of Korea and with respect to imports of manmade fiber textile products from the Republic of Korea have been determined by the Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements to involve foreign affairs functions of the United States. Therefore, the directions to the Commissioner of Customs, being necessary to the implementation of such actions, fall within the foreign affairs exception to the rule-making provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553. This letter will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR GAREL,
Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc.73–4642 Filed 3–7–73;10:29 am]

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

[H.C. 150]

SOUTHWESTERN GROUP INVESTORS, INC.

Notice of Receipt of Application for Permission To Acquire Control of Mutual Savings and Loan Association

MARCH 5, 1973.

Notice is hereby given that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has received an application from the Southwestern Group Investors, Inc., Houston, Tex., a multiple savings and loan holding company, for approval of acquisition of control of the Mutual Savings and Loan Association, Fort Worth, Tex., under the provisions of section 408(e) of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1730a(e)), and § 584.4 of the regulations for savings and loan holding companies, said acquisition to be effected by the purchase for cash of all the outstanding shares of Mutual Savings and Loan Association by the applicant. Comments on the proposed acquisition should be submitted to the Director, Office of Examinations and Supervision, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C. 20552, on or before April 9, 1973.

[SEAL] GRENVILLE L. MILLARD, JR.,
Assistant Secretary, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

[FR Doc.73–4495 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket No. CI73–558]

HURLEY PETROLEUM CORP.

Notice of Application

MARCH 2, 1973.

Take notice that on February 26, 1973, Hurley Petroleum Corp. (Applicant), 400 Petroleum Building, Shreveport, La. 71101, filed in Docket No. CI73–558 an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the sale for resale and delivery of natural gas in interstate commerce to Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. from the Carthage Field, Panola County, Tex., all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant states that it commenced the sale of natural gas on February 19, 1973, within the contemplation of § 157.29 of the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.29) and that it proposes to continue said sale for 1 year from the end of the 60-day emergency period within the contemplation of § 2.70 of the Commission's general policy and interpretations (18 CFR 2.70). Applicant proposes to sell up to 1,000 Mcf of gas per day at 45 cents per Mcf at 14.65 p.s.i.a.

It appears reasonable and consistent with the public interest in this case to prescribe a period shorter than 15 days for the filing of protests and petitions to intervene. Therefore, any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before March 19, 1973, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73–4562 Filed 3–7–73;8:45 am]

[Docket No. CI73–557]

MOBIL OIL CORP.

Notice of Application

MARCH 1, 1973.

Take notice that on February 26, 1973, Mobil Oil Corp. (Applicant), 800 3 Greenway Plaza East, Houston, TX 77046, filed in Docket No. CI73–557 an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the sale for resale and delivery of natural gas in interstate commerce to Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America from the Sand Dunes Field Area, Eddy County, N. Mex., all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant states that it intends to commence the sale of natural gas within the contemplation of § 157.29 of the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.29) and that it proposes to continue said sale for 2 years from the end of the 60-day emergency period within the contemplation of § 2.70 of the Commission's general policy and interpretations (18 CFR 2.70). Applicant proposes to sell up to 7,000 Mcf of gas per day at 35 cents per million B.t.u.

It appears reasonable and consistent with the public interest in this case to prescribe a period shorter than 15 days for the filing of protests and petitions to intervene. Therefore, any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before March 19, 1973, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10),

All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by section 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4276 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

NATIONAL POWER SURVEY; TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF ENERGY

Notice of Meeting and Agenda

Meeting to be held at the Federal Power Commission Offices, 441 G Street NW., Washington, DC, March 14, 1973, 9:30 a.m., Hearing Room C.

1. Meeting called to order by FPC Representative.
2. Objectives and purposes of the meeting.
A. Introductory remarks by Dr. Bruce Netschert, Chairman.
B. Task Force on Technical Aspects: Presentation of preliminary report and discussion.
C. Task Force on Standards and Practices: Presentation of preliminary report and discussion.
D. Task Force on Environmental Aspects: Presentation of preliminary report and discussion.
3. Adjournment.

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Committee—which statements, if in written form, may be filed before or after the meeting, or, if oral, at the time and in the manner permitted by the Committee.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4464 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

NATIONAL POWER SURVEY; TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF ENERGY, TASK FORCE ON TECHNICAL ASPECTS

Notice of Meeting and Agenda

Meeting to be held at the Federal Power Commission Offices, 441 G Street NW., Washington, DC, March 14, 1973, 1:30 p.m., Hearing Room C.

1. Meeting called to order by FPC Staff Representative.
2. Objectives and purposes of the meeting.
A. Introductory remarks by Dr. David C. White, Chairman.
B. Review of outlines of assigned position papers.
C. Summary of progress by Chairman.
3. Adjournment.

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Committee—which statements, if in written form, may be filed before or after the meeting, or, if oral, at the time and in the manner permitted by the Committee.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4466 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

NATIONAL POWER SURVEY; TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POWER SUPPLY, TASK FORCE ON FORECAST REVIEW

Notice of Meeting and Agenda

Meeting to be held at the Federal Power Commission Offices, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, DC, March 14, 1973, 9 a.m., Room 800.

1. Meeting called to order by FPC Coordinating Representative.
2. Objectives and purposes of meeting.
A. Correction and additions to minutes of previous meeting.
B. Discuss econometric study prepared by Ms. Kline.
C. Discuss projections of regional council data and summary of such data.
D. Discuss choice of central tendency of growth rates for energy, capacity, nuclear as fraction of total capacity.
E. Preparation for interim report.
F. Other business.
G. Set date for next meeting.
3. Adjournment.

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Committee—which statements, if in written form, may be filed before or after the meeting, or, if oral, at the time and in the manner permitted by the Committee.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4467 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

NATIONAL POWER SURVEY; TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FUELS, TASK FORCE ON ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS

Notice of Meeting and Agenda

Meeting to be held at the Federal Power Commission Offices, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, DC, March 15, 1973, 9:30 a.m., Room 785.

1. Meeting called to order by FPC Coordinating Representative.
2. Objectives and purposes of meeting.
A. Approval of minutes of meeting, February 15, 1973.
B. Report by Chairman Padgett on assumptions and procedures to be taken by the Committee.
C. Assignment of topics to be covered in the draft reports to the task forces.
D. Other business.
E. Time of next meeting.
3. Adjournment.

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Committee—which statements, if in written form, may be filed before or after the meeting, or, if oral, at the time and in the manner permitted by the Committee.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4468 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

NATIONAL POWER SURVEY, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Notice of Meeting

Meeting to be held at the Federal Power Commission Offices, 441 G Street NW., Washington, DC, March 14, 1973, 9:30 a.m., e.s.t., Room 2043.

1. Meeting called to order by FPC Coordinating Representative.
2. Objectives and purposes of meeting.
A. Approval of minutes of November 21, 1972 meeting.
B. Discussion of Revised Assumptions and Guidelines for the National Power Survey.
C. Report of Task Force on Future Financial Requirements—Dr. Glover.
D. Further development of Initial Lines of Inquiry.
E. Reports on assignments:
(1) Federal income taxes—Mr. Corey.
(2) Effect of Federal budgetary considerations on Federal power construction needs—Mr. Bodman.
(3) Special financing problems of non-Federal publicly owned systems—Mr. Fry.
(4) Research and development financing and diversification—vertical, horizontal—holding company act problems—Mr. Litke.
(5) Foreign trade policy considerations—Mr. Abbadessa.
(6) Capital structure and interest coverage—Mr. Childs.
(7) Sulfur emissions tax—Mr. O'Connor.
(8) Special financing problems of the REA borrowers—Mr. Askegaard.

F. Additional assignments of study projects.

G. Time schedule for completion of reports.

H. Other business.

I. Dates for future meetings.

3. Adjournment.

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Committee—which statements, if in written form, may be filed before or after the meeting, or, if oral, at the time and in the manner permitted by the Committee.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4463 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

NATIONAL POWER SURVEY, TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF ENERGY, TASK FORCE ON PRACTICES AND STANDARDS

Notice and Agenda for Meeting

Meeting to be held at the Federal Power Commission Offices, 441 G Street NW, Washington, DC, 1:30 p.m., March 14, 1973, room 4535.

1. Meeting called to order by FPC staff Representative.

2. Objectives and purposes of the meeting.

A. Introductory remarks by Chairman Charles A. Berg.

B. Review of outline for the report.

C. Progress on development of the report.

D. Plans for review of the report.

E. Date of next meeting.

3. Adjournment (about 4:30 p.m.).

This meeting is open to the public. Any interested person may attend, appear before, or file statements with the Committee—which statements, if in written form, may be filed before or after the meeting, or, if oral, at the time and in the manner permitted by the Committee.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4465 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Docket No. CI73-559]

PENNZOIL PRODUCING CO.

Notice of Application

MARCH 1, 1973.

Take notice that on February 23, 1973, Pennzoil Co. (Applicant), 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002, filed in Docket No. CI73-559 an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the sale for resale and delivery of natural gas in interstate commerce to United Gas Pipe Line Co., from the Humphries Field, East Gibson Area, Terrebonne Parish, La., all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant is presently selling natural gas from the subject properties pursuant to a temporary certificate issued March 24, 1972, in Docket No. CI72-490 at 35 cents per Mcf at 15.025 p.s.i.a. Applicant proposes to continue said sale for 1 year from the expiration of the temporary authorization, March 26, 1973, at 45 cents per Mcf at 15.025 p.s.i.a., within the contemplation of § 2.70 of the Commission's general policy and interpretations (18 CFR 2.70). The estimated monthly sales volume is 280,000 Mcf of gas.

It appears reasonable and consistent with the public interest in this case to prescribe a period shorter than 15 days for the filing of protests and petitions to intervene. Therefore, any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before March 19, 1973, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4277 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

BARNETT BANKS OF FLORIDA, INC.

Proposed Acquisition of Barnett Winston Mortgage Co.

Barnett Banks of Florida, Inc., Jacksonville, Fla., has applied, pursuant to section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) and § 225.4(b)(2) of the Board's Regulation Y, for permission to retain indirect ownership of voting shares of Barnett Winston Mortgage Co. (formerly known as Barnett Mortgage Co.), Winter Park, Fla., through its 100-percent-owned subsidiary, Barnett Winston Co., Jacksonville, Fla. Notice of the application was published in the following newspapers:

Orlando Evening Star...	Orlando, Fla....	Dec. 13, 1972
Daytona Beach Evening News.	Daytona Beach, Fla.	Dec. 12, 1972
The Ledger.....	Lakeland, Fla..	Dec. 13, 1972
The Tampa Tribune...	Tampa, Fla.....	Dec. 11, 1972
St. Petersburg Times...	St. Petersburg, Fla.	Dec. 13, 1972
The Melbourne Times..	Brevard County, Fla.	Dec. 13, 1972

Applicant states that the proposed subsidiary would continue the activities of a mortgage company by originating as principal the following types of mortgage loans: (1) Insured or guaranteed permanent single-family residential mortgage loans for resale to unaffiliated institutional mortgage investors; (2) loans for the construction of single-family residential properties where FHA insurance or a VA guaranty commitment has been secured; and (3) land acquisition and development loans for development of single-family residential projects where FHA insurance or a VA guaranty commitment has been secured. Applicant also states that it would service permanent single-family residential mortgage loans for unaffiliated institutional mortgage investors. The proposed subsidiary owns 100 percent of Exchange Properties, Inc., a company which holds title to real property acquired upon foreclosure of mortgage loans. Applicant indicates that the activities described above have been specified by the Board in § 225.4(a) (1) and (3) of Regulation Y as permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of § 225.4(b).

Interested persons may express their views on the question whether consummation of the proposal can "reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices." Any request for a hearing on this question should be accompanied by a statement summarizing the evidence the person requesting the hearing proposes to submit or to elicit at the hearing and a statement of the reasons why this matter should not be resolved without a hearing.

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.

Any views or requests for hearing should be submitted in writing and received by the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, not later than March 29, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 1, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4423 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CENTRAN BANCSHARES CORP.

Proposed Acquisition of Peoples Investment Co.

Centran Bancshares Corp., Washington, D.C., has applied, pursuant to section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) and § 225.4(b)(2) of the Board's Regulation Y, for permission to acquire all of the voting shares of Peoples Investment Co., Louisville, Ky. Notice of the application was published on January 17, 1973, in the Nashville Banner, a newspaper circulated in Nashville, Tenn.; on January 18, 1973, in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, a newspaper circulated in Cincinnati, Ohio; on January 18, 1973, in the Kentucky Post and Times-Star, a newspaper circulated in Covington, Ky.; and on January 19, 1973, in the Courier-Journal, a newspaper circulated in Louisville, Ky.

Applicant states that the proposed subsidiary would engage in the activities of making consumer finance loans and purchasing installment sales contracts, such as would be performed by a small loan company or an industrial loan company in the manner authorized by State law so long as such an industrial loan company does not both accept demand deposits and make commercial loans; and leasing of automobiles and industrial equipment. Such activities have been specified by the Board in § 225.4(a) of Regulation Y as permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of § 225.4(b). Applicant indicates that through Fincastle Insurance Agency, Inc., Louisville, Ky., the proposed subsidiary engages in the sale of credit life, health, and accident insurance and mobile and vehicular damage insurance, at the borrowers' option, in connection with loans and discounts originating from the affiliated loans companies of Peoples Investment Co. Under certain circumstances specified in the Board's interpretation (12 CFR 225.138) of § 225.4(a)(9) of Regulation Y, such activities may be permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of § 225.4(b).

Interested persons may express their views on the question whether consummation of the proposal can reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices. Any request for a hearing on this question should be accompanied by a statement summarizing the evidence the person requesting the hearing proposes to submit or to elicit at the hearing and a statement of the reasons why this matter should not be resolved without a hearing.

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Any views or requests for hearing should be submitted in writing and received by the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, not later than March 28, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 1, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4428 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CHASE MANHATTAN CORP.

Acquisition of Bank

The Chase Manhattan Corp., New York, N.Y., has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of Chase Manhattan Bank of Eastern New York (National Association), Albany, N.Y., a proposed new bank. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The Chase Manhattan Corp. is also engaged in the following nonbank activities: Mortgage servicing and servicing the Shapiro Factors Division of the Chase Manhattan Bank. In addition to the factors considered under section 3 of the Act (banking factors), the Board will consider the proposal in light of the company's nonbanking activities and the provisions and prohibitions in section 4 of the act (12 U.S.C. 1843).

The application may be inspected at the office of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit his views in writing to the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, to be received not later than March 28, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, February 28, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4421 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

DORACO, INC.

Order Approving Retention of Bank

Doraco, Inc., Doraville, Ga., a bank holding company within the meaning of the Bank Holding Company Act, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to retain 58.2 percent of the voting shares of The Northeast Commercial Bank, Doraville, Ga. (Bank).

Notice of the application, affording opportunity for interested persons to submit comments and views, has been given in accordance with section 3(b) of the act. The time for filing comments and views has expired, and the Board has considered the application and all comments received in light of the factors set forth in section 3(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Since the inception of Bank ($3.4 million in deposits) in 1969, applicant has owned 5,780 shares, or 24.08 percent of the Bank's stock, with an option to purchase additional shares. Beginning June 28, 1972, applicant exercised its option, purchasing 13,975 additional shares to bring its total ownership of shares in Bank to 19,755 or 82 percent. The option was apparently exercised in the belief that applicant already controlled Bank, and that accordingly, prior Board approval was not required under section 3(a) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. section 1842(a)). Upon being informed by the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta that the Board's approval of the transaction was required, applicant submitted the subject application.

Applicant's retention of the additional shares would not significantly affect competition between Bank and any competing institution, nor diminish the ability of Bank to meet the convenience and needs of its community. The financial and managerial resources of applicant and Bank are satisfactory, and future prospects for both appear favorable. It is the Board's judgment that the proposed transaction is in the public interest and that the application should be approved.

On the basis of the record, the application is approved for the reasons summarized above.

By order of the Board of Governors,[1] effective March 1, 1973.

[SEAL] TYNAN SMITH,
Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4424 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

FIRST AT ORLANDO CORP.

Order Approving Acquisition of Banks

First at Orlando Corp., Orlando, Fla., a bank holding company within the meaning of the Bank Holding Company Act, has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire 90 percent or more of the voting shares of Guaranty Bank of Miami (Guaranty Bank) and of West Dade Bank, both of Miami, Fla.

Notice of the applications, affording opportunity for interested persons to submit comments and views, has been given in accordance with section 3(b) of the Act. The time for filing comments and views has expired, and the Board has considered the applications and all comments received in light of the factors set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Applicant, the third largest banking organization in Florida, controls 32 banks with aggregate deposits of $1.1 billion, representing approximately 6.6 percent of the total deposits of commercial banks

[1] Voting for this action: Vice Chairman Robertson and Governors Mitchell, Daane, Brimmer, Sheehan, and Bucher. Absent and not voting: Chairman Burns.

in Florida. (All banking data are as of June 30, 1972, and reflect bank holding company acquisitions approved through December 31, 1972.) Applicant is the seventh largest banking organization in the Greater Miami banking market (approximated by Dade County and the communities of Dania, Davie, Hallandale, and Hollywood in the southern portion of Broward County) with four subsidiary banks holding 3.4 percent of total deposits in commercial banks in that market. Consummation of the proposal herein would increase insignificantly applicant's share of commercial bank deposits in the Greater Miami area and its ranking among banking organizations in that market would remain unchanged.

