and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the Amex and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–2208 Filed 1–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Rel. No. IC–20858; File No. 812–9290]

Quest for Value Accumulation Trust, et al.

January 24, 1995.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''SEC'' or the ''Commission'').

ACTION: Notice of Application for Exemption under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''1940 Act'').

APPLICANTS: The Quest for Value Accumulation Trust (the ''Trust''), Quest for Value Advisors (''Quest Advisors'') and certain life insurance companies and their separate accounts investing now or in the future in the Trust.

RELEVANT 1940 ACT SECTIONS: Order requested under Section 6(c) of the 1940 Act from the Provisions of Sections 9(a), 13(a), 15(a) and 15(b) of the 1940 Act and Rules 6e–2(b)(15) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15) thereunder.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants seek an order to the extent necessary to permit shares of the Trust and shares of any other investment company that is designed to fund insurance products and for which Quest Advisors, or any of its affiliates, may serve an investment advisor, administrator, manager, principal underwriter or sponsor (collectively, with the Trust, the ''Funds'') to be sold to and held by: (a) Variable annuity and variable life insurance separate accounts of both affiliated and unaffiliated life insurance companies (the ''Participating Insurance Companies''); and (b) qualified pension and retirement plans outside of the separate account context (the ''Plans'').

FILING DATE: The application was filed on October 18, 1994, and amended on December 23, 1994. Applicants represent that the application will be further amended during the notice period.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing on this application by writing to the Secretary of the SEC and serving Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests must be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on February 21, 1995 and accompanied by proof of service on the Applicants in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the interest, the reason for the request and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of the date of a hearing by writing to the Secretary of the SEC.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Applicants, Quest for Value Accumulation Trust, One World Financial Center, New York, New York 10281.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barbara J. Whisler, Senior Attorney, or Wendy F. Friedlander, Deputy Chief, both at (202) 942–0670, Office of Insurance Products, Division of Investment Management.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Following is a summary of the application; the complete application is available for a fee from the Public Reference Branch of the SEC.

Applicants' Representations

1. The Trust, an open-end, management investment company organized as a Massachusetts business trust on May 12, 1994, commenced operations on September 15, 1994. Currently, the Trust consists of seven separate series of shares: the Equity Series; the Small Cap Series; the Managed Series; the Bond Series; the Global Equity Series; the U.S. Government Income Series and the Money Market Series. Applicants incorporate by reference into the application the registration statement (File No. 33–78944) on Form N–1A of the Trust.

2. Quest Advisors serves as the investment advisor for each of the Trust's series. Quest Advisors is a subsidiary of Oppenheimer Capital, a general partnership registered as an investment advisor under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. A 33% interest in Oppenheimer Capital is held by Oppenheimer Financial Corp. while the remaining 67% interest is held by Oppenheimer Capital, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership whose units are traded on the New York Stock Exchange. Oppenheimer Capital, L.P. has as its sole general partner Oppenheimer Financial Corp.

3. The Trust currently offers its shares to and its shares are held by separate accounts, registered with the Commission under the 1940 Act as unit investment trusts, of life insurance company affiliates of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Company and National Home Life Assurance Company. The Trust serves as the investment vehicle for variable annuity contracts issued by these insurance companies. Shares of the Trust are also held by a separate account of CIGNA, which is not registered as an investment company under the 1940 Act pursuant to Section 3(c)(1) of the 1940 Act.

4. Applicants state that, upon the granting of the order requested in this application, the Trust intends to offer shares of its existing and future portfolios to separate accounts, registered as investment companies under the 1940 Act, of the above-referenced insurance companies and of other unaffiliated insurance companies (collectively, the ''Accounts''), to serve as an investment vehicle for various types of insurance products. These products may include variable annuity contracts, single premium variable life insurance contracts, scheduled premium variable life insurance contracts and flexible premium variable life insurance contracts (collectively, the ''Contracts''). The Trust may also offer shares of its portfolios directly to the Plans outside of the separate account context.

