

being included with stock options for purposes of margin calculations and clearing member qualifications.

Rules 1104 and 1106 in Chapter XI regarding the liquidation of an account of a clearing member upon suspension of that clearing member have been amended to include reference to positions in BOUNDS. Rule 1106(b)(2) contains a reference to specific or escrow deposits with respect to BOUNDS. No provisions for such deposits have been included in the present filing; therefore, these references will have no application until such time as OCC provides for escrow deposits with respect to BOUNDS.

#### 6. Proposed Chapter XXV of OCC Rules

The introduction to proposed Chapter XXV makes it clear that the rules in Chapters I through VII and IX through XII also are applicable to BOUNDS except where expressly modified or made inapplicable by Chapter XXV. The effect on other rules by each section in Chapter XXV is stated in brackets at the end of each section in Chapter XXV.

Proposed Rule 2501 of Chapter XXV sets forth the rights and obligations of holders and writers of BOUNDS with respect to the payment of dividend equivalents. Under the proposed rule, the holder of a BOUND is entitled to the dividend payments of a shareholder with a comparable position (*i.e.*, one hundred shares per contract). The writer is obligated to pay or deliver the dividend equivalent of either a cash dividend or a non-cash distribution to the holder of the BOUND. As noted earlier, certain distribution may result in an adjustment of the BOUND in lieu of a dividend equivalent while other distributions may give rise to only a dividend equivalent or both a dividend equivalent and an adjustment.

Proposed Rule 2501 specifies that on the dividend payable date OCC will notify each clearing member having a position in BOUNDS of the net sum or securities it is required to pay or deliver and the net sum or securities it is entitled to receive. Proposed Rule 2502 sets forth that the settlement date for a BOUND contract will be the third business day following the expiration date. Although BOUNDS that settle in cash (*i.e.*, when the underlying stock price closes above the strike price) could be settled earlier than BOUNDS that settle by delivery of the underlying stock (*i.e.*, when the underlying stock price closes at or below the strike price), it has been determined that the preferable product design is to have the same settlement period for both types of settlements. In the event the BOUND transaction cannot be settled through

regular-way settlement (*i.e.*, on the third business day following the expiration date), the contract will be settled on a broker-to-broker basis as governed by Rules 902 through 910A in Chapter IX.

Proposed Rule 2503 sets forth the procedures for settlement of BOUNDS at expiration. These procedures are straightforward in that BOUNDS to be settled in cash will be settled through OCC's cash settlement system. BOUNDS that are to be settled by delivery of stock ordinarily will be settled in the same manner that exercised stock options are settled (*i.e.*, through stock clearing corporations).

OCC believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of Section 17A of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder because the rule proposal should facilitate the prompt and accurate clearance and settlement of BOUNDS. OCC also believes the proposed rule change is consistent with the safeguarding of funds and securities in OCC's custody or control or for which OCC is responsible because it will apply to BOUNDS a system of safeguards which is substantially the same as which OCC currently applies to options.

#### (B) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

OCC does not believe that the proposed rule change will impact or impose a burden on competition.

#### (C) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments were not and are not intended to be solicited with respect to the proposed rule change and none have been received.

#### III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within thirty-five days of the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to ninety days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which OCC consents, the Commission will:

- (a) By order approve such proposed rule change or
- (b) Institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change should be disapproved.

#### IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing.

Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. § 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Room, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20549. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of OCC. All submissions should refer to the file number SR-OCC-95-20 and should be submitted by April 10, 1996.

For the Commission by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.<sup>7</sup>

Margaret H. McFarlane,

*Deputy Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 96-6643 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

---

## SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

### Data Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Small Business Administration's intentions to request approval on a new, and/or currently approved information collection.

**DATES:** Comments should be submitted by May 20, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jacqueline White, Management Analyst, Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street, S.W., Suite 5000, Washington, D.C. 20416. Phone Number: 202-205-6629. Copies of these collections can also be obtained.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title:* The Impact of Structural Change in the Banking Industry on Small Business Lending.

*Type of Request:* New Collection.  
*Description of Respondents:* Banks Involved in Mergers or Acquisitions.

*Annual Responses:* 350.

<sup>7</sup> 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(12) (1995).

*Annual Burden:* 175.

*Comments:* Send all comments regarding this information collection to Charles Ou, Small Business Administration, Office of Advocacy 409 3rd Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20416. Phone No.: 202-205-6966. Send comments regarding whether these information collections are necessary for the proper performance of the function of the agency, accuracy of burden estimate, in addition to ways to minimize this estimate, and ways to enhance the quality.

*Title:* Small Business Administration Applicant Survey.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Description of Respondents:* Individuals Seeking Employment.