Guaranty Bank ($23.5 million of deposits), with approximately 0.6 percent of the total deposits in commercial banks in the market, ranks 66th in terms of deposits among the 93 commercial banks located in the Greater Miami market. Guaranty Bank is located approximately 8 miles southwest of applicant's closest subsidiary bank; however, neither that bank nor any of applicant's other subsidiaries compete with Guaranty Bank to any significant extent. Moreover, in the light of the size of Guaranty Bank, the large number of competing banks in the area, and the traffic patterns and congestion in the area, it appears unlikely that any significant completition between Guaranty Bank and any of applicant's subsidiary banks would develop in the future. The same conclusions apply with respect to the elimination of significant existing competition and to the development of future competition between applicant's subsidiaries and the West Dade Bank, which is located 3 miles west of Guaranty Bank.

West Dade Bank was organized in 1971 by officials of Guaranty Bank, and one or more officers or directors of Guaranty Bank have served on West Dade Bank's board of directors since it began operations in October 1972. At the present time, there exists a significant degree of common stock ownership among shareholders of both banks; and, although the offices of Guaranty Bank and West Dade Bank are separated by a distance of only 3 miles, the banks do not appear to compete with each other nor are they likely to do so in the future in view of the close affiliate relationship existing between the two banks.

On the record before it, the Board concludes that consummation of applicant's proposal would not result in a monopoly nor be in furtherance of any combination, conspiracy, or attempt to monopolize the business of banking, nor have any significant anticompetitive effect, in any area of the State of Florida.

The financial condition and managerial resources of applicant and of its subsidiaries appear satisfactory and future prospects of each seem favorable, particularly in view of applicant's plans to improve the capital positions of certain of its subsidiary banks from the proceeds of a public offering of sinking fund debentures. The same conclusion seems applicable to the financial condition and managerial resources of Guaranty Bank and West Dade Bank. However, affiliation with applicant would provide Guaranty Bank and West Dade Bank with a ready source for additional capital and managerial resources. Therefore, considerations relating to the banking factors and some weight toward approval of the applications.

In connection with the West Dade Bank, a newly chartered bank, the payment of a large premium raises the question whether the charter of the bank was originally sought by its organizers for speculative purposes, rather than for legitimate banking purposes. In a similar case, the Board stated:

> In considering the public interest, the Board gives weight to a chartering authority being able to consider all of the relevant facts surrounding a proposal to establish a new bank including the probability that the ownership and management of a new bank will remain stable for a reasonable period of time.[1]

Although West Dade Bank opened for business on October 25, 1972, its organizers, the management of Guaranty Bank, originally applied to the State authorities for a charter in 1965; the application was denied because of the chartering authority's opinion that the area could not support an additional bank. The organizers filed a second application for a charter at the same location in August 1970; the application was granted in June 1971. It was not until March 1972, that the organizers approached applicant concerning the sale of the two banks. Based on this chronology and the facts of record, the Board concludes that the evidence does not indicate that the organizers of West Dade Bank secured the charter of the bank for the speculative purpose of selling it quickly for a profit.

Although the banking needs of residents of the Greater Miami area are being served adequately by existing institutions, applicant proposes to provide managerial and technical assistance to Guaranty Bank and West Dade Bank in order to enhance the competitive abilities of each of the banks. Considerations relating to the convenience and needs of the communities served by the two banks are regarded as consistent with approval of the applications.

It is the Board's judgment that the proposed acquisitions would be in the public interest and that the applications should be approved.

On the basis of the record, the applications are approved for the reasons summarized above. The transactions shall not be consummated (a) before the 30th calendar day following the effective date of this order or (b) later than 3 months after the effective date of this order, unless such period is extended for good cause by the Board, or by the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta pursuant to delegated authority.

By order of the Board of Governors,[2] effective February 27, 1973.

[SEAL] TYNAN SMITH,
Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4426 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[1] See statement accompanying order of Jan. 6, 1972, denying application for acquisition of shares of Bank of Jacomo, Blue Springs, Mo., by United Missouri Bancshares, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., 1972 Federal Reserve Bulletin 155 (February 1972).

[2] Voting for this action: Vice Chairman Robertson and Governors Mitchell, Daane, Brimmer, Sheehan, and Bucher. Absent and not voting: Chairman Burns.

FIRST PENNSYLVANIA CORP.

Proposed Acquisition of Continental Finance Corp. of America

First Pennsylvania Corp., Philadelphia, Pa., has applied, pursuant to section 4 (c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) and § 225.4 (b)(2) of the Board's Regulation Y, for permission to acquire voting shares of Continental Finance Corporation of America, Aurora, Colo., and thereby to indirectly acquire shares of its 17 subsidiaries which do business under the names CIB Co., East Continental Industrial Bank, Alliance Finance Company of California, Continental Finance Corporation of Aurora, or variations of the foregoing. Notice of the application was published on February 14, 1973, in the Denver Post, a newspaper circulated throughout the State of Colorado and in the Los Angeles Times, a newspaper circulated in Los Angeles County, Calif.

Applicant states that the proposed subsidiary would engage in the activities of (1) Operating industrial banks, in the manner authorized by Colorado law, that receive time and savings deposits and make loans to individuals, (2) the making of direct consumer loans to individuals on a secured or unsecured basis, and (3) the purchase of sales finance paper from retail dealers. Such activities have been specified by the Board in § 225.4(a) of Regulation Y as permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of § 225.4(b). In addition, Applicant states that the proposed subsidiary would engage in the activity of (4) selling to its debtors credit life and credit health and accident insurance, as well as property damage, fire, and extended coverage insurance to those debtors. Applicant indicates that this insurance is sold in connection with extensions of credit. Under certain circumstances specified in the Board's interpretation (12 CFR 225.138) of § 225.4(a)(9) of Regulation Y, such activity may be permissible for bank holding companies, subject to Board approval of individual proposals in accordance with the procedures of § 225.4(b).

Interested persons may express their views on the question whether consummation of the proposal can reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse

effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices. Any request for a hearing on this question should be accompanied by a statement summarizing the evidence the person requesting the hearing proposes to submit or to elicit at the hearing and a statement of the reasons why this matter should not be resolved without a hearing.

The application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

Any views or requests for hearing should be submitted in writing and received by the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, not later than March 28, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 1, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4430 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

GLOBE CORP.

Acquisition of Bank

Globe Corp., Scottsdale, Ariz., has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire 28.87 percent of the voting shares of the successor by merger to Upper Avenue National Bank of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The application may be inspected at the office of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit his views in writing to the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, to be received not later than March 28, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 1, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4429 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

INDIAN HEAD BANKS, INC.

Acquisition of Bank

Indian Head Banks, Inc., Nashua, N.H., has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire 80 percent of the voting shares of Indian Head National Bank of Concord, Concord, N.H., a proposed new bank. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The application may be inspected at the office of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit his views in writing to the Reserve Bank to be received not later than March 28, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 2, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4425 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

OWENS INVESTMENT CO.

Formation of One-Bank Holding Company

Owens Investment Co., Weeping Water, Nebr., has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(1) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(1)) to become a bank holding company through acquisition of 80 percent or more of the voting shares of Nebraska State Bank, Weeping Water, Nebr. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The application may be inspected at the office of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. Any person wishing to comment on the application should submit his views in writing to the Reserve bank to be received not later than March 26, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 2, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4422 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

TEXAS COMMERCE BANCSHARES, INC.

Acquisition of Banks

Texas Commerce Bancshares, Inc., Houston, Tex., has applied, in two separate applications, for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of Inwood National Bank, Houston, Tex., and Kingwood National Bank, Houston, Tex., both proposed new banks. The factors that are considered in acting on these applications are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

These applications may be inspected at the office of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas. Any person wishing to comment on these applications should submit his views in writing to the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, to be received not later than March 28, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 1, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4427 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

UNION COMMERCE CORP.

Acquisition of Bank

Union Commerce Corp., Washington, D.C., has applied for the Board's approval under section 3(a)(3) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(a)(3)) to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares (less directors' qualifying shares) of The Southern Ohio Bank, Cincinnati, Ohio. The factors that are considered in acting on the application are set forth in section 3(c) of the act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

The application may be inspected at the office of the Board of Governors or at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland. Any person wishing to comment on the application should sumbit his views in writing to the Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, to be received not later than March 29, 1973.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 2, 1973.

[SEAL] MICHAEL A. GREENSPAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc.73-4420 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File 500-1]

AFCOA

Order Suspending Trading

February 20, 1973.

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in the common stock, $0.10 par value, and all other securities of AFCOA, being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, pursuant to section 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, That trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period from 11:30 a.m., e.s.t., on February 20, 1973, through March 1, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4457 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File 500-1]

CONTINENTAL VENDING MACHINE CORP.

Order Suspending Trading

FEBRUARY 28, 1973.

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in the common stock, 10 cents par value, of Continental Vending Machine Corp., and the 6 percent convertible subordinated depentures due September 1, 1976, being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange, is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, Pursuant to section 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities

exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period from March 1, 1973, through March 10, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4454 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File 500-1]

LOGOS DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Order Suspending Trading

MARCH 2, 1973.

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in the common stock, $0.01 par value, and all other securities of Logos Development Corp., being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange, is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, Pursuant to section 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be in effect for the period from March 5, 1973, through March 14, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4450 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File 500-1]

MERIDIAN FAST FOOD SERVICES, INC.

Order Suspending Trading

MARCH 1, 1973.

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in the common stock, $0.01 par value, of Meridian Fast Food Services, Inc., being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange, is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, Pursuant to section 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period from March 2, 1973, through March 11, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4455 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File 500-1]

NOVA EQUITY VENTURES, INC.

Order Suspending Trading

MARCH 2, 1973.

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in the common stock, $0.01 par value, and all other securities of Nova Equity Ventures, Inc., being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange, is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, Pursuant to section 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period from March 4, 1973, through March 13, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4448 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File 500-1]

TOPPER CORP.

Order Suspending Trading

MARCH 2, 1973.

The common stock, $1 par value of Topper Corp. being traded on the American Stock Exchange, pursuant to provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and all other securities of Topper Corp., being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange; and

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in such securities on such exchanges and otherwise than on a national securities exchange is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, Pursuant to sections 19(a)(4) and 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in such securities on the above-mentioned exchange and otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period from March 5, 1973, through March 14, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4452 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File 500-1]

TRIEX INTERNATIONAL CORP.

Order Suspending Trading

MARCH 2, 1973.

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in the common stock, $0.01 par value, of Triex International Corp., being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange, is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, Pursuant to section 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in such securities otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period March 5, 1973, through March 14, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4451 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File 500-1]

U.S. FINANCIAL, INC.

Order Suspending Trading

MARCH 2, 1973.

The common stock, $2.50 par value, of U.S. Financial, Inc., being traded on the New York Stock Exchange, pursuant to provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and all other securities of U.S. Financial, Inc., being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange; and

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in such securities on such exchange and otherwise than on a national securities exchange is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, Pursuant to sections 15(c)(5) and 19(a)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that trading in such securities on the above-mentioned exchange and otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period from March 5, 1973, through March 14, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4453 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[File No. 500-1]

VETCO OFFSHORE INDUSTRIES, INC.

Order Suspending Trading

MARCH 1, 1973.

The common stock Vetco Offshore Industries, Inc., being traded on the American Stock Exchange, pursuant to provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and all other securities of Vetco Offshore Industries, Inc., being traded otherwise than on a national securities exchange; and

It appearing to the Securities and Exchange Commission that the summary suspension of trading in such securities on such exchanges and otherwise than on a national securities exchange is required in the public interest and for the protection of investors;

It is ordered, pursuant to sections 19(a)(4) and 15(c)(5) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, That trading in such securities on the above-mentioned exchange and otherwise than on a national securities exchange be summarily suspended, this order to be effective for the period from 3:25 p.m., e.s.t., on March 1, 1973, through March 6, 1973.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] RONALD F. HUNT, *Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-4449 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Delegation of Authority No. 30, Region VIII, Amdt. 2]

REGIONAL DIRECTOR ET AL.

Delegation of Authority To Conduct Program Activities in Region VIII

Delegation of Authority No. 30, Region VIII (37 FR 17620), as amended (38 FR 2358), is hereby further amended by revising Part IV, Sections A.2.; B.1.a. and B.2.h.(2) and Part VI, Sections A. 1.b and 3. and B. 1., 3., and 4.

* * * * *

PART IV—LOAN ADMINISTRATION (LA) PROGRAM

SECTION A. *Loan administration, servicing, collection, and liquidation authority.*

* * * * *

2. To contract for the services of fee appraisers, engineering, marketing, and feasibility studies, and other required services, in conjunction with loan processing, servicing, and loan liquidation:
(1) Regional Director.
(2) Chief and Assistant Chief, Regional LA Division.
(3) Supervisory Loan Officer, Regional LA Division.
(4) District Director.
(5) Chief, District LA Division.
(6) Branch Manager.

* * * * *

SECTION B. *Loan Administration, servicing, and collection authority.*

1. * * *

a. *Except*—To compromise or sell any primary obligation or other evidence of indebtedness owed to the Agency for a sum less than the total amount due thereon; and to deny liability of the Small Business Administration under the terms of a participation or guaranty agreement, or the assertion of a claim for recovery from a participating bank under any alleged violation of a participation or guaranty agreement; to authorize the liquidation of a loan; and the cancellation of authority to liquidate.
(1) Branch Manager.

2. To approve the following actions:
a. Use of such portions of the cash surrender value of assigned life insurance as are required to pay premiums due on the policy.
b. Release of dividends on assigned life insurance or consent to application of dividends against premiums due or to become due.
c. Minor modifications in the authorizations.
d. Extension of disbursement period on loans partially undisbursed.
e. Extension of initial principal payments.
f. Adjustment of interest payment dates.
g. Release of hazard insurance checks not in excess of $500 and endorsement of such checks on behalf of the Agency where SBA is named as joint loss payee.
h. Release of equipment with or without consideration where the value of equipment being released does not exceed $500.
(1) Concerning all current direct and participation loans and First Mortgage Plan 502 loans:
(1) Loan Officer, Regional LA Division.
(2) Loan Officer, District LA Division.
(2) Concerning all direct and participation loans:
(1) Loan Officer, Branch Office.

* * * * *

PART VI—LEGAL SERVICES

SECTION A. *Authority to conduct litigation activities.*

1. * * *

b. The execution and delivery of contracts of sale or of lease or sublease, quit-claim, bargain and sale of special warranty deeds, bills of sale, leases, subleases, assignments, subordinations, releases (in whole or part) of liens, satisfaction pieces, affidavits, proofs of claim in bankruptcy or other estates, and such other instruments in writing as may be appropriate and necessary to effectuate the foregoing, as to all matters in litigation.

(1) *Except*—To compromise or sell any primary obligation or other evidence of indebtedness owed to the Agency for a sum less than the total amount due thereon; and to deny liability of the Small Business Administration under the terms of a participation or guaranty agreement, or the assertion of a claim for recovery from a participating bank under any alleged violation of a participation or guaranty agreement:
(1) Regional Director.
(2) Regional Counsel.
(3) District Director.
(4) Branch Manager.

(2) *Except*—To compromise or sell any primary obligation or other evidence of indebtedness owed to the Agency for a sum less than the total amount due thereon; to deny liability of the Small Business Administration under the terms of a participation or guaranty agreement, or the assertion of a claim for recovery from a participating bank under any alleged violation of a participation or guaranty agreement; to authorize the liquidation of a loan; and the cancellation of authority to liquidate:
(1) District Counsel.
(2) Branch Counsel.

* * * * *

3. To take all necessary action in liquidating Economic Development Administration (EDA) loans having litigative aspects, when and as authorized by EDA:
(1) Regional Director.
(2) Regional Counsel.
(3) Regional Attorneys.
(4) District Director.
(5) District Counsel.
(6) District Attorneys.
(7) Branch Counsel.

SEC. *B. Loan closing authority.*

1. To close and disburse approved SBA loans and rehabilitation loans for Department of Housing and Urban Development:
(1) Regional Director.
(2) Regional Counsel.
(3) Regional Attorneys.
(4) District Director.
(5) District Counsel.
(6) District Attorneys.
(7) Branch Counsel.

* * * * *

3. To close approved EDA loans, as authorized:
(1) Regional Director.
(2) Regional Counsel.
(3) Regional Attorneys.
(4) District Director.
(5) District Counsel.
(6) District Attorneys.
(7) Branch Counsel.

4. To approve, when requested, in advance of disbursements, conformed copies of notes and other closing documents; and certify to the participating bank that such documents are in compliance with the participating authorization:
(1) Regional Director.
(2) Regional Counsel.
(3) Regional Attorneys.
(4) District Director.
(5) District Counsel.
(6) District Attorneys.
(7) Branch Counsel.

* * * * *

Effective date: September 28, 1972.

ROBERT G. SHERWOOD,
Regional Director, Region VIII.

[FR Doc.73-4462 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

Issuance of Agency Procedures for Compliance With Federal Environmental Statutes

Notice is hereby given of the publication of proposed procedures of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) for compliance with Federal environmental statutes, in accordance with the requirements of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)), and section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857).