5. In connection with any Contract issued by a Participating Insurance Company, the application states that each such company will have the legal obligation of satisfying all applicable requirements under both state and federal law. Applicants further state that the role of the Funds under this arrangement, insofar as the federal securities laws are applicable, will consist of offering shares to the Accounts and fulfilling any conditions that the Commission may impose upon granting the order requested in the application.

6. Applicants state that, due to the applicable tax law, the Funds wish to avail themselves of the opportunity to increase their asset base through the sale of shares of the Funds to the Plans. The Plans may choose any of the Funds as the sole investment option under the Plan or as one of several investment

options. Participants may be given an investment choice depending upon the Plan. Shares of any of the Funds sold to Plans will be held by the trustees of the Plans as mandated by Section 403(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (''ERISA''). Quest Advisors will not act as investment advisor to any of the Plans that will purchase shares of the Funds. Applicants note that, pursuant to ERISA, pass-through voting is not required to be provided to participants in the Plans.

Applicants' Legal Analysis

1. In connection with the funding of scheduled premium variable life insurance contracts issued through a separate account registered under the 1940 Act as a unit investment trust (''UIT''), Rule 6e–2(b)(15) provides partial exemptions from Sections 9(a), 13(a), 15(a) and 15(b) of the 1940 Act. The relief provided by Rule 6e–2 is available to a separate account's investment advisor, principal underwriter, and sponsor or depositor. The exemptions granted by Rule 6e–2(b)(15) are available only where the management investment company underlying the UIT offers its shares ''exclusively to variable life insurance separate accounts of the life insurer, or of any affiliated life insurance company.'' The use of a common management investment company as the underlying investment medium for both variable annuity and variable life insurance separate accounts of a single insurance company (or of two or more affiliated insurance companies) is referred to as ''mixed funding.'' The use of a common management investment company as the underlying investment medium for variable annuity and variable life insurance separate accounts of unaffiliated insurance companies is referred to as ''shared funding.'' ''Mixed and shared funding'' denotes the use of a common management investment company to fund the variable annuity and variable life insurance separate accounts of affiliated and unaffiliated insurance companies. The relief granted by Rule 6e–2(b)(15) is not available with respect to a scheduled premium variable life insurance separate account that owns shares of an underlying fund that offers its shares to a variable annuity separate account of the same company or of any other affiliated or unaffiliated life insurance company. Therefore, Rule 6e–2(b)(15) precludes mixed funding as well as shared funding.

2. Applicants state that because the relief under Rule 6e–2(b)(15) is available only where shares are offered exclusively to separate accounts of insurance companies, additional exemptive relief is necessary if shares of the Funds are also to be sold to Plans.

3. In connection with flexible premium variable life insurance contracts issued through a separate account registered under the 1940 Act as a UIT, Rule 6e–3(T)(b)(15) provides partial exemptions from Sections 9(a), 13(a), 15(a), and 15(b) of the 1940 Act. The exemptions granted to a separate account by Rule 6e–3(T)(b)(15) are available only where all of the assets of the separate account consist of the shares of one or more registered management investment companies which offer their shares ''exclusively to separate accounts of the life insurer, or of any affiliated life insurance company, offering either scheduled or flexible contracts, or both; or which also offer their shares to variable annuity separate accounts of the life insurer or of an affiliated life insurance company.'' Thus, Rule 6e–3(T) permits mixed funding, but does not permit shared funding.

4. Applicants state that because the relief under Rule 6e–3(T) is available only where shares are offered exclusively to separate accounts, additional exemptive relief is necessary if shares of the Funds are also to be sold to Plans.