*Annual Responses:* 7,500.

*Burden:* 1,275.

*Comments:* Send all comments regarding this information collection to Carol Cordova, Small Business Administration, Office of Human Resources, Suite 4000, 409 3rd Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20416; Phone: 202-205-6162.

*Title:* Procurement Automated Source.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Description of Respondents:* Small businesses interested in federal procurement opportunities.

*Annual Responses:* 219,500.

*Annual Burden:* 48,000.

*Comments:* Send all comments regarding this information collection to Glen Harwood, Small Business Administration, Office of Government Contracting, Suite 8000, 409 3rd Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20416, Phone: 202-205-6469.

*Title:* Request for Financial Statements.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Description of Respondents:* 8(a) Participating Firms.

*Annual Responses:* 3,100.

*Annual Burden:* 3,100.

*Title:* SBDC On Site Review and Record keeping Requirements.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Annual Responses:* 29.

*Annual Burden:* 3,976.

Jacqueline White,

*Chief, Administrative Information Branch.*

[FR Doc. 96-6599 Filed 3-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

### Data Collection Available for Public Comments and Recommendations

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces the Small Business Administration's intentions to request approval on a new, and/or currently approved information collection.

**DATES:** Comments should be submitted on or before May 20, 1996.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jacqueline White, Management Analyst, Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street, S.W., Suite 5000, Washington, DC. 20416. Phone Number: 202-205-6629. Copies of these collections can also be obtained.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title:* SBA Guaranty Lender's Customer Satisfaction.

*Type of Request:* New Information collection.

*Description of Respondents:* Guaranty Lenders.

*Annual Responses:* 8337.

*Annual Burden:* 2779.

*Comments:* Send all comments regarding this information collection to George Price, Office of Marketing and Customer Service, Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street, S.W., Washington, DC. 20416. Phone No.: 202-205-7124. Send comments regarding whether this information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the function of the agency, accuracy of burden estimate, in addition to ways to minimize this estimate, and ways to enhance the quality.

Jacqueline White,

*Chief, Administrative Information Branch.*

[FR Doc. 96-6715 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

## SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

### Rescission of Social Security Ruling SSR 82-43 Relationship—Presumption of the Validity of the Last Marriage

**AGENCY:** Social Security Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of rescission of Social Security Ruling SSR 82-43.

**SUMMARY:** The Commissioner of Social Security gives notice of the rescission of SSR 82-43.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 20, 1996.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joanne K. Castello, Division of Regulations and Rulings, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21235, (410) 965-1711.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Social Security Rulings make available to the public precedent final decisions, opinions, and orders relating to the Federal old-age, survivors, disability, supplemental security income, and black lung benefits programs. Social Security Rulings may be based on claim decisions made at all administrative levels of adjudication, Federal court decisions, Commissioner's decisions, opinions of the Office of the General Counsel, and other policy interpretations of the law and regulations.

SSR 82-43, issued in 1982, was published in the 1981-1985 Cumulative Edition of the Rulings on page 92. SSR 82-43 involves Kansas law on the presumption of the validity of the last marriage and rebutting the presumption. The Ruling holds that whether the presumption is rebutted depends on knowledge of divorce records about the worker from all places where he lived for the entire period of separation from the spouse who is challenging the last marriage and the existence of a divorce.

The Supreme Court of Kansas in *Harper v. DuPree*, 345 P.2d 644 (Kan. 1959), established a very high burden of proof on the party who attacks a marriage as invalid on the grounds that one of the spouses was not previously divorced. In *Harper*, the burden of proof is one of leaving "no room for reasonable doubt." In *Elms v. Bowen*, 702 F. Supp. 273 (D. Kan. 1989), the district court, relying on *Harper*, concluded that the absence of divorce records concerning a prior marriage was not sufficient to prove the invalidity of a subsequent marriage.

The presumption under Kansas law is so strict that it precludes a blanket rebuttal policy that the absence of a divorce decree among the public records of places the insured lived constitutes sufficient evidence that no divorce occurred. Therefore, each claim involving the rebuttal of the presumption of the last marriage under Kansas law must be evaluated and decided individually. SSR 82-43 is rescinded because it does not reflect Kansas law at this time and a general policy statement on rebutting the presumption of the validity of the last marriage where the claim is governed by Kansas law is not possible, at least until Kansas law is clarified.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, Programs 96.001 Social Security—Disability Insurance; 96.002 Social Security—Retirement Insurance; 96.004 Social Security—Survivors Insurance; 96.005 Special Benefits for Disabled Coal Miners.)

Dated: March 8, 1996.

Shirley S. Chater,

*Commissioner of Social Security.*

[FR Doc. 96-6674 Filed 3-19-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4190-29-P