These procedures, when established, will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER and in the ACDA Manual. The proposed procedures are as follows:

1. *General.* Attention is called to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)); section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857); Executive Order 11514 of March 5, 1970; and the Guidelines for Federal Agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) issued by the CEQ April 23, 1971 (36 FR 7724), incorporated herein by reference. Except as modified by the present policy guides, the CEQ guidelines will be followed by the responsible Agency officials in complying with policies and provisions of the NEPA and section 309 of the Clean Air Act. The requirements of these procedures are in addition to, and not a substitute for,

any environmental analyses or consultations required by any international obligations of the United States.

2. *Determining the Need for Environmental Impact Statements.* (a) Whether or not an environmental impact statement is required under section 102(2)(C) of the NEPA and filed for any Agency action, the policies and provisions of NEPA require that the environmental effects of proposed actions, and reasonable alternatives thereto (including those not within the authority of the Agency), be considered. The process of deciding on the need for an environmental impact statement on any Agency action will itself require an anlysis of the effects that the proposed action will have on the human environment. The inquiry into environmental effects is mandated, independent of the requirements to file environmental impact statements, by section 102(2)(B) of the NEPA, which requires procedures to insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decisionmaking along with economic, technical, and other considerations. CEQ Guideline No. 1 underscores this by recognizing that the purpose of section 102(2)(C) is to build into the agency decisionmaking process an appropriate and careful consideration of the environmental aspects of proposed actions, and to assist agencies in implementing not only the letter, but the spirit, of the NEPA. While the procedural requirements of section 102(2)(C) must be carefully complied with, it must also be emphasized that the essence of the NEPA is the need for real consideration of environmental effects.

(b) Section 102(2)(C) of the NEPA requires an environmental impact statement on "every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." Therefore, an activity which is both a major Federal action and which has a potentially significant effect on the environment requires an impact statement. For a general elaboration of the terms, see the CEQ guidelines, especially CEQ Guidelines 5(a) and 5(b).

3. *Responsibility within the Agency.* The Bureau of Science and Technology (ST) has primary responsibility for the Agency's compliance with the requirements of NEPA and for determining whether any proposed action requires an environmental impact statement.

Each Agency bureau and office having operational responsibility over a proposed major action which may significantly affect the environment shall inform ST of the proposed action, its potential environmental impact and reasonable alternatives thereto. In order to determine whether the proposed action will be a "major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment," ST together with the bureau or office having operational responsibility will investigate the direct and indirect environmental effects of the proposed action and shall consult with the Office of the General Counsel (GC). Where appropriate to supplement work in evaluating the environmental impact of the proposed action, they will solicit information from other parts of the Agency, from other Government agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved, or from private organizations.

In each instance where it is determined, after this investigation, that no environmental impact statement will be prepared by the Agency, a memorandum will be prepared for Agency files indicating the extent of the investigation conducted and the reasons for the determination that no impact statement will be prepared. A list of such actions will be available to Government agencies or members of the public on request to ST. In assessing the need for impact statements regarding any particular action, the following guidelines will be considered:

(a) Certain Agency activities would not be considered major Federal actions for purposes of the NEPA, for example, the following:

(1) Participation in research or study projects;

(2) Mandatory actions required under any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is a party, or required by the decisions of international organizations, authorities, conferences, or consultations in which the United States is a member or participant.

(b) Indirect effects of Agency activities can lead to a need to file an environmental impact statement. In some such instances, the Agency might be the lead agency responsible for the preparation of such a statement. However, in other cases, another agency might be the lead agency.

(c) The Agency is solely responsible for determining whether an environmental impact statement is required and for preparing an environmental impact statement only with respect to the Federal actions as to which it is the "lead agency," as defined in CEQ Guideline 5(b). Projects such as the destruction of weapons in accordance with the provisions of an international arms control agreement would be the subject of environmental impact statements, if otherwise required, prepared by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, or other lead agency. In some cases, joint preparation of the statement by two or more agencies may be appropriate.

Where it is determined that an environmental impact statement will be prepared by the Agency, ST together with the bureau having operational responsibility will prepare the statement. In doing so, they may, where appropriate, solicit information and comments from private organizations and government agencies with special expertise or interest, and, under the direction of the Secretary of State, engage in consultations, as appropriate, with foreign governments whose environments will be substantially affected by the proposed action. Advice on legal requirements for filing environmental impact statements and on legal requirements regarding their contents will be obtained from the Office of the General Counsel (GC).

4. *Responsibility for Investigation Into Environmental Effects of All Proposed Actions.* Even where it appears clear from the start that a proposed action will not require an environmental impact statement, the consideration of possible environmental effects will still be made and, as required by the NEPA, the results of that investigation will be an integral part of the decisionmaking process. Furthermore, where no impact statement will be prepared, ST and the bureau having operational responsibility will nonetheless submit for review and concurrence to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) all proposals for legislation, regulations, and construction projects which are related to the statutory responsibilities of the Administrator of the EPA, as indicated in CEQ Guideline No. 8.

5. *General Procedure.* Unless excluded under section 3, actions of the Agency which are covered by the NEPA will require an environmental impact statement.

(a) CEQ Guideline 10(b) requires "that draft environmental statements be prepared and circulated for comment and furnished to the Council early enough in the agency review process before an action is taken in order to permit meaningful consideration of the environmental issue involved."

The draft statements will be distributed by ST and the bureau or office having operational responsibility for comment to Government agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved, as determined by CEQ in Appendix II of the CEQ guidelines, and, in accordance with section 6(d) below, made available to the public. Upon circulation of draft statements to the EPA, comments shall be requested under both the NEPA and section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Notice of the draft statement's availability will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER as a public notice. ST and GC shall arrange for the publication.

Any comments received will be considered in final policy decisions and in the preparation of a final environmental impact statement. All such comments should be attached to the final statement, and those responsible comments not adequately discussed in the draft statement should be appropriately dealt with in the final statement. In any case where comments are not received in sufficient time to allow consideration in final policy decisions, they should be considered in future decisionmaking in similar areas of policy.

(b) In the case of international agreements, draft statements will be prepared in accordance with Department of State procedures (37 FR 19167, September 9, 1972).

6. *Exceptions.* The nature of negotiations and relations at the international

level may make it necessary to depart in some instances from the procedures in the CEQ guidelines. CEQ foresaw the need for such departures in CEQ Guidelines 4 and 10. Exceptions applicable to the Agency are set forth below:

(a) The statements and other written matter written to comply with the NEPA should not normally include any classified or administratively controlled material. However, there may be situations where such statements and memoranda cannot adequately discuss environmental effects without including material classified or administratively controlled under the provisions of 22 CFR Part 605 and the ACDA Security and Classification Handbook. In any event, however, those portions of any statement which are not classified or administratively controlled shall be made available to the public unless the material thus disclosed would be distorted or incomprehensible.

(b) Every attempt will be made to comply with the 30-day and 90-day periods which CEQ Guideline 10(b) requires between submission of statements and final action. Where schedules of international conferences or other factors make this impossible, the Agency will consult with the CEQ concerning appropriate modifications by the Agency of these minimum arrangements for the availability of environmental impact statements.

(c) Normally, agencies consulted in accordance with CEQ Guideline 7 shall be allowed 30 days for reply, and the EPA shall be allowed 45 days. However, the procedure in section 6(b) above will be followed if it becomes necessary to reduce these periods. When this is the case, all agencies to whom the draft statement has been sent will be informed by the responsible bureau of the reduced time period. The reduced time period must also be included in the public notice published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(d) Section 2(b) of Executive Order 11514 establishes requirements for providing public information on Federal actions and impact statements and envisions use of public hearings whenever appropriate. Public hearings will be employed by the Agency following the circulation of each draft impact statement unless it is determined that the requirements of carrying on international relations, including the constraints of time and the posture of the United States in negotiations do not allow such hearings to be carried out without prejudice to the national interest. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act do not apply to hearings involving "foreign affairs functions"; however, in each case where hearings are employed in accordance with this paragraph, a public notice of the hearings shall be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER indicating the time and place of the hearing and the matters to be considered, and the draft environmental impact statement shall be made available to the public at least 15 days prior to the hearing. ST and GC shall determine the nature and the procedures to be employed for such hearings, shall arrange for the hearing and the publication of the prescribed notice, and shall conduct the hearing. If such hearings cannot be carried out, arrangements should still be made, where practicable, for an expedited opportunity for members of the public to present their views orally.

All interested persons who desire to submit written comments or suggestions for consideration concerning these proposed procedures should submit them in duplicate to the General Counsel, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 2201 C Street NW., Washington, DC 20520, on or before April 9.

PHILIP J. FARLEY,
Acting Director.

[FR Doc.73-4442 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

OHIO STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Notice of Open Meeting

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Ohio State Advisory Committee will convene at 5 p.m. on March 9 and at 10 a.m. on March 10, 1973, at the Neil House, 41 South High Street, Columbus, OH 43215. This meeting shall be open to the public and the press.

The purposes of this meeting shall be to (1) finalize plans for an open meeting on Ohio Prison Reform and (2) interview State and local officials and community people.

This meeting will be conducted pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, D.C., March 2, 1973.

ISAIAH T. CRESWELL, Jr.,
Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 73-4626 Filed 3-7-73;11:22 am]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Notice 193]

ASSIGNMENT OF HEARINGS

MARCH 5, 1973.

Cases assigned for hearing, postponement, cancellation or oral argument appear below and will be published only once. This list contains prospective assignments only and does not include cases previously assigned hearing dates. The hearings will be on the issues as presently reflected in the Official Docket of the Commission. An attempt will be made to publish notices of cancellation of hearings as promptly as possible, but interested parties should take appropriate steps to insure that they are notified of cancellation or postponements of hearings in which they are interested. No amendments will be entertained after the date of this publication.

MC 51146 Subs 276 and 277, Schneider Transport, Inc., now asigned March 13, 1973, at St. Louis, Mo., is canceled and applications dismissed.

AB-5-Sub 48, Penndel Co. and George P. Baker, Richard C. Bond, Jervis Langdon, Jr., Willard Wirtz, trustees of the property of Penn Central Transportation Co., debtor, abandonment between Walton Junction and Traverse City, Traverse County, Mich., now assigned March 22, 1973, will be held in the Lars Hockstad Auditorium, Central High School, Traverse City, Mich.

MC 115841 Sub 438, Colonial Refrigerated Transportation, Inc., now being assigned hearing April 2, 1973 (2 weeks), at New York, N.Y., in a hearing room to be later designated.

MC-F-11682, U.S. Truck Co., Inc.—Purchase (portion)—Transportation Service, Inc., FD-27290, U.S. Truck Co., Inc., notes, MC-F-11683, Wilson Freight Co.—Purchase (portion)—Transportation Service, Inc., FD-27280, Wilson Freight Co., notes, now assigned March 26, 1973, will be held at the Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel, Washington Boulevard, and Michigan Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

[SEAL] ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4493 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Notice 226]

MOTOR CARRIER BOARD TRANSFER PROCEEDINGS

Synopses of orders entered by Division 3 of the Commission pursuant to sections 212(b), 206(a), 211, 312(b), and 410(g) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and rules and regulations prescribed thereunder (49 CFR Part 1132), appear below:

Each application (except as otherwise specifically noted) filed after March 27, 1972, contains a statement by applicants that there will be no significant effect on the quality of the human environment resulting from approval of the application. As provided in the Commission's general rules of practice any interested person may file a petition seeking reconsideration of the following numbered proceedings on or before April 9, 1973. Pursuant to section 17(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the filing of such a petition will postpone the effective date of the order in that proceeding pending its disposition. The matters relied upon by petitioners must be specified in their petitions with particularity.

No. MC-FC-74039. By order of February 27, 1973, the Commission, Division 3, acting as an Appellate Division, approved the transfer to Bestway Express, a corporation, Columbia, S.C., of the operating rights in Certificates Nos. MC-120668 (Sub-No. 3) and MC-120668 (Sub-No. 4), issued October 2, 1967, and October 2, 1967, to HC&D Lines, Inc., Hartsville, S.C., authorizing the transportation of general commodities, except petroleum products, commodities in bulk, classes A and B explosives, and household goods as defined by the Commission, between points in Darlington and Florence Counties, S.C., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in South Carolina; sand and gravel, except in bulk, from points in Marlboro County, S.C., to points in South Carolina; brick, from Society Hill, S.C., to points in North Carolina within 150 miles of Society Hill; sand and gravel, from Blenheim, S.C., to points in North

Carolina within 100 miles of Blenheim; livestock, agricultural commodities, ginned cotton, tobacco, fertilizer, and fertilizer materials, between Hartsville, S.C., and points within 50 miles thereof, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in North Carolina and South Carolina within 150 miles of Hartsville; cotton linters and other specified commodities, between Hartsville, S.C., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in North Carolina within 150 miles of Hartsville, and oil mill rolls and fittings, between Hartsville, S.C., and Augusta, Ga. John H. Caldwell, 914 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20005, attorney for applicants.

[SEAL] ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4492 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

[Notice 18]

MOTOR CARRIER, BROKER, WATER CARRIER, AND FREIGHT FORWARDER APPLICATIONS

MARCH 2, 1973.

The following applications (except as otherwise specifically noted, each applicant (on applications filed after March 27, 1972) states that there will be no significant effect on the quality of the human environment resulting from approval of its application), are governed by Special Rule 1100.247[1] of the Commission's general rules of practice (49 CFR, as amended), published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of April 20, 1966, effective May 20, 1966. These rules provide, among other things, that a protest to the granting of an application must be filed with the Commission within 30 days after date of notice of filing of the application is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Failure seasonably to file a protest will be construed as a waiver of opposition and participation in the proceeding. A protest under these rules should comply with section 247(d)(3) of the rules of practice which requires that it set forth specifically the grounds upon which it is made, contain a detailed statement of protestant's interest in the proceeding (including a copy of the specific portions of its authority which protestant believes to be in conflict with that sought in the application, and describing in detail the method—whether by joinder, interline, or other means—by which protestant would use such authority to provide all or part of the service proposed), and shall specify with particularity the facts, matters, and things relied upon, but shall not include issues or allegations phrased generally. Protests not in reasonable compliance with the requirements of the rules may be rejected. The original and one (1) copy of the protest shall be filed with the Commission, and a copy shall be served concurrently upon applicant's representative, or applicant if no representative is named. If the protest includes a request for oral hearing, such request shall meet the requirements of section 247(d)(4) of the special rules, and shall include the certification required therein.

Section 247(f) of the Commission's rules of practice further provides that each applicant shall, if protests to its application have been filed, and within 60 days of the date of this publication, notify the Commission in writing (1) that it is ready to proceed and prosecute the application, or (2) that it wishes to withdraw the application, failure in which the application will be dismissed by the Commission.

Further processing steps (whether modified procedure, oral hearing, or other procedures) will be determined generally in accordance with the Commission's general policy statement concerning motor carrier licensing procedures, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of May 3, 1966. This assignment will be by Commission order which will be served on each party of record. Broadening amendments will not be accepted after the date of this publication except for good cause shown, and restrictive amendments will not be entertained following publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER of a notice that the proceeding has been assigned for oral hearing.

No. MC 1328 (Sub-No. 11), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: MGS TRANSPORTATION, INC., Post Office Box 270, Alexandria, IN 46001. Applicant's representative: Donald W. Smith, 900 Circle Tower, Indianapolis, IN 46204. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Corrugated containers*, from Montpelier, Ind., to points in Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois, and (2) *roll paper stock*, from Monroe, Mich., and Steubenville, Ohio, to Montpelier, Ind., under a continuing contract with Indiana Box Corp. of Montpelier, Ind. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Indianapolis, Ind., or Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 2986 (Sub-No. 37), filed January 15, 1973. Applicant: I & S-MC-DANIEL, INC., 1102 Prairie Street, Vincennes, IN 47591. Applicant's representative: Ferdinand Born, 601 Chamber of Commerce Building, Indianapolis, Ind. 46204. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and those requiring special equipment) between Indianapolis, Ind., and Cincinnati, Ohio, over Interstate Highway 74, serving as an alternate route for operating convenience only, in connection with applicant's regular-route authoirty (serving no intermediate points). NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Indianapolis, Ind.

No. MC 8535 (Sub-No. 45), filed January 19, 1973. Applicant: GEORGE TRANSFER AND RIGGING COMPANY, INCORPORATED, Interstate 83 at Route 439, Parkton, Md. 21120. Applicant's representative: John Guandolo, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, DC 20036. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Composition board and particleboard*, from Chesapeake, Va., to points in Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority could be tacked at Chesapeake, Va., with its lead certificate MC 8535 to provide service on building, contractors', and plant construction materials from points in Virginia. In addition, applicant's MC 8535 may in turn be tacked with its Sub 38 at Kenbridge or Victoria, Va., to provide service on general commodities (with usual exceptions) from North Carolina. Thus, by tacking MC 8535 and its Sub 38 to the authority sought, service could be provided on specified commodities from North Carolina and Virginia to the destination States sought herein. Applicant further states no duplicating authority sought. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Washington, D.C.

No. MC 9325 (Sub-No. 64), filed January 16, 1973. Applicant: K LINES, INC., Post Office Box 1348, Lake Oswego, OR 97034. Applicant's representative: Eugene A. Feise (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Lime*, in bulk, from Portland, Oreg., to points in Idaho. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Portland, Oreg., or Seattle, Wash.

No. MC 14702 (Sub-No. 49), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: OHIO FAST FREIGHT, INC., 3893 Market Street NE., Warren, OH 44484. Applicant's representative: Paul F. Beery, 88 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH 43215. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Aluminum and aluminum articles*, between Rochester, N.Y., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Indiana, those in Michigan on and south of Michigan Highway 46, and the Chicago Ill., commercial zone. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Columbus, Ohio.