5. Applicants state that changes in the tax law have created the opportunity for the Funds to increase their asset base through the sale of Fund shares to the Plans. Applicants state that Section 817(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the ''Code''), imposes certain diversification standards on the underlying assets of the Contracts held in the Funds. The Code provides that such Contracts shall not be treated as an annuity contract or life insurance contract for any period in which the underlying assets are not, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Treasury Department, adequately diversified. On March 2, 1989, the Treasury Department issued regulations which established diversification requirements for the investment portfolios underlying variable contracts. Treas. Reg. § 1.817–5 (1989). The regulations provide that, to meet the diversification requirements, all of the beneficial interests in the investment company must be held by the segregated asset accounts of one or more insurance companies. The regulations do, however, contain certain exceptions to this requirement, one of which allows shares in an investment company to be held by the trustee of a qualified pension or retirement plan without adversely affecting the ability of shares in the same investment company to also be held by the separate accounts of insurance companies in connection with their variable contracts. Treas. Reg. § 1.817–5(f)(3)(iii).

6. Applicants state that the promulgation of Rules 6e–2 and 6e–3(T) under the 1940 Act preceded the issuance of these Treasury regulations. Applicants assert that, given the then current tax law, the sale of shares of the same investment company to both separate accounts and Plans could not have been envisioned at the time of the adoption of Rules 6e–2(b)(15) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15)

7. Applicants therefore request relief from Sections 9(a), 13(a), 15(a) and 15(b) of the 1940 Act, and Rules 6e–2(b)(15) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15) thereunder to the extent necessary to permit shares of the Funds to be offered and sold in connection with both mixed and shared funding.

8. Section 9(a) of the 1940 Act provides that it is unlawful for any company to serve as investment advisor to or principal underwriter for any registered open-end investment company if an affiliated person of that company is subject to a disqualification enumerated in Section 9(a) (1) or (2). Rules 6e–2(b) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15) provide exemptions from Section 9(a) under certain circumstances, subject to the limitations on mixed and shared funding. The relief provided by Rules 6e–2(b)(15)(i) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15)(i) permits a person disqualified under Section 9(a) to serve as an officer, director, or employee of the life insurer, or any of its affiliates, so long as that person does not participate directly in the management or administration of the underlying fund. The relief provided by Rules 6e–2(b)(15)(ii) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15)(ii) permits the life insurer to serve as the underlying fund's investment advisor or principal underwriter, provided that none of the insurer's personnel who are ineligible pursuant to Section 9(a) participate in the management or administration of the fund.

9. Applicants state that the partial relief from Section 9(a) found in Rules 6e–2(b)(15) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15), in effect, limits the amount of monitoring necessary to ensure compliance with Section 9 to that which is appropriate in light of the policy and purposes of the Section. Applicants state that those 1940 Act rules recognize that it is not necessary for the protection of investors or the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act to apply the provisions of Section 9(a) to the many individuals in a large insurance company complex, most of whom will have no involvement in matters pertaining to investment

companies within that organization. Applicants note that the Participating Insurance Companies are not expected to play any role in the management or administration of the Funds. Therefore, Applicants assert, applying the restrictions of Section 9(a) serves no regulatory purpose. The application states that the relief requested should not be affected by the proposed sale of shares of the Funds to the Plans because the Plans are not investment companies and are not, therefore, subject to Section 9(a).

10. Rules 6e–2(b)(15)(iii) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15)(iii) under the 1940 Act assume the existence of a pass-through voting requirement with respect to management investment company shares held by a separate account. The application states that the Participating Insurance Companies will provide pass-through voting privileges to all Contract owners so long as the Commission interprets the 1940 Act to require such privileges.

11. Rules 6e–2(b)(15)(iii) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15)(iii) under the 1940 Act provide exemptions from the pass-through voting requirement with respect to several significant matters, assuming observance of the limitations on mixed and shared funding imposed by the 1940 Act and the rules thereunder.

Rules 6e–2(b)(15)(iii)(A) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15)(iii)(A) provide that the insurance company may disregard voting instructions of its contract owners with respect to the investments of an underlying fund, or any contract between a fund and its investment advisor, when required to do so by an insurance regulatory authority.

Rules 6e–2(b)(15)(iii)(B) and 6e–3(T)(b)(15)(iii)(B) provide that the insurance company may disregard voting instructions of its contract owners if the contract owners initiate any change in the company's policies, principal underwriter, or any investment advisor, provided that disregarding such voting instructions is reasonable and subject to the other provisions of paragraphs (b)(15)(ii) and (b)(7)(ii) (B) and (C) of each rule.

