

ger or cargo flights, and flight under simulated instrument flight conditions.

(b) Flight training for a pilot qualifying to serve as pilot in command or as second in command in a crew requiring three or more pilots shall include flight instruction and practice in at least the following maneuvers and procedures:

(1) In each type of airplane to be flown by him:

(i) At the authorized maximum takeoff weight, takeoff using maximum takeoff power with simulated failure of the critical engine. For transport category airplanes the simulated engine failure shall be accomplished as closely as possible to the critical engine failure speed (V_1), and climbout shall be accomplished at a speed as close as possible to the takeoff safety speed (V_2). Each pilot shall ascertain the proper values for speeds V_1 and V_2 ;

(ii) At the authorized maximum landing weight, flight in a four-engine airplane, where appropriate, with the most critical combinations of two engines inoperative, or operating at zero thrust, utilizing appropriate climb speeds as set forth in the Airplane Flight Manual;

(iii) At the authorized maximum landing weight, simulated pullout from the landing and approach configurations accomplished at a safe altitude with the critical engine inoperative or operating at zero thrust.

(iv) Suitable combinations of airplane weight and power less than those specified in subdivisions (i), (ii), and (iii) of this subparagraph may be employed if the performance capabilities of the airplane under the above conditions are simulated.

(2) Conduct of flight under simulated instrument conditions, utilizing all types of navigational facilities and the letdown procedures used in normal operations. If a particular type of facility is not available in the training area, such training may be accomplished in a synthetic trainer.

(c) Flight training for a pilot qualifying to serve as second in command in a crew requiring two pilots shall include flight instruction and practice in at least the following maneuvers and procedures:

(1) In each type of airplane to be flown by him in scheduled operation:

(i) Assigned flight duties as second in command, including flight emergencies,
(ii) Taxiing,
(iii) Takeoffs and landings,
(iv) Climbs and climbing turns,
(v) Slow flight,
(vi) Approach to stall,
(vii) Engine shutdown and restart,
(viii) Takeoff and landing with simulated engine failure,
(ix) Conduct of flight under simulated instrument conditions including instrument approach at least down to circling approach minimum and missed approach procedures.

(2) Conduct of flight under simulated instrument conditions, utilizing all types of navigational facilities and the letdown procedures used in normal operations. Except for those approach procedures for which the lowest minimums are approved, all other letdown procedures may be given in a synthetic trainer which

contains the radio equipment and instruments necessary to simulate other navigational and letdown procedures approved for use by the air carrier.

§ 42.45c Initial flight navigation training.

(a) The training for flight navigation shall include the applicable portions of at least paragraphs (a) through (d) and (f) through (h) of § 42.45a.

(b) Prior to serving as a required flight crew member each flight navigator shall be given sufficient ground and flight training to become proficient in those duties assigned him by the air carrier. The flight training may be accomplished during passenger or cargo flights under the supervision of a qualified flight navigator.

§ 42.45d Initial flight engineer training.

(a) The training for flight engineers shall include at least the instruction specified in § 42.45a (a) through (e).

(b) Flight engineers shall be given sufficient training in flight to become proficient in those duties assigned them by the air carrier. Except for emergency procedures, this training may be accomplished during passenger or cargo flights under the supervision of a qualified flight engineer.

§ 42.45e Initial crew member emergency training.

(a) The training in emergency procedures shall be designed to give each crew member appropriate individual instruction in all emergency procedures, including assignments in the event of an emergency, and proper coordination between crew members. At least the following subjects as appropriate to the individual crew member shall be taught: The procedures to be followed in the event of the failure of an engine, or engines, or other airplane components or systems, emergency decompression, fire in the air or on the ground, ditching, evacuation, the location and operation of all emergency equipment, and power setting for maximum endurance and maximum range.

(b) Synthetic trainers may be used for training of crew members in emergency procedures where the trainers sufficiently simulate flight operating emergency conditions for the equipment to be used.

§ 42.45f Recurrent training.

(a) Each air carrier shall provide such training as is necessary to insure the continued competence of each crew member and to insure that each possesses adequate knowledge of and familiarity with all new equipment and procedures to be used by him.

(b) Each air carrier shall, at intervals established as part of the training program, but not to exceed 12 months, check the competence of each crew member with respect to procedures, techniques, and information essential to the satisfactory performance of his duties. Where the check of the pilot in command or second in command requires actual flight, such check shall be considered to have been met by the checks accomplished in accordance with §§ 42.44 (a) (2) or 42.44(a) (3), respectively.