No. MC 19157 (Sub-No. 17), filed February 2, 1973. Applicant: McCORMACK'S HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION, INC., Rural Delivery No. 3, Box 4, Campbell Road, Schenectady, NY 12306. Applicant's representative: Anthony C. Vance, 1111 E Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, DC 20004. Authority sought to operate as a *common*

[1] Copies of Special Rule 247 (as amended) can be obtained by writing to the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C. 20423.

carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Radioactive material, new and spent, radioactive source, special nuclear and by-product materials, radioactive material shipping containers, nuclear reactor component parts, and related equipment*, between points in Rowan County, Ky., and Barnwell County, S.C., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Vermont, West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority with its subs 11, 13, and 15 but has no present intention to tack. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Schenectady, N.Y., or New York, N.Y.

No. MC 30844 (Sub-No. 452), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: KROBLIN REFRIGERATED XPRESS, INC., 2125 Commercial Street, Post Office Box 5000, Waterloo, IA 50702. Applicant's representative: Truman A. Stockton, The 1650 Grant Street Building, Denver, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen and dehydrated foods*, from Boise, Burley, Fruitland, Nampa, and Weiser, Idaho, and Ontario, Oreg., (1) to Greenville, Mich., and (2) to points in Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Boise, Idaho, or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 34156 (Sub-No. 5), filed January 15, 1973. Applicant: NIEDERT MOTOR SERVICE, INC., 2300 South Mount Prospect Road, Des Plaines, IL 60018. Applicant's representative: Daniel C. Sullivan, Suite 1000, 327 South La Salle Street, Chicago, IL 60604. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), (1) between Chicago, Ill., and Lake McHenry, Boone, Cook, Du Page, Kane, De Kalb, Will, Kendall, and La Salle Counties, Ill.; (2) between points named in (1) above, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Illinois; and (3) between Lake and Porter County, Ind., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Illinois. NOTE: By the requests for authority in parts (1) and (2) above, applicant seeks to convert its Certificate of Registration to a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 41951 (Sub-No. 15) (Amendment), filed May 22, 1972. Published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issues of August 31, 1972, and as corrected on October 27, 1972, and republished, as amended, this issue. Applicant: WHEATLEY TRUCKING, INCORPORATED, 125 Brohawn Avenue, Post Office Box 458, Cambridge, MD 21613. Applicant's representative: M. Bruce Morgan, Post Office Box 786, Azar Building, Glen Burnie, MD 21061. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Foodstuffs* (except frozen or cold pack), from Cambridge, Md., to Plymouth, Ind. NOTE: The purpose of this amendment is to change the destination point from South Bend, Ind., to Plymouth, Ind. Applicant states that the existing authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Baltimore, Md., or Philadelphia, Pa.

No. MC 51146 (Sub-No. 308), filed January 24, 1973. Applicant: SCHNEIDER TRANSPORT, INC., 2661 South Broadway, Green Bay, WI 54304. Applicant's representative: Charles Singer, Suite 1000, 327 South La Salle, Chicago, IL 60604. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Such merchandise* as is dealt in by department stores (except foodstuffs, furniture and commodities in bulk) and (2) *foodstuffs and furniture* (except in bulk), moving in mixed loads with the commodities described in (1) above, from points in New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Delaware, New Jersey, and Maryland, to the facilities maintained or utilized by The J. L. Hudson Co. located at Grand Rapids, Ann Arbor, Flint, Pontiac, and Detroit, Mich., and Toledo, Ohio, restricted to traffic originating at the origins sought and destined to the above-named facilities. NOTE: Common control may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 52110 (Sub-No. 134), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: BRADY MOTORFRATE, INC., 2150 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, IA 50312. Applicant's representative: Cecil L. Goettsch, 11th Floor Des Moines Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50309. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products and meat by-products, and articles distributed by meat packinghouses*, as described in Appendix 1 to the report in Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates, 61 MCC 209 and 766 (except hides and commodities in bulk), from Denison and Iowa Falls, Iowa to points in Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, restricted to traffic originating at the facilities of Farmland Industries, Inc. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Kansas City, Mo., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 59059 (Sub-No. 6), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: ARROW FREIGHT LINES, INC., Box 1665, East Highway 30, Grand Island, NE 68801. Applicant's representative: Gailyn L. Larson, Post Office Box 80806, 521 South 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68501. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those requiring special equipment), serving the warehouse site of Western Electric, at or near Underwood, Iowa, as an off-route point in connection with applicant's regular route operations via Omaha, Nebr. NOTE: Common control may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Omaha, Nebr.

No. MC 61592 (Sub No. 297), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: JENKINS TRUCK LINE, INC., 3708 Elm Street, Bettendorf, IA 52722. Applicant's representative: Donald Smith, 900 Circle Tower Building, Indianapolis, IN 46204. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Tractors and attachments and agricultural implements*, between the warehouse site of Deutz Tractor Corp., located at or near O'Fallon, Mo., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Restriction: Shipments from points in Wisconsin and Minnesota to O'Fallon, Mo., restricted to traffic on behalf of the Deutz Tractor Corp. and from shipping facilities used by the Deutz Tractor Corp. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at St. Louis, Mo.

No. MC 61592 (Sub-No. 298), filed January 30, 1973. Applicant: JENKINS TRUCK LINE, INC., 3708 Elm Street, Bettendorf, IA 52722. Applicant's representative: Donald Smith, 900 Circle Tower Building, Indianapolis, IN 46204. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Composition board and plywood*, unfinished or prefinished, natural veneers or synthetic, including, but not limited to plastics, vinyls, and polyesters, from Shawano, Wis., to points in the United States including Alaska (but excluding Hawaii). NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing

authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 61592 (Sub-No. 299), filed February 1, 1973. Applicant: JENKINS TRUCK LINE, INC., 3708 Elm Street, Bettendorf, IA 52722. Applicant's representative: Donald Smith, 900 Circle Tower Building, Indianapolis, IN 46204. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *New furniture and fixtures*, between points in Utah, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and California. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Salt Lake City, Utah.

No. MC 61592 (Sub-No. 300), filed February 1, 1973. Applicant: JENKINS TRUCK LINE, INC., 3708 Elm Street, Betterndorf, IA 52722. Applicant's representative: Donald Smith, 900 Circle Tower Building, Indianapolis, Ind. 46204. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Trailers*, designed to be drawn by passenger automobiles, in initial movements, from points in Jackson County, W. Va., to points in the United States east of the Mississippi River (excluding Minnesota and Louisiana). NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Washington, D.C.

No. MC 67200 (Sub-No. 39), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: THE FURNITURE TRANSPORT COMPANY, INC., Post Office Box 392, Furniture Row, Milford, CT 06460. Applicant's representative: Arthur J. Piken, One Lefrak City Plaza, Flushing, NY 11368. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *New furniture*, crated and uncrated, (1) between points in Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, South Carolina, Alabama, and Louisiana; and (2) between points in Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, South Carolina, and Louisiana, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. NOTE: Applicant states that it seeks no duplicating authority and that the requested authority herein cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests that it be held both at Mamia, Fla., and Boston, Mass.

No. MC 67200 (Sub-No. 40), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: THE FURNITURE TRANSPORT COMPANY, INC., Post Office Box 392, Furniture Row, Milford, CT 06460. Applicant's representative: Arthur J. Piken, One Lefrak City Plaza, Flushing, NY 11368. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *New furniture*, (1) between points in Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and Tennessee; and (2) between points in Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. NOTE: Applicant states that it seeks no duplicating authority and that the requested authority herein cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at both Dallas, Tex., and Boston, Mass.

No. MC 70083 (Sub-No. 27), filed January 9, 1973. Applicant: DRAKE MOTOR LINES, INC., 20 Olney Avenue, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034. Applicant's representative: Herbert Burstein, One World Trade Center, New York, NY 10048. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except explosives and inflammable commodities), moving on a through air bill of lading of direct air carriers or air freight forwarders, between New York, N.Y., and points in Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, and Rockland Counties, N.Y.; Newark, N.J., and points in Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Salem, Monmouth, Somerset, Morris, Passaic, Bergen, Essex, and Union Counties, N.J.; Philadelphia, Pa., and points in Bucks, Montgomery, Chester, and Delaware Counties, Pa.; Wilmington, Del., and points in New Castle County, Del.; points in Fairfield County, Conn.; Boston, Mass., and points in Middlesex, Plymouth, Essex, Bristol, Suffolk, and Norfolk Counties, Mass.; and Providence, R.I., and points in Providence County, R.I.; Baltimore, Md., and points in Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Frederick, Harford, and Howard Counties, Md.; Washington, D.C., and points in Charles, Montgomery, and Prince Georges Counties, Md., and Fairfax, Prince William, and Loudoun Counties, Va.; on the one hand, and, on the other, Detroit, Mich., and points in Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, Washtenaw, Wayne, and Livingston Counties, Mich. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at New York, N.Y., or Philadelphia, Pa.

No. MC 71459 (Sub-No. 36), filed January 17, 1973. Applicant: O. N. C. FREIGHT SYSTEMS, a Corporation, 2800 West Bayshore Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303. Applicant's representative: C. J. Boddington (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Class A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, commodities requiring special equipment, and those injurious or contaminating to other lading), (1) between Page, Ariz., and Fredonia, Ariz., from Page over U.S. Highway 89 to junction Alternate U.S. Highway 89, thence over Alternate U.S. Highway 89 to Fredonia, Ariz., and return over the same route, (2) between San Bernardino, Calif., and Ashfork, Ariz., from San Bernardino, Calif., over Interstate Highway 15 to junction Interstate Highway 40, at or near Barstow, Calif., thence over Interstate Highway 40 (U.S. Highway 66) to Ashfork, Ariz., and return over the same route, (3) between Lordsburg, N. Mex., and Deming, N. Mex., from Lordsburg, over Interstate Highway 10 (U.S. Highway 70), to Deming, and return over the same route, and the requests for authority in (1), (2), and (3) above are for alternate routes in connection with applicant's regular route authority, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. NOTES: Common control may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Phoenix, Ariz., or Los Angeles, Calif.

No. MC 74238 (Sub-No. 3) filed January 15, 1973. Applicant: KRIEGSMAN TRANSFER COMPANY, a Corporation, 278 Koch Street, Pekin, IL 61554. Applicant's representative: Robert M. Kaske, 2017 Wisteria Road, Rockford, IL 61107. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Household goods*, as defined by the Commission, between Peoria, Ill. and points in its commercial zone and Minnesota, on the one hand, and on the other points in Ohio, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority at Peoria, Ill., points in Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, and Iowa. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at either Springfield or Chicago, Ill. or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 82492 (Sub-No. 75), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: MICHIGAN & NEBRASKA TRANSIT CO., INC., Post Office Box 2853, 2109 Olmstead Road, Kalamazoo, MI 49003. Applicant's representative: Jack H. Blanshan, 29 South La Salle Street, Chicago, IL 60603. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dairy products* (except commodities in bulk), from points in Minnesota and Wisconsin, to Toledo and Maumee, Ohio and points in Michigan. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill. or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 82079 (Sub-No. 31), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: KELIER TRANSFER LINE, INC., 1239 Randolph

Avenue SW., Grand Rapids, MI 49507. Applicant's representative: J. M. Neath, Jr., 900—One Vandenberg Center, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods, frozen prepared foods, frozen food products and frozen bakery goods*, from Cleveland, Ohio, to points in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, restricted to traffic originating at Cleveland, Ohio, and terminating in the destination area. NOTE: Common control and dual operations may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Lansing, Mich., or Cleveland, Ohio.

No. MC 83835 (Sub-No. 100), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: WALES TRANSPORTATION, INC., Post Office Box 6186, Dallas, TX 75222. Applicant's representative: James W. Hightower, 136 Wynnewood Professional Building, Dallas, Tex. 75224. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Concrete reinforcement products, accessories and parts*, from the plantsite of Superior Concrete Accessories, Inc., located at Parson, Kans., to points in Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, New York, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Ohio, and North Carolina. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority but indicates that it has no present intention to tack and therefore does not identify the points or territories which can be served through tacking. Persons interested in the tacking possibilities are cautioned that failure to oppose the application may result in an unrestricted grant of authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at (1) Dallas, Tex., or (2) Kansas City, Mo.

No. MC 100785 (Sub-No. 2), filed January 8, 1973. Applicant: LAWRENCE E. BULT, doing business as L. BULT CARTAGE, 123 North Williams Street, Thornton, IL 60476. Applicant's representative: Irving Stillerman, 29 South La Salle Street, Chicago, IL 60603. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Lime, limestone and limestone products*, in bag, or in bulk in dump or hopper-type vehicles, from Chicago, Ill., and points within the Chicago, Ill., commercial zone to points in Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 103051 (Sub-No. 268), filed January 19, 1973. Applicant: FLEET TRANSPORT COMPANY, INC., 934 44th Avenue North, Nashville, TN 37209. Applicant's representative: Russell E. Stone (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (a) *Nitrogen fertilizer solutions or other liquid fertilizer solutions*, in tank vehicles, from Tyner, Tenn., to points in Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee, and (b) *fertilizer*, dry in bags or in bulk, from Tyner, Tenn., to points in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority but indicates that it has no present intention to tack and therefore does not identify the points or territories which can be served through tacking. Persons interested in the tacking possibilities are cautioned that failure to oppose the application may result in an unrestricted grant of authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Nashville, Tenn., or Atlanta, Ga.

No. MC 103993 (Sub-No. 754), filed January 19, 1973. Applicant: MORGAN DRIVE-AWAY, INC., 2800 West Lexington Avenue, Elkhart, IN 46514. Applicant's representative: Paul D. Borghesani, 2800 West Lexington Avenue, Elkhart, IN 46514. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Trailers*, designed to be drawn by passenger automobiles, in initial movements, and (2) *buildings and sections of buildings* on undercarriages, from points in Weld County, Colo. (except Greeley, Colo.), to points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii). NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 103993 (Sub-No. 755), filed January 19, 1973. Applicant: MORGAN DRIVE-AWAY, INC., 2800 West Lexington Avenue, Elkhart, IN 46514. Applicant's representative, Paul D. Borghesani, 2800 West Lexington Avenue, Elkhart, IN 46514. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting (1) *Trailers*, designed to be drawn by passenger automobiles, in initial movements, and (2) *buildings and sections of buildings*, on undercarriages, from points in Washington County, N.Y., to points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii). NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 103993 (Sub-No. 756), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: MORGAN DRIVE-AWAY, INC., 2800 West Lexington Avenue, Elkhart, IN 46514. Applicant's representative: Paul D. Borghesani (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Buildings and sections of building*, on undercarriages, from points in Columbia County, N.Y., to points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii). NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Albany, N.Y.

No. MC 108207 (Sub-No. 366), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: FROZEN FOOD EXPRESS, a corporation, 318 Cadiz Street, Post Office Box 5888, Dallas, TX 75222. Applicant's representative: J. B. Ham (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Foodstuffs*, from the plantsite and warehouse facilities utilized by Jeno's, Inc., at Duluth, Minn., to points in Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Minneapolis, Minn., or Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 107012 (Sub-No. 172), filed February 1, 1973. Applicant: NORTH AMERICAN VAN LINES, INC., Post Office Box 988, Lincoln Highway East and Meyer Road, Fort Wayne, IN 46801. Applicant's representative: Donald C. Lewis (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *New furniture and commercial and institutional fixtures*, from Sanford, N.C., to points in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Dual operations and common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority and provide a through transportation service for new furniture and commercial and institutional fixtures from Sanford, N.C., to points in the United States via Tennessee. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 108393 (Sub-No. 68), filed January 12, 1973. Applicant: SIGNAL DELIVERY SERVICE, INC., 930 North York Road, Hinsdale, IL 60521. Applicant's representative: J. A. Kundtz, 1100 National City Bank Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Parts of electrical and gas appliances, and equipment, materials, and supplies* used in the manufacture, distribution and repair of electrical and gas appliances, between Fort Smith, Jacksonville, and Jonesboro, Ark.; Cleveland, Ohio; and St. Paul, Minn., on the one hand, and, on the other, La Porte, Ind., and (2) *gas and electrical appliances, parts of electrical and gas appliances, and equipment, materials, and supplies* used in the

manufacture, distribution and repair of electrical and gas appliances, between Evansville, Ind., and Chicago, Ill., on the one hand, and, on the other, St. Paul, Minn., under contract with Whirlpool Corp. NOTE: Common control and dual operations may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Washington, D.C.

No. MC 110420 (Sub-No. 674), filed January 19, 1973. Applicant: QUALITY CARRIERS, INC., Post Office Box 186, Pleasant Prairie, WI 53158. Applicant's representative Fred H. Figge (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Malt syrup*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Peoria, Ill., to points in Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, and (2) *chemicals*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Peoria, Ill., to points in Georgia, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, North Carolina, and South Carolina. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 110525 (Sub-No. 1047) (Amendment), filed November 29, 1972, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of March 1, 1973, and republished this issue. Applicant: CHEMICAL LEAMAN TANK LINES, INC., 520 East Lancaster Avenue, Downingtown, PA 19335. Applicant's representative: Leonard A. Jaskiewicz, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, DC 20036. NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to indicate that the applicant seeks to restrictively amend its previously published request for authority by restricting the requested operations therein "to traffic originating at the plantsite and/or warehouse facilities of Cargill, Inc., at Dayton, Ohio." The rest of the application remains as previously published.