12. Applicants further represent that the Funds' sale of shares to the Plans does not impact the relief requested in this regard. As noted previously by Applicants, shares of the Funds sold to Plans would be held by the trustees of such Plans as required by Section 403(a) of ERISA. Section 403(a) also provides that the trustee(s) must have exclusive authority and discretion to manage and control the Plan with two exceptions: (a) When the Plan expressly provides that the trustee(s) is (are) subject to the direction of a named fiduciary who is not a trustee, in which case the trustee(s) is (are) subject to proper directions made in accordance with the terms of the Plan and not contrary to ERISA; and (b) when the authority to manage, acquire or dispose of assets of the Plan is delegated to one or more investment managers pursuant to Section 402(c)(3) of ERISA. Unless one of the two exceptions stated in Section 403(a) applies, Plan trustees have the exclusive authority and responsibility for voting proxies. Where a named fiduciary appoints an investment manager, the investment manager has the responsibility to vote the shares held unless the right to vote such shares is reserved to the trustees or to the named fiduciary. In any event, there is no pass-through voting to the participants in such Plans. Accordingly, Applicants note that, unlike the case with insurance company separate accounts, the issue of the resolution of material irreconcilable conflicts with respect to voting is not present with Plans.

13. Applicants state that no increased conflicts of interest would be present by the granting of the requested relief. Applicants assert that shared funding does not present any issues that do not already exist where a single insurance company is licensed to do business in several, or all, states. Applicants note that where insurers are domiciled in different states, it is possible that the state insurance regulatory body in a state in which one insurance company is domiciled could require action that is inconsistent with the requirements of insurance regulators in one or more other states in which other insurance companies are domiciled. Applicants submit that this possibility is no different and no greater than exists where a single insurer and its affiliates offer their insurance products in several states.

14. Applicants further submit that affiliation does not reduce the potential, if any exists, for differences among state regulatory requirements. In any event, the conditions (adapted from the conditions included in Rule 6e–3(T)(b)(15)) discussed below are designed to safeguard against any adverse effect that these differences may produce. If a particular state insurance regulator's decision conflicts with the majority of other state regulators, the affected insurer may be required to withdraw its separate account's investment in the relevant Fund.

15. Applicants also argue that affiliation does not eliminate the potential, if any exists, for divergent judgments as to the advisability or legality of a change in investment policies, principal underwriter, or investment advisor initiated by owners of the Contracts. Potential disagreement is limited by the requirement that the Participating Insurance Company's disregard of voting instructions be both reasonable and based on specified good faith determinations. However, if a Participating Insurance Company's decision to disregard Contract owner instructions represents a minority position or would preclude a majority vote approving a particular change, such Participating Insurance Company may be required, at the election of the relevant Fund, to withdraw its investment in that Fund. No change or penalty will be imposed as a result of such withdrawal.

16. Applicants state that there is no reason why the investment policies of a Fund with mixed funding would or should be materially different from what those policies would or should be if such investment company or series thereof under only variable annuity or variable life insurance contracts. Applicants therefore argue that there is no reason to believe that conflicts of interest would result from mixed funding. Moreover, Applicants represent that the Fund will not be managed to favor or disfavor any particular insurance company or type of Contract.

17. Section 817(h) imposes certain diversification standards on the underlying assets of variable annuity contracts and variable life insurance contracts held in the portfolios of management investment companies. Treasury Regulation 1.817–5(f)(3)(iii), which established diversification requirements for such portfolios, specifically permits ''qualified pension or retirement plans'' and separate accounts to share the same underlying management investment company. Therefore, Applicants have concluded that neither the Code, nor the Treasury regulations nor the revenue rulings thereunder present any inherent conflicts of interest if Plans, variable annuity separate accounts and variable life insurance separate accounts all invest in the same management investment company.