(c) The appropriate instructor, supervisor, or check airmen shall certify as to the proficiency demonstrated, and such certification shall become a part of the individual's record.

§ 42.45g Approval of training programs.

The training program established by the air carrier under the provisions of §§ 42.45 through 42.45f shall meet with the approval of an authorized representative of the administrator: *Provided*, That the curriculum of such training program shall be submitted in appropriate form to an authorized representative of the Administrator not later than May 1, 1960.

§ 42.45h Flight crew member qualification for large aircraft.

(a) No air carrier shall utilize any flight crew member, nor shall any such airman perform the duties authorized by his airman certificate, unless he satisfactorily meets the appropriate requirements of §§ 42.40, 42.41, 42.43, 42.44; and 42.45 or 42.45f.

(b) Check airman shall certify as to the proficiency of the pilot being examined, as required by §§ 42.43(b) and 42.44(a) and such certification shall become a part of the airman's record.

The provisions of this amendment shall become effective January 1, 1961, except as otherwise provided in § 42.45g.

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 604, 605, 72 Stat. 752, 775, 778; 49 U.S.C. 1354, 1421, 1424, 1425)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on December 1, 1959.

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 59-10303; Filed, Dec. 4, 1959; 8:50 a.m.]

[Reg. Docket No. 40; Amdt. 42-24]

PART 42—IRREGULAR AIR CARRIER AND OFF-ROUTE RULES

Maximum Age Limitations for Pilots

Notice was given in Draft Release 59-4 (24 F.R. 5249) that a proposal was under consideration to amend Parts 40, 41 and 42 of the Civil Air Regulations to provide, in part, maximum age limits for certain utilizations of pilots in air-carrier operations by an air carrier.

It was pointed out in the draft release that the number of active air carrier pilots age 60 or over has been increasing significantly in recent years, that pilots in this age group are being employed in the carriage of a substantial number of passengers, both in piston and jet-powered aircraft, and that this number will increase substantially within the next few years. Absent some limitation in the regulations, this condition could continue until a number of active pilots have, within the next 5 years, reached ages 65 to 70, and together with the then larger group over age 60 become increasingly responsible for a growing percentage of air carrier operations.

The draft release points out the reasons indicating that a hazard to safety is presented by utilization of pilots of

these ages in air carrier operations. These include the fact that there is a progressive deterioration of certain important physiological and psychological functions with age, that significant medical defects attributable to this degenerative process occur at an increasing rate as age increases, and that sudden incapacity due to such medical defects becomes significantly more frequent in any group reaching age 60.

Such incapacity, due primarily to heart attacks and strokes, cannot be predicted accurately as to any specific individual on the basis of presently available scientific tests and criteria. On the contrary, the evidences of the aging process are so varied in different individuals that it is not possible to determine accurately with respect to any individual whether the presence or absence of any specific defect in itself either led to or precluded a sudden incapacitating attack. Any attempt to be selective in predicting which individuals are likely to suffer an incapacitating attack would be futile under the circumstances and would not be medically sound. Such a procedure, in light of the knowledge that a substantial percentage of any group of persons will suffer from such attacks after reaching age 60, would therefore be ineffective in eliminating the hazard to safety involved.

This conclusion is emphasized by the fact that, in the case of one large group under medical supervision over an extended period, some 85% of the persons who had a heart attack for the first time had the attack within six months to a year after a thorough medical examination had found the individual in a condition normal to his age and without any evidence to suggest the imminence of such an attack. In addition, the general good health of an individual, or the appearance of good health, are not determinative as to whether he will suffer a heart attack from the conditions that are normal as a result of age.

Other factors, even less susceptible to precise measurement as to their effect but which must be considered in connection with safety in flight, result simply from aging alone and are, with some variations, applicable to all individuals. These relate to loss of ability to perform highly skilled tasks rapidly, to resist fatigue, to maintain physical stamina, to perform effectively in a complex and stressful environment, to apply experience, judgment and reasoning rapidly in new, changing and emergency situations, and to learn new techniques, skills and procedures. The progressive loss of these abilities generally started well prior to age 60; and, even though they may be significant in themselves prior to age 60, they assume greater significance at the older ages when coupled with the medical defects leading to increased risk of sudden incapacitation.