No. MC 110563 (Sub-No. 101), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: COLDWAY FOOD EXPRESS, INC., Ohio Building, Sidney, Ohio 45365. Applicant's representative: Joseph M. Scanlan, 111 West Washington, Chicago, IL 60602. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat byproducts and articles distributed by meat packinghouses* (except hides and commodities in bulk) as described in sections A and C of Appendix I to the report in Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates, 61 MCC 209 and 766, from Hastings, Nebr., to points in New York, Connecticut, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Virginia, Michigan, and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with is existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Philadelphia, Pa., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 111720 (Sub-No. 10), filed January 17, 1973. Applicant: RAY WILLIAMS AND ARLENE WILLIAMS, a Partnership, doing business as WILLIAMS TRUCK SERVICE, 2800 East 11th Street, Post Office Box 40, Sioux Falls, SD 57101. Applicant's representative: Donald L. Stern, 530 Univac Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68102. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, and meat byproducts, dairy products and articles distributed by meat packinghouses* as described in sections A, B, and C of Appendix I to the report in Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates, 61 MCC 209 and 766 (except liquid commodities in bulk, in tank vehicles, skins, hides, pelts and glue stock), from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Sioux City, Iowa, to points in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee, under contract with John Morrell & Co. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

No. MC 111812 (Sub-No. 483), filed January 19, 1973. Applicant: MIDWEST COAST TRANSPORT, INC., 900 West Delaware, Post Office Box 1233, Sioux Falls, SD 57101. Applicant's representative: Davis L. Lewis (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Bomb and flare parachutes and related accessories* from points in South Dakota east of the Missouri River to San Francisco, Calif. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

No. MC 112304 (Sub-No. 62), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: ACE DORAN HAULING & RIGGING CO., a corporation, 1601 Blue Rock Street, Cincinnati, OH 45223. Applicant's representative: A. Charles Tell, 100 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH 43215. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Aluminum and aluminum products, supplies, and equipment* used in the manufacturing thereof, between Adrian, Mich., on the one hand, and on the other, points in the United States in and east of Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Texas. NOTE: Applicant states that tacking possibilities exist between the requested authority and its existing authority under MC 112304 (Sub-No. 1), but indicates that it has no present intention of tacking. Persons interested in the tacking possibilities are cautioned that failure to oppose the application may result in an unrestricted grant of authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Los Angeles, Calif., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 112822 (Sub-No. 258), filed January 12, 1973. Applicant: BRAY LINES INCORPORATED, Post Office Box 1191, 1401 North Little, Cushing, OK 74023. Applicant's representative: K. Charles Elliot (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Expanded polystyrene forms and shapes*, in packages, (1) from the plantsite of Mobil Chemical Co., Frankfort, Ill., to points in Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas; and (2) from the plantsite of Mobil Chemical Co., Covington, Ga., to points in Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Dallas or Houston, Tex.

No. MC 113658 (Sub-No. 6), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: SCOTT TRUCK LINE, INC., 5871 North Broadway, Post Office Box 16346 T.A., Denver, CO 80216. Applicant's representative: Charles J. Kimball, State Bank Building, 1600 Broadway, Denver, CO 80202. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products and meat byproducts* as described in sections A and C of Appendix I to the report in Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates, 61 MCC 209 and 766, from Denver, Colo., to Elmsford, Rochester, Mount Kisco, Maspeth, and New York, N.Y., East Hartford, Hartford, and Stamford, Conn., Philadelphia and Allentown, Pa., Baltimore, Md., and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Denver, Colo.

No. MC 113658 (Sub-No. 7), filed January 30, 1973. Applicant: SCOTT TRUCK LINE, INC., 5871 North Broadway (Post Office Box 16346-T.A. Denver, CO 80216. Applicant's representative: Marion F. Jones, Suite 1600, Lincoln Center, 1660 Lincoln Street, Denver, CO 80203. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except household goods as defined by the Commission, emigrant moveables, those of unusual value, classes A and B explosives, commodities requiring special equipment, and those injurious or contaminating to other lading), between the junction of Colorado Highway 113 and Interstate Highway 80S near Sterling, Colo., and the junction of U.S. Highway 26 and Interstate Highway 80 near Ogallala, Nebr., over Interstate Highway 80S and Interstate Highway 80, for joinder purpose only. NOTE: Common

control may be involved. Applicant states that the purpose of the instant application is to eliminate a gateway. Applicant further states that granting the authority sought in this application might affect the environment favorably due to elimination of 69 miles of highway travel per trip. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Denver, Colo.

No. MC 114019 (Sub-No. 244), filed January 12, 1973. Applicant: MIDWEST EMERY FREIGHT SYSTEM, INC., 7000 South Pulaski Road, Chicago, IL 60629. Applicant's representative: Arnold L. Burke, 127 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60602. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Food and food products*, (1) from points in Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, to points in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Colorado, Ohio, Wisconsin, and that part of Pennsylvania on and west of U.S. Highway 15; (2) (a) from points in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts to points in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, points in that part of Pennsylvania east of U.S. Highway 15; Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Ocean, and Salem Counties, N.J.; and Albany, N.Y. (except points in the commercial zone of Albany, N.Y.); points in Allegany, Broome, Cattaraugus, Cayuga, Chautauqua, Chemung, Chenango, Clinton, Cortland, Delaware, Erie, Essex, Franklin, Fulton, Genesee, Greene, Hamilton, Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Livingston, Madison, Monroe, Montgomery, Niagara, Oneida, Onondaga, Ontario, Orleans, Oswego, Otsego, Saint Lawrence, Saratoga, Schenectady (except points in the commercial zone of Albany, N.Y.), Schoharie, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Sullivan, Tioga, Tompkins, Ulster, Warren, Washington, Wayne, Wyoming, and Yates Counties, N.Y.; and (b) from points in New Hampshire, to points in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, New York, New Jersey, and points in Pennsylvania east of U.S. Highway 15. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority but indicates that it has no present intention to tack and therefore does not identify the points or territories which can be served through tacking. Persons interested in the tacking possibilities are cautioned that failure to oppose the application may result in an unrestricted grant of authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Boston, Mass.

No. MC 114019 (Sub-No. 245), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: MIDWEST EMERY FREIGHT SYSTEM, INC., 7000 South Pulaski Road, Chicago, IL 60629. Applicant's representative: Arnold L. Burke, 127 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60602. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, (except those of unusual value, classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving Underwood, Iowa as an off-route point in connection with applicant's regular route operations between Chicago, Ill., and Pueblo, Colo. NOTE: Common control may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at New York, N.Y., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 114211 (Sub-No. 190), filed December 18, 1972. Applicant: WARREN TRANSPORT, INC., 324 Manhard, Post Office Box 420, Waterloo, IA 50704. Applicant's representative: Kenneth R. Nelson (same address as applicant) and Daniel Sullivan, 327 South La Salle Street, Chicago, IL 60604. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Tractors* (except those with vehicle beds, bed frames, and fifth wheels); (2) *Equipment* designed for use in conjunction with tractors; (3) *Agricultural, industrial and construction machinery and equipment;* (4) *Attachments*, for the above described commodities; (5) *Internal combustion engines;* (6) *Parts* of the above described commodities when moving in mixed loads with such commodities; and (1) *Materials, equipment and supplies* used in the manufacture and distribution of the commodities described in (1) through (6) above (except commodities in bulk), from the plant, warehouse and storage facilities of the J. I. Case Co. at or near Bettendorf and Burlington, Iowa and Racine, Wis. to points in Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington, restricted to traffic originating at the plant, warehouse and storage facilities of the J. I. Case Co. at or near Bettendorf and Burlington, Iowa, and Racine, Wis. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill., or Milwaukee, Wis.

No. MC 114301 (Sub-No. 76), filed January 15, 1973. Applicant: DELWARE EXPRESS CO., a Corporation, Post Office Box 97, Elkton, MD 21921. Applicant's representative: Chester A. Zyblut, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20005. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Asphalt*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Wilmington, Del., to points in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Washington, D.C.

No. MC 115093 (Sub-No. 10) (Clarification), filed January 12, 1973, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of March 1, 1973, and republished this issue. Applicant: MERCURY MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., 704 West Kennedy Boulevard, Tampa, FL 33606. Applicant's representative: James F. Wharton, 17th Floor, CNA Building, Post Office Box 231, Orlando, FL 32802. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), (1) Between Wilson, N.C., and junction U.S. Highways 70 (also 701) and 301: From Wilson over U.S. Highway 301 to junction U.S. Highway 70, and return over the same route;

(2) Between Fayetteville, N.C., and junction U.S. Highways 301 and 701: From Fayetteville over U.S. Highway 13 to junction U.S. Highway 301, thence, over U.S. Highway 301 to junction U.S. Highway 701 (also 70), and return over the same route; (3) between Greensboro and Rockingham, N.C.: From Greensboro over U.S. Highway 220 to junction U.S. Highway 1 at Rockingham, and return over the same route; (4) between Petersburg, Va. and Raleigh, N.C.: From Petersburg over U.S. Highway 1 to Raleigh, and return over the same route; (5) between Raleigh and Rockingham, N.C.: From Raleigh over U.S. Highway 1 to Rockingham, and return over the same route; (6) between Rockingham, N.C., and Cheraw, S.C.: From Rockingham over U.S. Highway 1 to Cheraw, S.C. (and intersection South Carolina Highway 9), and return over the same route; (7) between Cheraw and Society Hill, S.C.: From Cheraw (and intersection South Carolina Highway 9) over U.S. Highway 52 to Society Hill (and intersection U.S. Highway 15 (also 401)), and return over the same route; (8) between Society Hill and Florence, S.C.: From Society Hill (and intersection U.S. Highway 15 (also 401)) over U.S. Highway 52 to Florence, and return over the same route; (9) between Raleigh and Fayetteville, N.C.: From Raleigh over U.S. Highway 401 to Fayetteville, and return over the same route; (10) between Fayetteville, N.C., and Bradenton, Fla.: Serving Florence, S.C. for purposes of joinder only;

And (11) between Bennettsville, S.C. and Columbus, Ga.: Serving Cheraw, S.C. for purposes of joinder only; and serving in (1) through (9) inclusive above no intermediate or off-route points except, as pertinent, those points in Virginia presently authorized in carriers regular-route operations. Restriction: Restricted to the transportation of traffic moving (a) between points in Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and those in that part of New York on and south of New York Highway 7, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Georgia and Florida, and (b) through Mount Olive, N.C., and points within 15 miles thereof or those in Florence County, S.C. The requests for authority above are for alternative routes or additional service points for purposes of joinder for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's presently authorized regular-route operations in No. MC-115093. NOTE: The

purpose of this republication is to more clearly indicate the termini at which applicant will join this request for alternate routes with its presently authorized regular-route operations. The applicant states that this application seeks to obtain the alternate gateway of Florence, S.C. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Tampa or Jacksonville, Fla.

No. MC 116544 (Sub-No. 137) (Correction), filed November 2, 1972, published in the FR issue of January 11, 1973, and republished this issue. Applicant: WILSON BROTHERS TRUCK LINE, INC., 700 East Fairview Avenue, Post Office Box 636, Carthage, MO 64836. Applicant's representative: Floyd F. Knutson (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, from New Hampton, Iowa, to points in Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to indicate the correct origin as New Hampton, Iowa, in lieu of Hampton, Iowa which was inadvertantly previously published in error. Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 117119 (Sub-No. 470), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: WILLIS SHAW FROZEN EXPRESS, INC., Post Office Box 188, Elm Springs, AR 72728. Applicant's representative: Bobby G. Shaw (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Foods, cooked, cured, preserved, prepared, or frozen; meats, meat products, and meat byproducts* as described in sections A and C of Appendix 1 to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates* 61 M.C.C. 209 and 766 (except commodities in bulk, in tank vehicles), in vehicles equipped with mechanical refrigeration, from Oklahoma City, Okla., to points in Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, restricted to traffic originating at the plantsite and/or warehouse facilities utilizes by Geo. A. Hormel & Co., at or near Oklahoma City, Okla., and destined to points in the above-named States. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority but indicates that it has no present intention to tack and therefore does not identify the points or territories which can be served through tacking. Persons interested in the tacking possibilities are cautioned that failure to oppose the application may result in an unrestricted grant of authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 117940 (Sub-No. 87), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: NATIONWIDE CARRIERS, INC., Post Office Box 104, Maple Plain, MN 55359. Applicant's representative: Donald Stern, 530 Univac Building, 7100 West Center Road, Omaha, NE 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Foodstuffs*, from the plantsite and warehouse facilities utilized by Jeno's, Inc., at Duluth, Minn., to points in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Vermont, New Hampshire, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Applicant also holds contract carrier authority under MC 114789 and subs, therefore dual operations may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Minneapolis, Minn.

No. MC 117940 (Sub-No. 88), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: NATIONWIDE CARRIERS, INC., Post Office Box 104, Maple Plain, MN 55359. Applicant's representative: Donald Stern, 530 Univac Building, 7100 West Center Road, Omaha, NE 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Bananas, and agricultural commodities* otherwise exempt from economic regulation under section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, when transported in mixed loads with bananas, (1) from Galveston, Tex., to points in Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, and ports of entry on the international boundary line between the United States and Canada in Minnesota and North Dakota, for furtherance to points in Canada, (2) from Mobile, Ala., to points in Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Ohio, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and ports of entry on the international boundary line between the United States and Canada in Minnesota and North Dakota, for furtherance to points in Canada, (3) from Charleston, S.C., to points in Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, and (4) from Wilmington, Del., to points in Ohio and West Virginia. NOTE: Applicant also holds contract carrier authority under MC 114789 and subs thereunder, therefore dual operations may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Minneapolis, Minn., Miami, Fla., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 118159 (Sub-No. 130), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: NATIONAL REFRIGERATED TRANSPORT, INC., 1925 National Plaza, Tulsa, Okla. 74151. Applicant's representative: Jack R. Anderson (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, and meat byproducts, and articles distributed by meat packinghouses*, as described in sections A and C of Appendix 1 to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, 61 M.C.C. 209 and 766 (except in bulk, hides or skins), from Mankato, Kans., to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. NOTE: Common control and dual operations may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Kansas City, Mo., or Tulsa, Okla.

No. MC 118213 (Sub-No. 1), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: ANTHONY TAMMARO, INC., U.S. Highway 130, Robbinsville, N.J. 08691. Applicant's representative: Morton E. Kiel, 140 Cedar Street, New York, NY 10006. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Bananas*, and *agricultural commodities* otherwise exempt from economic regulation under section 203(B)(6) of the Act when transported in mixed shipments with bananas, from Newark, N.J., Wilmington, Del., points in the New York, N.Y., commercial zone and Albany, N.Y., to New York, N.Y., points in Westchester County, N.Y., Essex, Bergen, and Mercer Counties, N.J., and Philadelphia and Northampton Counties, Pa., and *returned shipments* of the same commodities in the opposite direction. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority but indicates that it has no present intention to tack and therefore does not identify the points or territories which can be served through tacking. Persons interested in the tacking possibilities are cautioned that failure to oppose the application may result in an unrestricted grant of authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at New York, N.Y.

No. MC 119634 (Sub-No. 6), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: DICK IRVIN, INC., 218 12th Avenue North, Post Office Box F, Shelby, MT 59474. Applicant's representative: Joe Gerbase, 100 Transwestern Building, 404 North 31st Street, Billings, MT 59101. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (A) *Glacier talc and diatomaceous earth*, in bags and in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Three Forks, Mont., to port of entry on the international boundary line between the United States and Canada at or near Sweetgrass, Mont., and (B) *gilsonite*, in bulk and in bags, from Bonanza, Utah, to port of entry on the international boundary line between the United States and Canada at or near Sweetgrass, Mont. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested

authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Great Falls or Billings, Mont.

No. MC 119880 (Sub-No. 55), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: DRUM TRANSPORT, INC., Post Office Box 2056, East Peoria, IL 61611. Applicant's representative: Donald L. Stern, 530 Univac Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Alcoholic liquors*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Detroit, Mich., to Scobeyville, N.J. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 120910 (Sub-No. 4), filed January 10, 1973. Applicant: SERVICE EXPRESS, INC., Post Office Box 1009, Tuscaloosa, AL 35401. Applicant's representative: William P. Jackson, Jr., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. (A) Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Plastic pipe*, from the plantsite and warehouse facilities of Central Foundry Co. located at Holt, Ala., to points in Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Miss.; Benton, Washington, Madison, Carroll, Newton, Boone, Marion, Searcy, Stone, Izard, Fulton, Sharp, Lawrence, Randolph, Clay, Greene, Craighead, and Mississippi Counties, Ark.; Newton, McDonald, Barry, Stone, Taney, Christian, Douglas, Ozark, Howell, Oregon, Ripley, Carter, Butler, Stoddard, Mississippi, New Madrid, Dunklin, and Permiscot Counties, Mo., restricted to the transportation of shipments originating at the plantsite and warehouse facilities of Central Foundry Co. at Holt, Ala.; (2) *General commodities* (except classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and commodities requiring special equipment), between Tuscaloosa, Ala., on the one hand, and, on the other points within 75 miles of Tuscaloosa, Ala., that are located within the State of Alabama, restricted to the transportation of shipments originating at or destined to Tuscaloosa, Ala., and points within the commercial zone thereof;

And (3) *Building materials, farm products, fertilizer, gravel, household goods, live stock*, and *sand*, between points in Alabama within a radius of 100 miles of Greensboro, Ala. including Greensboro, Ala. (B) Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and commodities requiring special equipment), between Coffeeville and Mobile, Ala.: from Coffeeville, over Alabama Highway 69 via Salitpa, Ala., to Jackson, Ala., thence over Alabama Highway 13 to Mobile, Ala., and return over the same route, restricted such that no freight is to be handled between Mobile and Jackson, Ala., or intermediate points between Mobile and Jackson, Ala. NOTE: Applicant's requests for authority in parts (A)(2), (A)(3) and (B) above seek to convert authority it presently holds in certificate of registration No. MC–120910 (Sub-No. 2), issued April 25, 1966, to a certificate of public convenience and necessity. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority, and that no duplicating authority is sought If a hearing is deemd necessary, applicant requests it be held at Tuscaloosa, Birmingham, or Montgomery, Ala.