18. Applicants note that while there are differences in the manner in which distributions are taxed for variable annuity contracts, variable life insurance contracts and Plans, Applicants state that these tax consequences do not raise any conflicts of interest. When distributions are to be made, and the separate account or the Plan is unable to net purchase payments to make the distributions, the separate account or the Plan will redeem shares of the Funds at their respective net asset

value. The Plan will then make distributions in accordance with the terms of the Plan. A Participating Insurance Company will surrender values from the separate account into the general account make distributions in accordance with the terms of the variable contract.

19. With respect to voting rights, Applicants state that it is possible to provide an equitable means of giving such voting rights to Contract owners and to Plans. Applicants represent that the Funds will inform each shareholder, including each Account and Plan, of its respective share of ownership in the respective Funds. Each Participating Insurance Company will then solicit voting instructions in accordance with the ''pass-through'' voting requirement.

20. Applicants argue that the ability of the Funds to sell their respective shares directly to Plans does not create a ''senior security'', as such term is defined under Section 18(g) of the 1940 Act, with respect to any Contract owner as opposed to a participant under a Plan. Regardless of the rights and benefits of participants and Contract owners under the respective Plans and Contracts, the Plans and the Accounts have rights only with respect to their shares of the Funds. Such shares may be redeemed only to net asset value. No shareholder of any of the Funds has any preference over any other shareholder with respect to distribution of assets or payment of dividends.

21. Finally, Applicants state that there are no conflicts between Contract owners and participants under the Plans with respect to the state insurance commissioners' veto powers (direct with respect to variable life insurance and indirect with respect to variable annuities) over investment objectives. The basic premise of corporate democracy and shareholder voting is that not all shareholders may agree with a particular proposal. The state insurance commissioners have been given the veto power in recognition of the fact that insurance companies usually are unable to simply redeem their separate accounts out of one fund and invest those monies in another fund. Generally, to accomplish such redemptions and transfers, complex and time consuming transactions must be undertaken. Conversely, trustees of Plans or the participants in participant-directed Plans can make the decision quickly and implement redemption of shares from a Fund and reinvest the monies in another funding vehicle without the same regulatory impediments or, as is the case with most Plans, even hold cash pending suitable investment. Based on the foregoing, Applicants represent that even should there arise issues where the interests of Contract owners and the interests of Plans conflict, the issues can be almost immediately resolved in that trustees of the Plans can, independently, redeem shares out of the Funds.

22. Applicants stat that they do not see any greater potential for material irreconcilable conflicts arising between the interests of participants under the Plans and owners of the Contracts issued by the Accounts from possible future changes in the federal tax laws than that which already exists between variable annuity contract owners and variable life insurance contract owners.

23. Applicants state that various factors have kept certain insurance companies from offering variable annuity and variable life insurance contracts. According to Applicants, these factors include: the cost of organizing and operating an investment funding medium; the lack of expertise with respect to invest management (particularly with respect to stock and money market investments); and the lack of name recognition by the public of certain insurers as investment professionals. Applicants argue that use of the Funds as common investment media for the Contracts would ease these concerns. Participating Insurance Companies would benefit not only from the investment and administrative expertise of the Funds' investment advisor, but also from the cost efficiencies and investment flexibility afforded by a large pool of funds. Applicants state that making the Funds available for mixed and shared funding may encourage more insurance companies to offer variable contracts such as the Contracts which may then increase competition with respect to both the design and the pricing of variable contracts. Applicants submit that this can be expected to result in greater product variation and lower charges. Thus, Applicants argue that Contract owners would benefit because mixed and shared funding will eliminate a significant portion of the costs of establishing and administering separate funds. Moreover, Applicants assert that sales of shares of the Funds to Plans should increase the amount of assets available for investment by the Funds. This should, in turn, promote economies of scale, permit increased safety of investments through greater diversification, and make the addition of new portfolios more feasible.

24. Applicants believe that there is no significant legal impediment to permitting mixed and shared funding. Additionally, Applicants note the previous issuance of orders permitting mixed and shared funding where shares of a fund were sold directly to qualified plans such as the Plans.