The older pilots as a group fly the largest, highest-performance aircraft, carrying the greatest number of passengers over the longest non-stop distances, operating into and out of the most con-

gested airports near the largest cities, and traveling in flight in and through traffic lanes with the highest density of air traffic. A great many of these flights involve the newest, largest, fastest and most highly-powered jet aircraft. The possible hazards inherent in the older pilot's medical condition are entirely too serious to determine the question of safety by an attempt to balance the increased chances of an incapacitating attack against the possibility that the pilot might not be engaged in the carriage of a large number of passengers at the time of such an attack.

In exploring all the ramifications of the problems involved, the nature of air traffic and air carrier operations in the future has been considered. Present indications are that the very large increases that have taken place in recent years are small in relation to the increases yet to occur. Projection of the number of pilots who will be in the 60 to 70 year age group, in an era of extreme density and frequency of jet and piston air carrier operations involving many millions of passenger miles, indicates a probability of sudden incapacitation of some of these pilots in the course of flight. While medical science may at some future time develop accurate, validly selective tests which would safely allow selected pilots to fly in air carrier operations after age 60, safety cannot be compromised in the meantime for lack of such tests. This is particularly so in light of the statutory directive contained in section 601(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 that, "In prescribing standards, rules, and regulations * * * the Administrator shall give full consideration to the duty resting upon air carriers to perform their services with the highest possible degree of safety in the public interest * * *" and that, "The Administrator shall exercise and perform his powers and duties under this Act in such a manner as will best tend to reduce or eliminate the possibility of, or recurrence of, accidents in air transportation * * *".

To the extent that a progressive loss of certain abilities generally starts well prior to age 60, further consideration is required of those aspects of safety in flight concerned with factors other than incapacitation. Especially with the development and increasing use of larger and higher performance aircraft and more complicated traffic conditions, growing importance attaches to the ability of pilots to learn new techniques, skills, and procedures, and to unlearn and discard previously learned and well-established patterns of behavior.

For this reason, the draft proposal included a provision to establish age 55 as the age prior to which an individual must obtain a type-rating for turbo-jet powered aircraft in order to act as pilot-in-command for such aircraft in air carrier service. Age 55 was selected on the basis that it marks the point at which the detrimental effects of age on physiological and psychological functions have become significant.

All interested persons have been given an opportunity to comment and all com-

ments received have been given careful consideration. Many strong arguments were made, both in favor of and against the draft proposal. Some of the comments in favor of the proposal recommended more stringent action than that now being taken in this amendment, and referred to opinions and conclusions more far-reaching than those expressed above. Some of these were received from active airline pilots, although a majority of those identifying themselves as airline pilots from whom comments were received were adverse to the proposal.

The Air Transport Association, representing the major scheduled air carriers conducting charter flights and special services or scheduled cargo operations under the provisions of Part 42, was in favor of the proposal as to age 60. One large supplemental air carrier was opposed to the entire proposal. The Air Line Pilots Association, from which most complete and voluminous comments were received, was also opposed to the proposals, but offered no practicable substitute to achieve the safety aims of this amendment. The position taken was that qualification of a pilot should be determined on an individual selection basis without any limitation as to chronological age. This is rejected as an inadequate safety standard in light of the present inability of medical science to provide a reliable and valid basis for selection.

Some requests for a public hearing were received. In the rulemaking process, a public hearing has basically the same purpose as written comments, namely, to inform the Agency of the facts and opinions of the public concerning the proposed rule. It serves a useful purpose, however, when it provides something more than usually is obtained from written comments. Normally, this would involve situations where facts and views cannot be expressed adequately by written comments, where written comments cannot properly be evaluated without further development in a public hearing, or where written comments which have been received raise new issues which require further public consideration and this can be accomplished most satisfactorily and expeditiously in a hearing.

Comments were received covering all the issues involved in the proposed rule. They have been most carefully evaluated with respect to their bearing on some of the requests that were received for a public hearing. In respect to the provision to establish age 55 as the age prior to which an individual must obtain a type-rating for turbo-jet powered aircraft, it is possible that a hearing may produce further information or data not already encompassed in the scope of the comments received. The comments and other data available appear to be sufficiently precise and determinative in connection with the provisions applicable to utilization of a pilot after attainment of age 60. In this connection, the requests for a public hearing did not indicate any area that the comments have not covered adequately nor was any

showing made that they could not be evaluated properly without a public hearing. They did not point out any issue that was not previously considered. On this point a public hearing is likely to repeat opinions and evidence already submitted in the form of written comments. With respect to this provision of the proposed rule, therefore, it does not appear that a public hearing would serve a useful purpose; and it is not deemed necessary in the public interest.