No. MC 121082 (Sub-No. 5) (Amendment), filed October 10, 1972, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of November 16, 1972, and republished this issue. Applicant: ALLIED DELIVERY SYSTEM, INC., 2201 Fenkell Avenue, Detroit, MI 48238. Applicant's representative: William B. Elmer, 23801 Gratiot Avenue, East Detroit, MI 48021. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (A) *Patterns*, from the plantsite of Simplicity Pattern Co., Inc., at Niles, Mich., to points in Ohio on and west of Ohio Highway 4 from Sandusky to Springfield, and on and north of U.S. Highway 40 from Springfield to the Indiana State boundary line; points in Indiana on and north of U.S. Highway 50, points in Illinois on and north and east of Interstate 74, and points in Wisconsin on and south of U.S. Highway 18; (B) *packages*, not less than 25 pounds and not more than 70 pounds in weight in an industrial plant and commercial delivery service, from Detroit, Mich., and points within 8 miles thereof to points within 25 miles of Detroit, Mich., with return of rejected, refused, and damaged shipments, subject to the following restrictions: (1) No less than 25 pounds and no more than 200 pounds shall be delivered in any one day from one consignor to any one consignee; (2) no service shall be rendered to or from New Baltimore or New Haven and shipments to and from Mount Clemens from any one consignor to any one consignee on one day shall not exceed 50 pounds; (3) this grant of authority and any other authority granted to date hereof shall not be considered separable for purposes of transfer or sale;

(4) No vehicle operated under this grant of authority shall be used exclusively by any one shipper and all shipments shall be handled on a consolidated basis with a uniform charge applicable thereto; (C) *Restaurant and store fixtures, office equipment, printing machinery and supplies, janitor supplies, and salvage materials*, between Detroit, Mich., and points in Michigan. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority but indicates that it has no present intention to tack and therefore does not identify the points or territories which can be served through tacking. Persons interested in the tacking possibilities are cautioned that failure to oppose the application may result in an unrestricted grant of authority. Parts (B) and (C) of this application are presently held by applicant in certificate of registration No. MC–121082 (Sub-Nos. 1 and 2), and by the request herein applicant seeks to convert this authority to a certificate of public convenience and necessity. The purpose of this republication is to indicate that the authority requested in part (A) above is not a conversion proceeding and to indicate the requests for authority in parts (B) and (C) above. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Lansing or Detroit, Mich.

No. MC 123176 (Sub-No. 10), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: ROLLAND GUENTHER, doing business as R. GUENTHER TRUCKING, 3905 Kraus Lane, Ross, OH 45061. Applicant's representative: Jack B. Josselson, 700 Atlas Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Used empty whiskey barrels*, from Pekin, Ill., to Overpeck, Ohio. NOTE: Applicant holds a motor contract carrier permit in No. MC–78725, therefore dual operations may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Cincinnati or Columbus, Ohio.

No. MC 123556 (Sub-No. 4), filed January 8, 1973. Applicant: RAHIER TRUCKING, INC., 1822 South First Street, Yakima, WA 98901. Applicant's representative: Warren L. Dewar, Jr., 303 East D Street, Yakima, WA 98901. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Roofing and roofing materials*, from points in Multnomah County, Oreg., to points in Okanogan, Chelan, Kittitas, Klickitat, Yakima, Douglas, Grant, Benton, Adams, Franklin, Walla Walla, Whitman, Columbia, Garfield, and Asotin Counties, Wash. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Yakima, Kennewick, Richland, or Pasco, Wash., Portland, Oreg., or Seattle, Wash.

No. MC 124174 (Sub-No. 94), filed January 15, 1973. Applicant: MOMSEN TRUCKING CO., a Corporation, 2405 Hiway Boulevard, Spencer, IA 51301. Applicant's representative: Marshall D. Becker, 530 Univac Building, 7100 West Center Road, Omaha, NE 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, classes A and B explosives, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving the site of Western Electric Co. at or near Underwood, Iowa, as an off-route point in connection with

applicant's presently authorized regular route operations. NOTE: Common control may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests a consolidated hearing with coapplicants at Omaha, Nebr.

No. MC 125764 (Sub-No. 7), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: LILAC CITY EXPRESS, INC., Post Office Box 13186, Spokane, WA 99213. Applicant's representative: Donald A. Ericson, 708 Old National Bank Building, Spokane, Wash. 99201. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Packaged foodstuffs* (except fresh meats and frozen foods), from points in San Francisco, Sonoma, Monterey, Merced, Fresno, and Orange Counties, Calif., to points in Spokane County, Wash., under a continuing contract, or contracts, with U.R.M. Stores, Inc. at Spokane, Wash. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Spokane, or Seattle, Wash., or Portland, Oreg.

No. MC 126222 (Sub-No. 13), filed January 18, 1973. Applicant: JOSEPH A. SIEFERT AND JOSEPH J. SIEFERT, a partnership, doing business as SIEFERT BROS. TRUCKING CO., Post Office Box 310, Du Quoin, IL 62832. Applicant's representative: G. M. Rebman, 314 North Broadway, 1230 Boatman's Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo. 63102. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Plastic pipe and component parts*, from the plantsite and shipping facilities of Drainage Engineering Co., at Benton, Ill., to points in Illinois, Tennessee, Michigan, Indiana, Missouri, Ohio, Iowa, Arkansas, Kentucky, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and Oklahoma, under contract with Drainage Engineering Co. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at St. Louis, Mo., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 126899 (Sub-No. 61), filed January 24, 1973. Applicant: USHER TRANSPORT, INC., 3925 Old Benton Road, Paducah, KY 42001. Applicant's representative: George M. Catlett, 703–706 McClure Building, Frankfort, Ky. 40601. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Malt beverages*, in containers, and *related advertising materials and premiums, and empty malt beverage containers on return*, from Evansville, Ind., to points in Ohio, the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, Kentucky (except Hopkinsville), Pennsylvania, West Virginia, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and those points in Illinois lying on and north of the junction of U.S. Highway 34 and the Illinois-Iowa State line, thence along U.S. Highway 34 to its junction with Illinois Highway 116, thence along Illinois Highway 116 to Peoria, Ill., thence along U.S. Highway 24 to the Illinois-Indiana State line; (2) *malt beverage containers* (a) from points in Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania, to Evansville, Ind.; and, (b) from points in Illinois, the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, Indiana, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, to Newport, Ky. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority can be tacked with its existing authority at Sub 26 to allow service from Milwaukee, Wis., to points in Kentucky (except Hopkinsville) but it has no present intentions to tack. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, or Louisville, Ky.

No. MC 126956 (Sub-No. 8), filed January 31, 1973. Applicant: NORTHLAND TRANSPORT, INC., 1803 42d Avenue East, Superior, WI 54880. Applicant's representative: Robert D. Gisvold, 1000 First National Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Foodstuffs*, from Duluth, Minn., to points in Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia, under a continuing contract with Jeno's, Inc., Duluth, Minn. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Minneapolis, Minn.

No. MC 127505 (Sub-No. 53), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: RALPH H. BOELK, doing business as R. H. BOELK TRUCK LINES, Route 2, Mendota, Ill. 61342. Applicant's representative: William H. Towle, 127 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60602. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Plastic pipe, fittings and accessories* (except those which because of size or weight require special equipment or handling), (1) from Davidson, Mich., to points in Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; (2) from Faribault, Minn., to points in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin; and (3) from Wilton, Iowa, to points in Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, and Wisconsin. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Detroit, Mich., or Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 127962 (Sub-No. 4), filed January 30, 1973. Applicant: J. W. POOLE, INC., Post Office Box 408, Wytheville, VA 24832. Applicant's representative: Robert R. Tiernan, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20036. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Metal threaded screws, bolts, nuts, and wire*, from Norfolk, Va., to Elk Creek, Va., on traffic having a prior movement in foreign commerce, under contract with American Screw (a Division of Textron Industries, Inc.). NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Washington, D.C., or Roanoke, Va.

No. MC 128616 (Sub-No. 11), filed January 9, 1973. Applicant: BANKERS DISPATCH CORPORATION, 4970 South Archer Avenue, Chicago, IL 60632. Applicant's representative: Arnold Burke, Suite 1133, 127 North Dearborn, Chicago, IL 60604. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Commercial papers, documents, and written instruments* (except coins, currency, and negotiable securities) as are used in the conduct and operation of banks and banking institutions, between Detroit, Mich., on the one hand, and, on the other Buffalo, N.Y., under contract with banks and banking institutions. NOTE: Applicant holds common carrier authority under MC 114533 and subs thereto, therefore, dual operations may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Detroit, Mich. or Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 129282 (Sub-No. 16), filed December 15, 1972. Applicant: BERRY TRANSPORTATION, INC., Post Office Box 1824, Longview, TX 75601. Applicant's representative: Fred S. Berry (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Paper and paper articles*, from Monroe and West Monroe, La., to Beaumont, Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, Longview, Lufkin, Nacogdoches, and Tyler, Tex. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Monroe or Shreveport, La.

No. MC 133220 (Sub-No. 7), filed January 23, 1973. Applicant: RECORD TRUCK LINE, INC., Post Office Box 11, Henderson, TN 38340. Applicant's representative: R. Connor Wiggins, Jr., 909 100 North Main Building, Memphis, Tenn. 38103. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Fire prevention sprinkler systems and fire prevention sprinkler systems parts, accessories, and attachments, and tools, devices and apparatus* used in the installation and erection thereof; and (2) *pipe fittings, pipe connections, pipe hangers, castings and valves*, from the plantsite and warehouse facilities of ITT-Grinnell Corp., located at or near Clito, Ga., to points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii); and (3) *materials, tools, devices and apparatus* used in the fabrication, assembly, and installation of (1) and (2) from points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii) to the plantsite and warehouse facilities of ITT-Grinnell Corp., located at or near Cleito, Ga., under contract with ITT-Grinnell Corp. and Grinnell Corp. NOTE: Applicant holds common carrier authority under MC 125227 and subs thereto, therefore dual operations may be involved. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Atlanta, Ga.

No. MC 133775 (Sub-No. 13), filed January 16, 1973. Applicant: REEFER TRANSIT LINE, INC., 55 East Washington Street, Chicago, IL 60602. Applicant's representative: Daniel C. Sullivan, 327 South La Salle Street, Suite 1000, Chicago, IL 60604. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat by-products and articles distributed by meat packinghouses*, as described in sections A and C of appendix I to the report in Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates, 61 MCC 209 and 766 (except hides and commodities in bulk), from the plantsites and storage facilities of Spencer Foods, Inc. at or near Spencer, Harley, and Cherokee, Iowa, to points in Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Common control may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot or will not be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 134182 (Sub-No. 10), filed January 29, 1973. Applicant: MILK PRODUCERS MARKETING COMPANY, doing business as, ALL STAR TRANSPORTATION, a corporation, Second and West Turnpike Road, Lawrence, Kans. 66044. Applicant's representative: Warren H. Sapp, 910 Fairfax Building, 101 West 11th Street, Kansas City, MO 64105. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat byproducts and articles distributed by meat packinghouses*, as described in sections A and C to appendix I to the report in Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates, 61 MCC 209 and 766 (except hides and commodities in bulk), from Mankato, Kans., to points in Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the District of Columbia. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Kansas City, Mo., Topeka or Wichita, Kans.

No. MC 134599 (Sub-No. 68), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: INTERSTATE CONTRACT CARRIER CORPORATION, Post Office Box 748, Salt Lake City, UT 84110. Applicant's representative: Richard A. Peterson, Post Office Box 80806, Lincoln, NE 68501. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Crated office furniture and parts thereof, and related advertising sales and promotional materials*, from the plantsite and facilities of Steelcase Corp. at Grand Rapids, Mich., to points in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware, under a continuing contract, or contracts, with Steelcase Corp. at Grand Rapids, Mich. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Salt Lake City, Utah, or Lincoln, Nebr.

No. MC 135445 (Sub-No. 1) (Correction), filed December 10, 1972, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on February 8, 1973, and republished as corrected this issue. Applicant: THOMAS E. ZABEL, Route 1, Box 118, Plainview, MN 55964. Applicant's representative: F. H. Kroeger, 2288 University Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55114. NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to show the correct docket number assigned thereto, as shown above, in lieu of No. MC 135455 (Sub-No. 1), which was published in error. The rest of the notice of filing remains as previously published.

No. MC 134755 (Sub-No. 33) (Amendment), filed October 2, 1972, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of October 27, 1972, and republished, as amended, this issue. Applicant: CHARTER EXPRESS, INC., 1959 East Turner Street, Box 3772, Springfield, MO 65804. Applicant's representative: Le Roy Smith (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Articles* manufactured and/or dealt in by wholesale and retail grocery houses, from the facilities of United Facilities, Inc., located at or near Galesburg, Ill., to points in Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. NOTE: The purpose of this amendment is to indicate Missouri as an additional destination State. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Chicago, Ill., or St. Louis, Mo.

No. MC 135797 (Sub-No. 7), filed January 10, 1973. Applicant: J. B. HUNT TRANSPORT, INC., 833 Warner Street SW., Atlanta, GA 30310. Applicant's representative: Virgil H. Smith, Suite 12, 1587 Phoenix Boulevard, Atlanta, GA 30349. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Expanded polystyrene forms and shapes*, in packages, (1) from the plantsite of Mobil Chemical Co., located at or near Frankfort, Ill., to points in Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas; and (2) from the plantsite of Mobile Chemical Co., located at or near Covington, Ga., to points in Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests to be held at Atlanta, Ga., or Dallas, Tex.

No. MC 135871 (Sub-No. 14), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: H.G.M. TRANSPORT COMPANY, a corporation, 1079 West Side Avenue, Jersey City, NJ 07306. Applicant's representative: George A. Olsen, 69 Tonnele Avenue, Jersey City, NJ 07306. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Such commodities* as are dealt in by department stores, and *supplies and equipment* used in the conduct of such business, between points in the New York, N.Y., and Jersey City, N.J., commercial zone as defined by the Commission, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, under continuing contract with Ames Department Stores, Inc. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at New York, N.Y., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 135874 (Sub-No. 17), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: LTL PERISHABLES, INC., Post Office Box 37468, Millard Station, Omaha, NE 68137. Applicant's representative: Donald L. Stern, 530 Univac Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68106. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Animal casings*, from Rockport, Mo., to Chicago, Ill. NOTE: Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Omaha, Nebr.

No. MC 136431 (Sub-No. 2), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: FRANK ANDLER, doing business as A.T.C. TRUCKING COMPANY, Post Office Box 684, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080. Applicant's representative: William B. Elmer, 21635 East Nine Mile Road, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Hardwood flooring and materials and supplies* used in connection with the installation, repair or maintenance thereof, from Ishpeming, Mich., and White Lake, Wis., to points in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin, and *lumber* from points in above-named destination territory to Ishpeming, Mich., and White Lake, Wis., and (2) *lumber* from points in Alger, Delta, Houghton, Marquette, Menominee, and Schoolcraft Counties, Mich., to points in Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. NOTE: Applicant holds contract carrier authority under MC 114365, therefore dual operations may be involved. Applicant states that the requested authority cannot be tacked with its existing authority. If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Lansing, Mich., Detroit, Mich., or Chicago, Ill.

No. MC 136760 (Sub-No. 1), filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: LISAN TRUCKING CORP., 200 Markley Street,

Port Reading, NJ 07064. Applicant's representative: A. David Millner, 744 Broad Street, Newark, NJ 07102. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Household chemical products* (except in bulk), from Port Reading, N.J. to New York, N.Y., to points in Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties, N.Y., Lisbon, Mansfield, and Rockville, Conn., Hialeah, Jacksonville, and Miami, Fla., Portland, Maine, Baltimore, Md., Canton, East Weymouth, Norton, South Boston, and Springfield, Mass., Linden, N.J., Syracuse and Waterford, N.Y., Ambridge, Dubois, McKeesport, Murraysville, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, Pa., Esmond, R.I., and Manchester, N.H., under a continuing contract, or contracts, with Sage Laboratories, Inc. at New York, N.Y. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at New York, N.Y.