Applicants' Conditions

Applicants have consented to the following conditions if the order requested in the application is granted:

1. A majority of the Board of Trustees or Board of Directors of each Fund (each, a ''Board'') shall consist of persons who are not ''interested persons'' of the Funds, as defined by Section 2(a)(19) of the 1940 Act and the rules thereunder and as modified by any applicable orders of the Commission, except that, if this condition is not met by reason of the death, disqualification, or bona fide resignation of any trustee or director, then the operator of this condition shall be suspended: (a) For a period of 45 days if the vacancy or vacancies may be filled by the Board; (b) for a period of 60 days if a vote of shareholders is required to fill the vacancy or vacancies; or (c) for such longer period as the Commission may prescribe by order upon application.

2. Each Board will monitor its respective Fund for the existence of any material irreconcilable conflict among the interests of the Contract owners of all of the Accounts investing in the respective Funds. A material irreconcilable conflict may arise for a variety of reasons, including: (a) An action by any state insurance regulatory authority; (b) a change in applicable federal or state insurance, tax, or securities laws or regulations, or a public ruling, private letter ruling, no-action or interpretative letter, or any similar action by insurance, tax, or securities regulatory authorities, (c) an administrative or judicial decision in any relevant proceeding; (d) the manner in which the investments of the Funds are managed; (e) a difference in voting instructions given by owners of variable annuity contracts and owners of variable life insurance contracts; or (f) a decision by a Participating Insurance Company to disregard the voting instructions of Contract owners.

3. The Participating Insurance Companies, Quest Advisors (or any other investment advisor of the Funds), and any Plan that executes a fund participation agreement upon becoming an owner of 10% or more of the assets of a Fund (the ''Participants'') will report any potential or existing conflicts to the Board. Participants will be responsible for assisting the appropriate Board in carrying out its responsibilities under these conditions by providing the Board with all information reasonably necessary for the Board to consider any issues raised. This responsibility

includes, but is not limited to, an obligation by each Participant to inform the Board whenever voting instructions of Contract owners are disregarded. The responsibility to report such information and conflicts and to assist the Board will be a contractual obligation of all Participants investing in the Funds under their agreements governing participation in the Funds and such agreements shall provide that these responsibilities will be carried out with a view only to the interests of Contract owners.

4. If it is determined by a majority of the Board, or by a majority of its disinterested trustees or directors, that an irreconcilable material conflict exists, the relevant Participant shall, at its expense and to the extent reasonably practicable (as determined by a majority of the disinterested trustees or directors), take any steps necessary to remedy or eliminate the irreconcilable material conflict, including:

(a) Withdrawing the assets allocable to some or all of the Accounts from the Funds and reinvesting such assets in a different investment medium including another portfolio of the relevant Fund or another Fund, or submitting the question as to whether such segregation should be implemented to a vote of all affected contract owners; and, as appropriate, segregating the assets of any appropriate group (i.e., variable annuity contract owners, variable life insurance contract owners, or variable contract owners of one or more Participant) that votes in favor of such segregation, or offering to the affected variable contract owners the option of making such a change; and (b) establishing a new registered management investment company or managed separate account. If a material irreconcilable conflict arises because of a Participant's decision to disregard voting instruction of the owners of the Contracts, and that decision represents a minority position or would preclude a majority vote, the Participant may be required, at the election of the relevant Fund, to withdraw its Account's investment in the Fund, and no charge or penalty will be imposed as a result of such withdrawal.

The responsibility to take remedial action in the event of a Board determination of a material irreconcilable conflict and to bear the cost of such remedial action shall be a contractual obligation of all Participants under the agreements governing their participation in the Funds. The responsibility to take such remedial action shall be carried out with a view only to the interests of Contract owners. For purposes of this Condition Four, a majority of the disinterested members of the applicable Board shall determine whether any proposed action adequately remedies any material irreconcilable conflict, but, in no event will the relevant Fund or Quest Advisors (or any other investment advisor of the Funds) be required to establish a new funding medium for any Contract. Further, no Participant shall be required by this Condition Four to establish a new funding medium for any Contract if any offer to do so has been declined by a vote of a majority of the Contract owners materially affected by the material irreconcilable conflict.