After considering all of the comments received, I find that a public hearing is necessary and appropriate with respect to the proposal concerning eligibility to obtain a type-rating for turbo-jet powered aircraft after the attainment of age 55 and a notice for such a hearing on January 7, 1960, is being issued. I find further that establishment of a maximum age of 60 for pilots utilized by air carriers in air carrier operations is necessary for safety in air commerce and is in the public interest.

In answer to some of the comments received from air taxi operators and other operators of small aircraft it appears necessary to point out that this amendment will not apply to pilots of small aircraft. At the time that the proposal was issued as a draft release it was contemplated that such operations would shortly be conducted pursuant to the provisions of a new Part 47. However, since the effective date of that part has been suspended, and such operations will continue to be conducted under Part 42 for an additional period, this amendment to Part 42 has been expressly limited to large aircraft. This amendment will, of course, apply to pilots of large aircraft when utilized by commercial operators subject to the provisions of Part 42. The necessity of a maximum age limitation to pilots of small aircraft utilized by air taxi and other commercial operators will be the subject of further study by the Agency. If such a requirement is found necessary it will be issued as a separate proposal for comments by the public.

In consideration of the foregoing, section 42.40 of Part 42 of the Civil Air Regulations (14 CFR Part 42) is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 42.40 Airman requirements.

(c) No individual who has reached his 60th birthday shall be utilized or serve as a pilot on any large aircraft while engaged in air carrier operations.

This amendment shall become effective on March 15, 1960.

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 602, 604, 72 Stat. 752, 775, 776, 778; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1422, 1424)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on December 1, 1959.

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 59-10304; Filed, Dec. 4, 1959; 8:50 a.m.]

Chapter III—Federal Aviation Agency

SUBCHAPTER C—AIRCRAFT REGULATIONS

[Reg. Docket No. 195; Amdt. 60]

PART 507—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

Brown-Line Corporation Safety Belts

Due to unsatisfactory service performance and subsequent investigation, Brown-Line Corporation Model WB-2002-2 safety belts must be replaced in civil aircraft since they do not meet Technical Standard Order C22 standards. As use of the belt is hazardous, the Administrator finds that notice and public procedure hereon are impracticable and that good cause exists for making this amendment effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

In consideration of the foregoing § 507.10(a) is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:

59-24-3 BROWN-LINE CORPORATION SAFETY BELTS. Applies to all Brown-Line Model WB-2002-2 safety belts.

Investigation of two recent accidents involving aircraft in which the subject model safety belts were installed, disclosed that the wearer could not free himself from the belt, thereby preventing his escape from the aircraft. The design of this belt buckle is such that it will not enable the wearer to quickly and easily release the belt from the buckle. Thus this belt does not conform with section 4.1.2 of TSO-C22¹ and compliance is considered essential to safety in cases of fire or emergencies involving landings in water.

Accordingly, since this model safety belt does not meet the necessary safety requirements, it is not acceptable for installation in civil aircraft. Furthermore, all belts of this model that are in service must be replaced with acceptable safety belts within the next 25 hours of service time or the next periodic inspection, whichever occurs first.

(Sec. 313(a), 601, 603; 72 Stat. 752, 775, 776; 49 U.S.C. 1354(a), 1421, 1423)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on December 1, 1959.

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 59-10270; Filed, Dec. 4, 1959; 8:46 a.m.]

Title 7—AGRICULTURE

Subtitle A—Office of the Secretary of Agriculture

[Amdt. 6]

PART 5—DETERMINATION OF PARITY PRICE

Substitution of Term "Milkfat" for "Butterfat"

The purpose of this amendment is to substitute the term "milkfat" for "butterfat" in regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the determi-

¹ Section 4.1.2 of TSO-C22 states in part: " * * * shall include an easily operable quick release mechanism which will enable the wearer to release himself easily under a load simulating the wearer hanging in the belt."

nation of parity prices (21 F.R. 761, 7 CFR 5.1-5.7). The sole intent of this change is to authorize use of terminology which now is commonly used within the dairy industry and which is in consonance with terminology used in the official standards published by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Section 5.1 is amended by adding the following paragraph:

(c) The term "milkfat" as used in these regulations is synonymous with the term "butterfat", and when any statute requires calculation of the parity price of butterfat, the parity price of milkfat shall be the parity price of butterfat.