No. MC 136891 (Sub-No. 1), filed January 11, 1973. Applicant: STAN WATKINS TRUCKING, INC., 406 Fifth Avenue South, Shelby, MT 59474. Applicant's representative: Howard C. Burton, Post Office Box 2265, Great Falls, MT 59403. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (A) *malt beverages*, in bottles, can and kegs, (1) from the facilities of Theodore Hamm Brewing Co. at San Francisco, Calif. and St. Paul, Minn. to Shelby, Mont.; (2) from the facilities of Theodore Hamm Brewing Co. at San Francisco, Calif. to Kalispell and Libby, Mont.; (3) from the facilities of Ranier Brewing Co. at Seattle, Wash. to Missoula, Great Falls, and Shelby, Mont.; (4) from the facilities of Carling Brewing Co. at Tacoma, Wash. to Libby, Kalispell, Shelby, and Great Falls, Mont.; (5) from the facilities of Lucky Breweries, Inc. at Vancouver, Wash. and San Francisco, Calif. to Shelby and Havre, Mont.; (6) from the facilities of Pabst Brewing Co. at Los Angeles, Calif. and Milwaukee, Wis. to Missoula, Mont.; (7) from the facilities of Miller Brewing Co. at Azusa, Calif. to Great Falls, Kalispell and Libby, Mont.; (8) from the facilities of Anhauser-Busch, Inc. at Van Nuys, Calif. to Missoula, Shelby and Harve, Mont.;

(9) From the facilities of Minneapolis Brewing Co. (Grain Belt) at Minneapolis, Minn., to Missoula, Mont.; (10) from the facilities of Jacob Schmidt Brewing Co. at Minneapolis, Minn., to Missoula, Mont.; (11) from the facilities of Heileman Brewing Co. (Old Style), at LaCrosse, Wis., to Shelby, Mont.; and (12) from the facilities of Joesph Schlitz Brewing Co. at Milwaukee, Wis., to Shelby, Mont.; (B) *carbonated beverages*, in bottles and cans, from Chico and Vista, Calif., Portland and Eugene, Oreg., and Seattle and Yakima, Wash., to Missoula, Great Falls, Shelby, Harve, Kalispell, and Libby, Mont.; and (C) *return shipments of bottles*, from the destination points in (A) and (B) above, to the origin points in (A) and (B) above, restricted to mixed truckload lots consisting of a minimum of 42,000 pounds of all liquid commodities and a minimum of 20,000 pounds of bottles, kegs, cans, and pallets. The service to be performed in (A), (B), and (C) above will be under continuing contracts with: (a) Gusto Distributors at Great Falls, Mont.; (b) Harve Distributors at Harve, Mont.; (c) Lee Distributors at Kalispell, Mont.; (d) Shelby Distributors at Shelby, Mont.; (e) Triple "C" Distributors at Shelby, Mont.; and (f) Zip Beverages at Missoula, Mont. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Great Falls, Helena, or Missoula, Mont.

No. MC 136927 (Sub-No. 2), filed November 29, 1972. Applicant: PETERSEN NORTHWEST CORPORATION, Post Office Box 3156, Midway, WA. Applicant's representative: George Kargianis, 2120 Pacific Building, Seattle, Wash. 98104. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes transporting: *Modular or factory constructed buildings or substantial sections thereof* in truckaway service and/or towaway service, from points in Washington to points in Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and points within said States. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Seattle, Wash.

No. MC 138043 (Sub-No. 1), filed September 18, 1972. Applicant: F. W. CASPERSEN, 622 Madison Avenue, Glencoe, IL 60022. Applicant's representative: Donald S. Mullins, 4704 West Irving Park Road, Chicago, IL 60641. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Radiopharmaceuticals, radioactive drugs, medical isotopes, and medical test kits*, between St. Louis, Mo., and Chicago, Ill., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, restricted to shipments weighing not more than 100 pounds and packages not exceeding 50 pounds, under contract with Mallinckrodt/Nuclear. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at either Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; or Milwaukee, Wis.

No. MC 138098 (Sub-No. 1), filed January 31, 1973. Applicant: JACK E. BRAZIL, doing business as BRAZIL VAN & STORAGE, 1427 D West Park Avenue, Redlands, CA 92373. Applicant's representative: Alan F. Wohlstetter, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Used household goods*, as defined by the Commission, restricted to the transportation of traffic having a prior or subsequent movement beyond said points in containers, and further restricted to the performance of pickup and delivery service in connection with packing, crating, and containerization or unpacking, uncrating, and decontainerization of such traffic, between points in Imperial, San Diego, Kern, Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties, Calif. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Redlands or Los Angeles, Calif.

No. MC 138277 (Sub-No. 1), filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: GEER TRUCKING CO., INC., Post Office Box 11993, Tampa, FL 33610. Applicant's representative: William P. Jackson, Jr., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fabricated steel products*, from points in Florence and Darlington Counties, S.C., to points in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Columbia, S.C., or Washington, D.C.

No. MC 138338, filed December 27, 1972. Applicant: JAMES L. (JIM) PERKINS, Route No. 2, Box 248, Jellico, TN 37762. Applicant's representative: Don R. Moses, Post Office Box 67, Jellico, TN 37762. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Stone, crushed stone, and products* made from stone or crushed stone (including but not limited to asphalt paving materials) in dump trucks, between points in the area bounded as described herein: Beginning at Caryville, Tenn., thence northeast along U.S. Highway 25W to La Follette, Tenn.; thence northeast along Tennessee Highway 63 to the intersection of U.S. Highway 25E near Harrogate, Tenn.; thence north and northwest along U.S. Highway 25E to the intersection of Kentucky Highway 229; thence northwest along Kentucky 229 Highway to the intersection of Kentucky Highway 192; thence southwest along Kentucky Highway 192 to Baldrock, Ky.; thence southwest to U.S. Highway 27 at Parkers Lake, Ky.; thence south along U.S. Highway 27 to the intersection of Tennessee Highway 63; thence along Tennessee Highway 63 south and southeast to Caryville, Tenn., under contract with Jellico Stone Co., Inc., and Nally & Gibson Surfacing, Inc. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests that it be held at Nashville, Tenn.

No. MC 138402, filed January 26, 1973. Applicant: IOWA COMMODITIES, INC., Sheldon, Iowa 51201. Applicant's representative: Robert G. Planansky, Post Office Box 82028, 605 South 14th Street, Lincoln, NE 68501. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Dry animal and poultry feeds, dry animal and poultry feed ingredients, and animal and poultry health aids* from the plantsites and warehouse storage facilities of Land O' Lakes at Sheldon and Fort Dodge, Iowa, to points in Minnesota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada; (2) *animal and poultry feed ingredients* from the destination area named in (1) above to Sheldon and Fort Dodge, Iowa, on return; and (3) *anhydrous ammonia* from Spencer, Iowa, to points in Minnesota, South Dakota, and Nebraska. Restriction: The authority set forth above

is restricted to the transportation services to be performed under a continuing contract with Land O' Lakes. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Sioux City, Iowa, or Omaha, Nebr.

MOTOR CARRIER OF PASSENGERS

No. MC 138313, filed December 20, 1972. Applicant: NORTHERN BUS LINES LIMITED, 1416 Third Avenue South, Lethbridge, AB, Canada T1J0K7. Applicant's representative: B. P. Offet, Suite 204, 324 Seventh Street South, Lethbridge, AB, Canada T1J3Z6. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle with passengers, in special and charter operations, in round trip sightseeing or pleasure tours, beginning and ending at ports of entry on the United States-Canada boundary line and extending to points in the United States (including Alaska but excluding Hawaii). NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Billings, Mont.

No. MC 138401, filed January 22, 1973. Applicant: CLAUDE G. PEARSON BUSES LIMITED, 68 Queen Street South, Tilbury, ON, Canada. Applicant's representative: Wilhelmina Boersma, 1600 First Federal Building, Detroit, Mich. 48226. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in round trip charter operations, beginning and ending at ports of entry on the United States-Canada international boundary line at or near Detroit and Port Huron, Mich., and extending to points in Michigan. NOTE: If a hearing is deemed necessary, applicant requests it be held at Detroit or Lansing, Mich.

APPLICATION FOR FILING WATER CARRIERS

No. W-1263 (Sub-No. 2) (New England Steamboat Lines, Inc., Common Carrier Application), filed February 22, 1973. Applicant: NEW ENGLAND STEAMBOAT LINES, INC., 263 Main Street, Old Saybrook, CT 06475. Applicant's representative: James A. Natalie, Jr., Middletown Savings Bank Building, Middletown, Conn. 06475. Application of New England Steamboat Lines, Inc., filed February 22, 1973, for a certificate to operate as a *common carrier*, by water, in interstate or foreign commerce, in the transportation of *passengers, motor vehicles, and commodities* loose and in vehicles, in round trip operations between Chester, Deep River, East Haddam, Middletown, and Old Saybrook, Conn., on the one hand, and, on the other, Greenport, Long Island, N.Y. All of the above are identical to service presently being provided by the applicant, previously known as Connecticut Steamboat Line, Inc., under grant of temporary authority, No. W-1263 (Sub-No. ITA, dated January 10, 1973.

No. W-1264 (Cruises East, Inc., Common Carrier Application), filed February 13, 1973. Applicant: CRUISES EAST, INC., Pier No. 1, Montauk, N.Y. Applicant's representative: Richard A. Corwin, 1 State Street Plaza, New York, NY 10004. Application of Cruises East, Inc., filed February 13, 1973, for a certificate to operate as a *common carrier*, by water, in interstate or foreign commerce, in the transportation of *passengers*, permitting it to operate the MV *Pompano*, a vessel owned by the corporation, in a daily scheduled service between Pier No. 1, Montauk Point, Long Island, N.Y., and Old Harbor Dock, Block Island, R.I.

APPLICATION FOR POSTAL CERTIFICATE

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, No. MC-137023 (Notice of Filing an Application for a Postal Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity), filed January 15, 1973. Applicant: SAM BALLARD, 821 A Street, Meridian, MS 39301. Applicant's representative: John Ballard, 4230 37th Avenue, Meridian, MS 39301. By application filed January 15, 1972, applicant seeks a postal certificate of public convenience and necessity to transport mail in the following territory: (1) Serving Meridian, Miss.; (2) between Meridian, Miss., and New Orleans, La., from Meridian, over Interstate Highway 59 to New Orleans, and return over the same route, serving the off-route points of Laurel, Hattiesburg, Poplarville, and Picayune, Miss.; (3) between Meridian, Miss., and Jackson, Miss., from Meridian, over Interstate Highway 20 to Jackson, and return over the same route, serving the Jackson Airport as an off-route point; (4) between Meridian, Miss., and Mobile, Ala., from Meridian, over U.S. Highway 45 to Mobile, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate point of Waynesboro; (5) between Meridian, Miss., and Macon, Miss., from Meridian, over U.S. Highway 45 to Macon, and return over the same route, serving the intermediate points of Porterville, Electric Mills, Scooba, and Shuqualak, Miss.;

And (6) between Meridian, Miss., and Louisville, Miss., from Meridian, over Mississippi Highway 19 to Philadelphia, thence from Philadelphia over Mississippi Highway 15 to Louisville, and return over the same routes, serving the intermediate points of Collinsville, Philadelphia, and Noxapater, Miss. Appended to the application are copies of six postal contracts held by applicant which were in effect on July 1, 1971, the critical "grandfather" date: Route No. 393-AY relating to service in the city of Meridian, Miss.; Route No. 39311 relating to service between Meridian, Miss., and New Orleans, La.; Route No. 39011 relating to service between Meridian, Miss., and Jackson, Miss.; Route No. 36910 relating to service between Meridian, Miss., and Mobile, Ala.; Route No. 39337 relating to service between Meridian, Miss., and Macon, Miss.; and Route No. 39332 relating to service between Meridian, Miss., and Louisville, Miss.

Any interested person desiring to oppose the application may file with the Commission an original and one copy of his written representations, views, or arguments in opposition to the application on or before April 9, 1973. A copy of each such pleading should be served upon applicant's representative.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] ROBERT L. OSWALD,
Secretary.

[FR Doc.73-4381 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]

CUMULATIVE LISTS OF PARTS AFFECTED—MARCH

The following numerical guide is a list of parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published to date during March.

3 CFR

PROCLAMATIONS:
3044 (See EO 11705) 6135
4190 5617
4191 5993
4192 6133

EXECUTIVE ORDERS:
11642 (see EO 11704) 5619
11704 5619
11705 6135

4 CFR

303 5455
304 5621

5 CFR

213 ..... 5621, 5837, 5995

6 CFR

130 ..... 5995, 6283

7 CFR

51 5622
58 5622
68 6284
210 6164
215 6165
220 6165
225 6165
250 6165
265 6166
270 6166
295 6166
301 ..... 5877, 6286
401 5878
722 ..... 5879, 5880
730 6287
811 6287
907 ..... 5480, 5880
908 ..... 5480, 6288
910 ..... 5623, 6167
928 5880
1079 5996

PROPOSED RULES:
52 6188
724 5905
991 5882
1103 5641
1125 5882
1701 5643

8 CFR

100 5996
341 5997
343a 5997

9 CFR

73 5624
76 ..... 5455, 6167
82 6167
94 6275

PROPOSED RULES:
92 5641

10 CFR

2 5624
50 5997

PROPOSED RULES:
50 5659
70 5659
73 5659

12 CFR

211 5837
545 6057
561 6057
563 6057
746 5625

13 CFR

61 6275

PROPOSED RULES:
121 6291
124 6081

14 CFR

39 ..... 5626, 5627, 6168
61 6276
71 ..... 5455, 5456 5627, 5628, 5838, 6168, 6169, 6276
73 5628
95 5628
97 ..... 5456, 6276
221 ..... 5838, 6060
302 5630
385 6061
400 6169
401 6170
425 6170
435 6170

PROPOSED RULES:
71 ..... 5482, 5657, 5658, 5911, 5912, 6075, 6194, 6290
105 6076

15 CFR

PROPOSED RULES:
1000 5906

16 CFR

13 ..... 5838, 6062, 6063

PROPOSED RULES:
255 6191

17 CFR

210 6064
231 5457
240 6277
241 5457
271 5457
276 5457

PROPOSED RULES:
1 6190
275 5912

18 CFR

305 5458

19 CFR

1 6069
8 5630
19 5630

PROPOSED RULES:
134 6181

20 CFR

210 5631
238 6171
801 6171
802 6171

PROPOSED RULES:
404 5656

21 CFR

1 5459
130 ..... 6137, 6258
132 6258
135b 5840, 5841
135c 5840, 5841, 6137
148e 5459
148m 5459
191 6138
191b 6138
295 5459

PROPOSED RULES:
1 6191
131 6191
176 6191
145 6074
278 6290
295 6074

24 CFR

1700 5841
1914 5461
1915 5462

26 CFR

1 ..... 5462, 5842, 6148, 6277
12 6277
301 6148

PROPOSED RULES:
45 6181
53 6075

29 CFR

2 5631
103 6176
511 6278
1916 5467
1917 5467
1918 5467
1952 6177

PROPOSED RULES:
1602 5659
1910 5644

32 CFR

719 5997
720 6021
727 6026
750 6028
751 6040
753 6048
756 6052
757 6053
823 5632
1661 6279
1709 6177

PROPOSED RULES:
216 6186
1604 5667
1613 5667

33 CFR

127 6069
207 5468

PROPOSED RULES:
117 5657

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATES—MARCH

Pages	*Date*
5449–5609	Mar. 1
5611–5829	2
5831–5985	5
5987–6125	6
6127–6267	7
6269–6360	8

federal register

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1973
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Volume 38 ■ Number 45

PART II

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

■

NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR USE IN ANIMAL FEEDS

Combination Antibiotic Drugs No Longer Sanctioned

Title 21—Food and Drugs

CHAPTER I—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SUBCHAPTER C—DRUGS

PART 135e—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR USE IN ANIMAL FEEDS

Combination Antibiotic Drugs Used in Animal Feeds No Longer Sanctioned

An order was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of October 7, 1972 (37 FR 21279), effective upon publication, establishing a new § 135e.1000 *Combination antibiotic drugs in animal feeds no longer sanctioned.*

Based upon the receipt of information that errors appeared to have been made in the combination antibiotic drug listing in § 135e.1000(c), the Commissioner of Food and Drugs published an order in the FEDERAL REGISTER of November 4, 1972 (37 FR 23538) staying the effective date of § 135e.1000 for a period of 30 days and inviting interested persons to submit written comments within such period of time on what they believed to be errors in the combination antibiotic drug listing.

Comments were received from eight firms. Having considered the comments received and other relevant information the Commissioner concludes that the combination antibiotic drug listing in § 135e.1000(c) should be corrected to read as set forth below.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 512, 82 Stat. 343–351; 21 U.S.C. 360b) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), § 135e.1000 is amended in the table in paragraph (c) to read as set forth below.

Effective date. This order shall be effective on March 7, 1973.

(Sec. 512, 82 Stat. 343–351; 21 U.S.C. 360b)

Dated: February 14, 1973.

WILLIAM F. RANDOLPH,
Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.