5. The Board's determination of the existence of an irreconcilable material conflict and its implications shall be made known promptly and in writing to all Participants.

6. Participants will provide pass-through voting privileges to all Contract owners so long as the Commission continues to interpret the 1940 Act as requiring pass-through voting privileges for Contract owners. Accordingly, the Participants, where applicable, will vote shares of the Fund held in their Accounts in a manner consistent with voting instructions timely received from Contract owners. Participants will be responsible for assuring that each of their Accounts that participates in the Funds calculates voting privileges in a manner consistent with other Participants. The obligation to calculate voting privileges in a manner consistent with all other Accounts will be a contractual obligation of all Participants under the agreements governing their participation in the Funds. Each Participant will vote shares for which it has not received timely voting instructions as well as shares it owns in the same proportion as it votes those shares for which it has received voting instructions.

7. All reports received by the Board or potential or existing conflicts, and all Board action with regard to: (a) Determining the existence of a conflict; (b) notifying Participants of a conflict; and (c) determining whether any proposed action adequately remedies a conflict, will be properly recorded in the minutes of the appropriate Board of other appropriate records. Such minutes or other records shall be made available to the Commission upon request.

8. Each Fund will notify all Participants that separate account prospectus disclosure regarding potential risks of mixed and shared funding may be appropriate. Each Fund shall disclose in its prospectus that: (a) Shares of the Fund may be offered to insurance company separate accounts of both annuity and life insurance variable contracts, and to qualified plans; (b) due to differences of tax treatment and other considerations, the interests of various contract owners participating in the Funds and the interests of Plans investing in the Funds may conflict; and (c) the Board will monitor the Funds for any materials conflicts and determine what action, if any, should be taken.

9. Each Fund will comply with all provisions of the 1940 Act requiring voting by shareholders (which, for these purposes, shall be the persons having a voting interest in the shares of the Funds), and, in particular, each Fund will either provide for annual meetings (except to the extent that the Commission may interpret Section 16 of the 1940 Act not to require such meetings) or comply with Section 16(c) of the 1940 Act, (although the Funds are not one of the trusts described in Section 16(c) of the 1940 Act) as well as with Section 16(a), and, if applicable, Section 16(b) of the 1940 Act. Further, each Fund will act in accordance with the Commission's interpretation of the requirements of Section 16(a) with respect to periodic elections of directors (or trustees) and with whatever rules the Commission may promulgate with respect thereto.

10. If and to the extent that Rules 6e–2 and 6e–3(T) are amended (or if Rule 6e–3 under the 1940 Act is adopted) to provide exemptive relief from any provision of the 1940 Act or the rules thereunder with respect to mixed and shared funding on terms and conditions materially different from any exemptions granted in the order requested by Applicants, then the Funds and/or the Participants, as appropriate, shall take such steps as may be necessary to comply with Rules 6e–2 and 6e–3(T), as amended, and Rule 6e–3, as adopted, to the extent such rules are applicable.

11. No less than annually, the Participants shall submit to the Boards such reports, materials, or data as the Boards may reasonably request so that the Boards may carry out fully the obligations imposed upon them by the conditions contained in the application. Such reports, materials, and data shall be submitted more frequently if deemed appropriate by the Boards. The obligations of the Participants to provide these reports, materials, and data to the Boards, when the appropriate Board so reasonably requests, shall be a contractual obligation of all Participants under the agreements governing their participation in the Funds.

12. If a Plan becomes an owner of 10% or more of the assets of a Fund, such Plan will execute a fund

participation agreement with the applicable Fund. A Plan will execute an application containing an acknowledgment of this condition upon such Plan's initial purchase of the shares of any Fund.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–2209 Filed 1–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Investment Company Act Release No. 20853; 811–8474]

Third Avenue Value Fund II, Inc.; Notice of Application

January 24, 1995.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'').