Sections 5.3 and 5.4 are amended by substituting the term "milkfat" for the term "butterfat" where this term appears.

(Sec. 375, 52 Stat. 66, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1375. Interpret or apply sec. 301, 52 Stat. 38, as amended; U.S.C. 1301)

Done at Washington, D.C., this 2d day of November 1959.

CLARENCE L. MILLER,
Assistant Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 59-10315; Filed, Dec. 4, 1959; 8:51 a.m.]

Chapter VII—Commodity Stabilization Service (Farm Marketing Quotas and Acreage Allotments), Department of Agriculture

[Amdt. 2]

PART 722—COTTON

Subpart—Regulations Pertaining to Acreage Allotments for the 1960 Crop of Upland Cotton

COUNTY ALLOTMENT; ALLOCATIONS TO COUNTIES FROM STATE'S SHARE OF NATIONAL RESERVE AND FROM STATE RESERVE; REMAINDER OF THE STATE RESERVE—STATE OF LOUISIANA

Basis and purpose. The purpose of this amendment is to establish for the State of Louisiana county allotments showing components thereof (computed county allotment, allocation from State's share of national reserve; adjustments from State reserve for trends and abnormal conditions); allocations to counties from State reserve for small farms and to correct inequities and prevent hardship; and to establish the remainder of State reserve which is available for allocation to counties for new farms, late and reconstituted farms and correction of errors.

The amendment contained herein is issued pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1281 et seq.), including amendments under Public Law 86-172 (73 Stat. 393, approved August 18, 1959). Notice of the proposed issuance of acreage allotment regulations for the 1960 crop of upland cotton was published in the FEDERAL

REGISTER on September 12, 1959 (24 F.R. 7382) in accordance with section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 238; 5 U.S.C. 1003) prior to issuance of such regulations.

Farmers engaged in the production of upland cotton in 1959 will determine in a referendum to be held on December 15, 1959, whether marketing quotas will be in effect for the 1960 crop of upland cotton. In order that farm allotments may be established as early as possible and notices of individual farm allotments may be mailed, insofar as practicable, so as to be received by farmers prior to the referendum, as required by section 362 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, it is essential that

this amendment be made effective as soon as possible. Accordingly, it is hereby determined and found that compliance with the notice and public procedure requirements and the 30-day effective date requirement of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act is impracticable and contrary to the public interest and this amendment shall be effective upon filing of this document with the Director, Office of the Federal Register.

The regulations pertaining to acreage allotments for the 1960 crop of upland cotton (24 F.R. 8430, 8628, 9693) are amended by inserting after the tabulation for Kentucky in § 722.316(h) (1) the following tabulation for Louisiana:

LOUISIANA

[Acres]