§ 135e.1000 Combination antibiotic drugs in animal feeds no longer sanctioned.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	SPECIES: CHICKEN BREEDER	
83810	RESERPINE	.002 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	10-200 GM/TON
	SPECIES: CHICKEN BROILER	
83021	AMPROLIUM	.004-.025 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
83023	AMPROLIUM	.004-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
83027	AMPROLIUM	.004-.25 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
83043	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83052	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83056	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.025-.005 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
83100	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
-	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
83126	AMPROLIUM	.004-.0125 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83143	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
83145	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83146	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83159	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
83189	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
83190	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0035 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
83198	AMPROLIUM	.004-.0125 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83149	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.01 PERCENT
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
83082	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	.0125 PERCENT
83138	HYGROMYCIN B	8 GM/TON
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83060	NIHYDRAZONE	100 GM/TON
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83049	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83050	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83051	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83122	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83123	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	200 GM/TON MAXIMUM
83066	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	ZOALENE	.0125 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83075	ROXARSONE	.005 PERCENT
	ZOALENE	.0125 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83076	ROXARSONE	.005 PERCENT
	ZOALENE	.0125 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83032	ZOALENE	.0125 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	8-12 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	TYLOSIN	3.2-50 GM/TON COMB.
83069	ZOALENE	.0125 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	TYLOSIN	3.2-50 GM/TON COMB.
83133	ZOALENE	.0125 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83135	ZOALENE	.004-.0125 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83205	ZOALENE	.004-.0125 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	SPECIES: CHICKEN LAYER	
83714	RESERPINE	.0002 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-200 GM/TON
	SPECIES: CHICKEN REPLACEMENT	
83411	AMPROLIUM	.004-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
83416	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
83417	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
83430	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
83431	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83444	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
83551	AMPROLIUM	.004-.0125 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83506	NIHYDRAZONE	100 GM/TON
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83442	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
83443	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83463	ROXARSONE	.005 PERCENT
	ZOALENE	.0125 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6 GM/TON
83539	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	ZOALENE	.0083-.0125 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83453	ZOALENE	.004-.0125 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
83480	ZOALENE	.004-.0125 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	8-12 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	TYLOSIN	3.2-50 GM/TON COMB.
83537	ZOALENE	.0083-.0125 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.01 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	SPECIES: CHICKEN UNSPECIFIED	
82121	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
82122	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
82753	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ETHOPABATE	.0004 PERCENT
82005	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82057	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82069	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82378	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82418	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB
82425	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82139	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
82140	BACITRACIN	3.6-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50 GM/TON COMB.
82141	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
82142	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82000	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82171	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
82173	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82502	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82503	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
82504	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82505	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
82783	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	SODIUM FLUORIDE	.5-1 PERCENT
82754	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82756	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82484	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82496	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82739	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82883	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82662	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
82663	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
82203	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82204	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82205	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON
82206	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82547	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82638	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82639	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
82493	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82944	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82945	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON
82946	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82947	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82948	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82949	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82950	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON
82951	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	PENICILLIN PLUS STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82952	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82953	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82954	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82955	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82956	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82011	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82012	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82060	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82066	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100-500 GM/TON
82072	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82176	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82222	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
82353	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82414	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82428	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82435	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	50-100 GM/TON
82442	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON
82449	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100-200 GM/TON
82543	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82548	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82549	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015-.05 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82550	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015-.05 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82552	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015-.05 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82553	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015-.05 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
82556	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PROCAINE PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON
82559	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82561	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON COMB.
82567	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	50 GM/TON
82572	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
82574	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON COMB.
82578	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
82580	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON COMB.
82934	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82939	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82501	HYGROMYCIN B	8-12 GM/TON
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82123	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82127	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82129	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82131	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82133	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON 125 GM/TON MAXIMUM
82135	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82196	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82562	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82569	NICARBAZIN	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	50 GM/TON
82510	NIHYDRAZONE	.011 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82019	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON MAXIMUM
82020	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82021	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82146	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82147	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6 GM/TON COMB.
82513	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82585	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82586	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82587	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82588	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00082 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82589	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82660	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82762	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82013	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82016	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82018	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82048	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82049	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82055	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	50-100 GM/TON
82056	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	50-100 GM/TON
82061	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	50-100 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN	.00083 PERCENT
82062	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82067	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100-500 GM/TON
82068	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100-500 GM/TON
82073	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82074	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	100-500 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN	125 GM/TON MAXIMUM
82092	NITROFURAZONE	.0112 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82093	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82094	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82095	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82096	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82153	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 PERCENT
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.005 PERCENT
82155	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82161	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82163	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.005 PERCENT
82180	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82181	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82223	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
82225	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
82258	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82265	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL-PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82272	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82279	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82286	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82322	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
82324	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON COMB.
82325	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
82326	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
82327	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
82328	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON COMB.
82329	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-180 GM/TON COMB.
82330	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-180 GM/TON COMB.
82332	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82333	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82334	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON COMB.
82335	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
82336	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
82337	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100 GM/TON
82338	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
82339	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100 GM/TON
82340	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON
82341	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON
82342	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
82343	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
82344	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
82356	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82368	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82370	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82394	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82415	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82417	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82422	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82424	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82429	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82431	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82443	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
82445	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
82450	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100-200 GM/TON
82452	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100-200 GM/TON
82461	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82462	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82468	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82469	NITROFURAZONE	.0112 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82471	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82472	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82678	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82680	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
82682	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82715	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82716	NITROFURAZONE	.0112 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82717	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82900	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82907	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82930	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82085	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82087	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82174	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82178	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82207	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82208	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82209	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82210	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82211	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82212	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82213	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82298	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82299	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82300	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82301	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82302	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82303	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82304	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
82305	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-200 GM/TON
82306	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
82307	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82308	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82309	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82310	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82311	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82312	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82313	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82314	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
82315	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.007 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82390	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82391	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.0025-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82392	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.0025-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82393	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
82695	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
82696	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
82713	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82887	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82294	NYSTATIN	50-100 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82295	NYSTATIN	50-100 GM/TON
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
82296	NYSTATIN	50-100 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82097	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
82098	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82107	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
82108	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82698	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82728	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NICOTINE	.003-.07 PERCENT
82729	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82765	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
82766	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON
82777	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
82778	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82860	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82861	NICOTINE	.003-.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82406	PIPERAZINE	.1-.4 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82407	PIPERAZINE	.1-.4 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82104	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82114	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82480	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82492	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82699	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82735	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82867	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82483	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82495	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB
82738	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82870	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82105	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82115	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82493	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82700	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82736	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82773	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82868	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82106	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82116	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82482	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82494	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82701	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82737	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82869	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82664	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
82665	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
82666	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
82015	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82050	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82076	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82151	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82159	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82162	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82255	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82257	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82262	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82264	ROXARSONE	.0125-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82269	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82271	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82276	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82278	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82283	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82285	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82292	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82366	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82369	ROXARSONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82423	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82430	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82444	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
82928	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82931	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82007	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82058	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82070	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
82419	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82426	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
82440	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
82022	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82023	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82024	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82025	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82026	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82027	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82079	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82080	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82083	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.033-.1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82084	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.033-.1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
82143	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82149	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82150	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82152	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82156	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82157	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82158	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82160	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82227	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82251	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82252	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82253	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82254	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82256	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82259	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82260	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82261	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82263	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82266	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82267	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82268	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82270	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82273	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82274	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82275	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82277	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82280	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82281	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82282	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82287	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82288	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82289	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82291	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82364	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82365	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.0075 PERCENT
82367	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82455	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.033-.10 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
82465	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.033-.10 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON
82506	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82526	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	PROCAINE PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
82564	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82571	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82577	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82584	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82594	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
82648	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.00075 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82884	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
82925	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82927	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82964	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82965	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82966	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82972	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82991	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
82999	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
82499	ZOALENE	.0125-.0188 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.

SPECIES: RABBIT

80059	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
80058	OXYTETRACYCLINE	10 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	10 GM/TON
80269	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.1 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	10 GM/TON
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.025 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE

SPECIES: SWINE

80032	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	150 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80045	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	150 GM/TON
	PEPSIN	
80082	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	500 GM/TON
80294	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80018	BACITRACIN	50 GM/TON
	THYROPROTEIN	200 GM/TON
80019	BACITRACIN	25 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN	25 GM/TON
	THYROPROTEIN	200 GM/TON
80020	BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
	THYROPROTEIN	200 GM/TON
80021	BACITRACIN	50 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN	50 GM/TON
	THYROPROTEIN	200 GM/TON
80113	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80133	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	10-50 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80154	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	50-100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80155	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	50-100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80158	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80161	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80168	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80232	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON COMB.
	PIPERAZINE	.6 PERCENT
80233	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON COMB.
	SODIUM FLUORIDE	.5-1 PERCENT
80266	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE	.6 PERCENT
80267	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	10-50 GM/TON

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	SODIUM FLUORIDE	.5-1 PERCENT
80273	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	50 GM/TON
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80277	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50 GM/TON COMB.
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80279	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80281	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	10-50 GM/TON
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80152	ZINC BACITRACIN	50-100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80157	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80160	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80163	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80166	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80236	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NICOTINE	.003-.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1.0 PERCENT
80238	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
	SODIUM FLUORIDE	.3 PERCENT
	SODIUM SULFATE	2 PERCENT
80241	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	SODIUM FLUORIDE	.5-1.0 PERCENT
80242	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
80243	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
80244	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
80245	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.12-.52 PERCENT
80246	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
80278	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80280	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80292	ZINC BACITRACIN	10-50 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80027	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80028	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80029	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80030	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80029	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80030	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80127	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80190	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
80191	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
80192	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
80202	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
80205	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80206	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80207	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80208	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
80209	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
80220	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1.0 PERCENT
80104	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	STREPTOMYCIN	10-50 GM/TON
80179	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
80002	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON MAXIMUM
80035	OXYTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE	.6 PERCENT
80044	OXYTETRACYCLINE	150 GM/TON
	PEPSIN	
80036	PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON
	PIPERAZINE	.1-.4 PERCENT
80037	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	10-50 GM/TON COMB.
	PIPERAZINE	.1-.4 PERCENT
80108	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	45-90 GM/TON COMB.
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80109	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-270 GM/TON COMB.
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80117	PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80134	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	45-90 GM/TON COMB.

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80135	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	45-90 GM/TON COMB.
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80137	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	45-90 GM/TON COMB.
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80138	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-270 GM/TON COMB.
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80139	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-270 GM/TON COMB.
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80141	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-270 GM/TON COMB.
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80142	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-270 GM/TON COMB.
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80005	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
80006	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80047	ROXARSONE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	150 GM/TON
	PEPSIN	
80077	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON MAXIMUM
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80096	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50-150 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80098	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	500 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80123	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	10-50 GM/TON
80318	ROXARSONE	.0025-.0075 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
80033	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	150 GM/TON
	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
80046	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	150 GM/TON
	PEPSIN	
80090	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	HYGROMYCIN B	12 GM/TON
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	500 GM/TON
	SPECIES: TURKEY	**UNSPECIFIED**
84185	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
84174	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84213	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
84214	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
84215	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84216	AMPROLIUM	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84003	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
84039	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84090	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
84146	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84166	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
84276	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	AMINO NITROTHIAZOLE	.05-10 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84343	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
84410	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84424	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
84431	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
84581	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84618	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
85077	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
84038	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84069	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
84070	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
84071	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
84072	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
84193	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84175	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
84176	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
84177	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
84178	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
84406	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
84407	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
84408	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84409	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
85105	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
85107	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
85108	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
84616	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
84617	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
84744	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
84746	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
85073	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84388	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84400	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84465	BUTYNORATE	.02 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	DINITRODIP ENYLSULFONYLETHYLENE DIAMINE	.02 PERCENT
	SULFANITRAN	.03 PERCENT
84782	BUTYNORATE	.07 PERCENT
	PHENOTHIAZINE	.29 PERCENT
	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.12 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84191	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84534	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	50 GM/TON
84535	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	NYSTATIN	100 GM/TON
85139	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.10 PERCENT
84496	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84522	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84523	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
84524	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
85134	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85135	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
85136	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
85203	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85204	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85205	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
85206	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	4-50 GM/TON
85207	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.011 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
85208	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85209	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85210	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
85211	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
85212	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
85213	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85215	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
85216	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
85217	DIENESTROL DIACETATE	.0023-.007 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
84013	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	50-100 GM/TON
84042	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84087	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100-500 GM/TON
84169	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
84204	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
84267	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
84346	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
84353	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100-200 GM/TON
84413	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84451	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84458	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84499	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON COMB.
84503	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
84505	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON COMB.
84510	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84511	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84512	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84513	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
84584	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84621	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84759	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85080	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
85140	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
85143	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON
85156	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
85158	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON COMB.
85194	FURAZOLIDONE	.022 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85199	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85202	FURAZOLIDONE	.0055 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
85222	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015-.05 PERCENT
85224	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
84442	NIHYDRAZONE	.011 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84022	NITARSONE	.01875 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84049	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84050	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84257	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
84258	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
84440	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84445	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84514	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84533	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84628	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84738	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85125	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85126	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
85127	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	10-50 GM/TON
85128	NITHIAZIDE	.0125-.04 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
84007	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
84014	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	50-100 GM/TON
84056	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84058	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84064	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84066	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84088	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100-500 GM/TON
84094	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
84112	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84113	NITROFURAZONE	.00112 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84114	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84116	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84159	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84164	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	50-100 GM/TON
84230	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
84232	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON COMB.
84234	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
84235	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
84236	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON COMB.
84237	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS STREPTOMYCIN	90-180 GM/TON COMB.
84241	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84242	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON COMB.
84244	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
84246	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
84247	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100 GM/TON
84249	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON
84250	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
84252	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON COMB.
84280	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	AMINO NITROTHIAZOLE	.05-.1 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84296	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84298	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84322	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84347	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
84354	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100-200 GM/TON
84365	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84375	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84414	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84416	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84489	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
84551	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84552	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
84553	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
84593	NITROFURAZONE	.0112 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84594	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84623	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
84640	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
84642	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
84678	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84679	NITROFURAZONE	.0112 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84691	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84761	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85012	NITROFURAZONE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85013	NITROFURAZONE	.0112 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85071	NITROFURAZONE	.0056 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84106	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84323	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.05 PERCENT
	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84335	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	AMINO NITROTHIAZOLE	.05-.10 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84360	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84370	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84371	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84484	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
84488	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
84590	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84591	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85019	NITROPHENIDE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85020	NITROPHENIDE	.05 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84188	NYSTATIN	50-100 GM/TON
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
84189	NYSTATIN	50-100 GM/TON
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
84118	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
84119	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84128	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
84129	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84377	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
84378	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84389	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
84390	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84596	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	NICOTINE	.03-.07 PERCENT
84597	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84796	PHENOTHIAZINE	.3-1 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84127	PIPERAZINE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84341	PIPERAZINE	.1-.4 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84342	PIPERAZINE	.1-.4 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
84125	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84135	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84384	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84396	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84568	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84603	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84790	PIPERAZINE DIHYDROCHLORIDE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84138	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84387	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84399	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84606	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84793	PIPERAZINE MONOHYDROCHLORIDE	.13-.52 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84126	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.18-.72 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84136	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84397	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84569	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84604	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84669	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84791	PIPERAZINE PHOSPHATE MONOHYDRATE	.23-.92 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84137	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84386	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84398	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84570	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84605	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84792	PIPERAZINE SULFATE	.21-.85 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84183	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84184	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84187	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
84068	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84179	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84180	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84181	RESERPINE	.0002 PERCENT
	MANGANESE BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84481	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
84536	RESERPINE	.00002-.0001 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84537	RESERPINE	.00002-.0001 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
84538	RESERPINE	.00002-.0001 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
84633	RESERPINE	.00002 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84634	RESERPINE	.0001 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84008	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
84044	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84054	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84152	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84281	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	AMINO NITROTHIAZOLE	.05-.1 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84294	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84297	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84348	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
84412	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84415	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84429	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
84460	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84624	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84641	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
	STREPTOMYCIN	30-50 GM/TON
84750	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
85040	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85069	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85072	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85086	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
85090	ROXARSONE	.0025-.005 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.05 PERCENT
84004	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
84040	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84091	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
84147	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84167	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	50-100 GM/TON COMB.
84344	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-200 GM/TON COMB.
84411	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84456	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84582	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84619	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	ACETYLAMINO-NITROTHIAZOLE	.015 PERCENT
84045	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84046	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84052	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84053	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84055	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84100	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
84101	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84103	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.005-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84292	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84293	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.01 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84295	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84334	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	AMINO NITROTHIAZOLE	.05-.10 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
84357	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84358	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.005-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84359	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.033-.1 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	4-50 GM/TON
84502	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84509	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84528	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84529	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84530	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
84575	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	10-50 GM/TON
84576	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	50-100 GM/TON
84577	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	100-200 GM/TON
84587	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0125-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84588	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.005-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
84589	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.033-.10 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.

IDENTIFICATION	DRUG	DOSAGE
84629	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
84674	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.005-.025 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
85017	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.005-.025 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85018	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.033-.10 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	4-50 GM/TON
85066	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85067	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	ARSANILIC ACID	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85068	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	SODIUM ARSANILATE	.005-.010 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85070	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	100-500 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85113	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85114	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85122	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE PLUS	
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85123	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	90-180 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85131	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLIN	10-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
85132	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	2.4-50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
85133	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.01-.02 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN PLUS	
	STREPTOMYCIN	14.4-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.003-.006 PERCENT
85152	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85153	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85154	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85155	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85165	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	CHLORTETRACYCLINE	200 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85166	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	OXYTETRACYCLINE	100 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85183	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	ZINC BACITRACIN	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85184	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN METHYLENE DISALICYLATE	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85185	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85186	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	PENICILLIN	50 GM/TON
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT
85187	SULFAQUINOXALINE	.0075 PERCENT
	FURAZOLIDONE	.00083 PERCENT
	BACITRACIN PLUS	
	PENICILLIN	3.6-50 GM/TON COMB.
	2,4-DIAMINO-5-(PARA-CHLOROPHENYL)-6-ETHYL PYRIMIDINE	.00075 PERCENT

[FR Doc.73-4155 Filed 3-7-73;8:45 am]