ACTION: Notice of Application for Deregistration under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''Act'').

APPLICANT: Third Avenue Value Fund II, Inc.

RELEVANT ACT SECTION: Section 8(f).

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicant seeks an order declaring it has ceased to be an investment company.

FILING DATE: The application was filed on January 6, 1995.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary and serving applicant with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m. on February 21, 1995, and should be accompanied by proof of service on the applicant, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549. Applicant, 767 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017–2023.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane L. Titus, Paralegal Specialist, at (202) 942–0584, or Barry D. Miller, Senior Special Counsel, at (202) 942–0564 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee from the SEC's Public Reference Branch.

Applicant's Representations

1. Applicant is an open-end, non-diversified investment company, organized as a corporation under the laws of Maryland. On April 12, 1994, Applicant registered under the Act and filed a registration statement under the Securities Act of 1933. Applicant's registration statement became effective on May 2, 1994.

2. On May 9, 1994, Applicant decided not to proceed with the offering of its Common Stock. There has been no initial public offering of Applicant's Common Stock.

3. Applicant has no shareholders, liabilities or assets. Applicant is not a party to any litigation or administrative proceeding.

4. Applicant is not now engaged, nor does it propose to engage in any business activities other than those necessary to wind up its affairs. After the Commission issues an order declaring that Applicant has ceased to be an investment company, Applicant intends to file articles of dissolution with the Maryland Department of Assessments and Taxation in Baltimore, Maryland.

For the SEC, by the Division of Investment Management, under delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–2210 Filed 1–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 2152]

State Department Overseas Security Advisory Council; Closed Meeting

The Department of State announces a meeting of the U.S. State Department—Overseas Security Advisory Council on Tuesday and Wednesday, February 14–15, 1995, at the Westin Hotel in Dallas, Texas. Pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and 5 U.S.C. 552b(c) (1) and (4), it has been determined the meeting will be closed to the public. Matters relative to classified national security information as well as privileged commercial information will be discussed. The agenda calls for the discussion of classified and corporate proprietary/security information as well as private sector physical and procedural security policies and protective programs at sensitive U.S. Government and private sector locations overseas.

For more information contact Patricia Richards, Overseas Security Advisory Council, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20522–1003, phone: 202–663–0533.

Dated: January 19, 1995.

Mark Mulvey,

Director of the Diplomatic Security Service.

[FR Doc. 95–1730 Filed 1–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–24–M

[Public Notice 2153]

Shipping Coordinating Committee; Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea Working Group on Fire Protection; Meeting

The U.S. Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Working Group on Fire Protection will conduct an open meeting on March 22, 1995, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 2415 at U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters, 2100 Second Street SW., Washington, DC 20593. The purpose of the meeting will be to prepare for discussion anticipated to take place at the Fortieth Session of the International Maritime Organization's Subcommittee on Fire Protection, scheduled for July 17, 1995.

The meeting will focus on proposed amendments to SOLAS for the fire safety of commercial vessels. Specific discussion areas include: Smoke and toxicity, closing mechanisms of fire doors, heat radiation through windows and glass partitions, sprinkler systems and fixed water spraying systems, emergency escape breathing devices, high speed craft, criteria for maximum fire loads, fire safety measures for deep fat cooking equipment, foam concentrates, phasing out of halons, interpretations to SOLAS 74, role of the human element in maritime casualties, safety of passenger submersible craft, smoke control and ventilation, fire safety aspects of composite materials used on board ships, and matters relating to tanker safety.

Additionally, the need for research and development in the area of fire protection will be discussed in an effort to promote new technology that will positively impact both safety and market competitiveness. Comments will be directly solicited on what research areas are viewed by industry as most critical to their safety and business goals and how best to accomplish the necessary work. A partnership initiative between the Coast Guard, industry, and other third party organizations will be proposed.

Interested members of the public are encouraged to attend. For further information regarding the meeting of the SOLAS Working Group on Fire