County	Computed county allotment	Allocation from State's share of national reserve	Adjustment from State reserve for—		County allotment, sum of columns (1), (2), (3) and (4)	Allocations from State reserve for—	
			Trends	Abnormal conditions		Small farms	Inequity and hardship cases
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Acadia	10,964	487.4	0	0	11,451.4	0	0
Allen	687	154.4	0	0	841.4	0	0
Ascension	497	129.1	0	0	626.1	0	0
Assumption	19	7.9	0	0	26.9	0	0
Avoyelles	22,714	1,202.2	0	0	23,916.2	0	2,468.3
Beauregard	324	76.5	0	0	400.5	0	0
Blenville	5,808	125.0	0	0	5,933.0	0	0
Bossier	17,756	191.2	0	0	17,947.2	0	1,284.1
Caddo	30,623	332.0	0	0	30,955.0	0	2,619.0
Calcasieu	163	20.9	0	0	183.9	0	0
Caldwell	6,250	132.4	0	0	6,382.4	0	804.5
Cameron	197	72.7	0	0	269.7	0	0
Catahoula	10,690	329.1	0	0	11,019.1	0	1,052.5
Clatborne	8,932	16.9	0	0	8,948.9	0	0
Concordia	8,270	182.2	0	0	8,452.2	0	812.8
De Soto	9,286	188.1	0	0	9,474.1	0	0
East Baton Rouge	740	181.2	0	0	921.2	0	0
East Carroll	21,796	144.1	0	0	21,940.1	0	2,170.2
East Feliciana	3,312	305.4	0	0	3,617.4	0	0
Evangeline	15,461	548.8	0	0	16,009.8	0	1,498.0
Franklin	48,863	551.4	0	0	49,414.4	0	4,708.7
Grant	3,417	48.1	0	0	3,465.1	0	449.2
Iberia	1,650	243.5	0	0	1,893.5	0	0
Iberville	604	56.3	0	0	660.3	0	0
Jackson	1,105	174.3	0	0	1,279.3	0	0
Jefferson	7	0.9	0	0	7.9	0	0
Jefferson Davis	430	75.9	0	0	505.9	0	0
Lafayette	13,418	804.8	0	0	14,222.8	0	0
Lafourche	24	0	0	0	24.0	0	0
La Salle	364	43.6	0	0	407.6	0	0
Lincoln	3,837	0	0	0	3,837.0	0	0
Livingston	373	136.3	0	0	509.3	0	0
Madison	16,227	179.1	0	0	16,406.1	0	1,761.2
Morehouse	26,486	235.5	0	0	26,721.5	0	2,904.2
Natchitoches	21,940	302.5	0	0	22,242.5	0	1,846.0
Orleans	2	0	0	0	2.0	0	0
Ouachita	12,369	168.5	0	0	12,537.5	0	880.0
Pointe Coupee	9,406	209.2	0	0	9,615.2	0	0
Rapides	15,133	321.5	0	0	15,454.5	0	1,536.5
Red River	10,545	96.9	0	0	10,641.9	0	0
Richland	41,959	438.2	0	0	42,397.2	0	4,221.7
Sabine	1,971	71.1	0	0	2,042.1	0	0
St. Helena	2,144	384.7	0	0	2,528.7	0	0
St. James	13	7.5	0	0	20.5	0	0
St. John the Baptist	8	5.1	0	0	13.1	0	0
St. Landry	32,611	1,095.2	0	0	33,706.2	0	2,998.0
St. Martin	7,973	649.3	0	0	8,622.3	0	0
St. Mary	3	0	0	0	3.0	0	0
St. Tammany	305	84.8	0	0	389.8	0	0
Tangipahoa	1,448	459.2	0	0	1,907.2	0	0
Tensas	16,988	173.0	0	0	17,161.0	0	1,814.5
Union	5,655	0	0	0	5,655.0	0	0
Vermilion	4,796	440.6	0	0	5,236.6	0	0
Vernon	1,098	191.6	0	0	1,289.6	0	0
Washington	5,328	615.9	0	0	5,943.9	0	0
Webster	6,393	118.0	0	0	6,511.0	0	0
West Baton Rouge	1,033	60.8	0	0	1,093.8	0	0
West Carroll	22,994	657.5	0	0	23,651.5	0	2,300.5
West Feliciana	2,190	132.6	0	0	2,322.6	0	0
Winn	977	118.1	0	0	1,095.1	0	0
a. State total	516,576	14,239.0	0	0	530,815.0	0	38,129.9

b. State reserve available for late and reconstituted farms and correction of errors (no State reserve allocated for new farms) 6,035.1
 c. Total allotment available from national allotment and national reserve for distribution in State (sum of columns (5), (6), and (7), and item (b)) 574,980

(Sec. 375, 52 Stat. 66, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1375. Interprets or applies sec. 344; 63 Stat. 670, as amended; sec. 377; 70 Stat. 206, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1344, 1377)

Done at Washington, D.C., this 30th day of November 1959.

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 59-10174; Filed, Nov. 30, 1959; 3:28 p.m.]

Chapter IX—Agricultural Marketing Service (Marketing Agreements and Orders), Department of Agriculture

SUBCHAPTER A—MARKETING ORDERS

[Navel Orange Reg. 174]

PART 914—NAVEL ORANGES GROWN IN ARIZONA AND DESIGNATED PART OF CALIFORNIA

Limitation of Handling

§ 914.474 Navel Orange Regulation 174.

(a) Findings. (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 14, as amended (7 CFR Part 914), regulating the handling of navel 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 recommendation and information submitted by the Navel 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 navel oranges as hereinafter provided will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(2) 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. 1001-1011) 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 navel 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