

[Docket No. 7570; Amdt. 77-3]

**PART 77—OBJECTS AFFECTING
NAVIGABLE AIRSPACE****Discretionary Review**

The purpose of this amendment is to exclude determinations of no hazard made under § 77.19(c) (1) from the applicability of discretionary review provided in § 77.37.

The FAA published a notice of proposed rule making in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* on August 23, 1966 (31 F.R. 11155), circulated as Notice 66-34, proposing to exclude no-hazard determinations relating to those structures for which a notice must be filed under § 77.13 but which would not exceed any standard of Subpart C of Part 77, and therefore would be neither an obstruction nor a hazard. Under the FAA's published criteria the proponent of a structure in this category could be given only a no-hazard determination. However, under § 77.37 the proponent should wait 30 days to allow any interested party the opportunity to petition for a discretionary review that could only result in a substantiation of the no-hazard determination.

Comments received in response to the notice indicated a general understanding of the unneeded delay of 30 days preceding finality of the determination and generally endorsed the proposal. Objections were received to the proposal that were directed to procedural delays encountered in disseminating information concerning the proposed structure to airspace users.

The Air Line Pilots Association objected, stating that local authority would not have an opportunity to study a proposed construction with regard to local zoning ordinances, and to assess the "effects" of the proposal on aviation in that location. A proponent must, of course, obtain any necessary approval from local government authorities prior to construction, including zoning approval, if any, which would consider the effects on local property interests. Elimination of the provision for discretionary review by the FAA would have no effect on any requirement local authorities may impose on the proponent.

The Department of the Air Force objected, stating that the elimination of a 30-day delay would not permit proper treatment of aviation considerations because of the length of time involved in obtaining and assessing the effect of the proposal. Particularly, the Air Force is concerned with training flights at very low levels for which a structure of moderate height could be a hazard, and which may be erected before the Air Force representatives would be aware of its existence. Part 77 was never intended to provide protection for very low level military training operations. If every structure that may be an obstruction to flights of this nature should be called a hazard, the public would be overburdened, and a hazard determination would be meaningless. The portion of the comment relating to the delay in obtaining information is pertinent, and

coincidentally is similar to a comment received from the Department of the Navy in concurring with the proposal. The FAA will review its procedures to insure appropriate coordination and timely dissemination of information to appropriate parties, including military representatives.

Some comments, conceding that a delay of 30 days may be burdensome in particular circumstances, suggested that a provision be promulgated to waive the 30-day period in circumstances of hardship, or that the 30-day period be retained when an interested party specifically requests its retention to permit time for filing a petition for review. One comment suggested eliminating acknowledgments issued under § 77.19(c) (1). Retention of the 30-day period under normal circumstances while waiving it in cases of hardship would base the decision for discretionary review upon the circumstances of the proponent rather than the effect upon aeronautical operations. If under the standards of Part 77 a structure could be neither an obstruction nor a hazard, periods of delay and additional reviews could not alter the determination. Moreover, issuing waivers would be time consuming and administratively inefficient where the necessity of review is nonexistent.

In consideration of the foregoing, § 77.37 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended, effective June 5, 1967, by adding the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (a):

§ 77.37 Discretionary review.

(a) * * * This paragraph does not apply to any acknowledgment issued under § 77.19(c) (1).

(Secs. 307, 313, 1101, Federal Aviation Act of 1958; 49 U.S.C. 1348, 1354, 1501)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on May 1, 1967.

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 67-5090; Filed, May 5, 1967;
8:47 a.m.]

TABLE I—AMPROMIUM IN COMPLETE CHICKEN AND TURKEY FEED

Principal ingredient	Grams per ton	Combined with—	Grams per ton	Limitations	Indications for use
1.1 * * *	***	***	***	§ 121.262, table 1, item 2.1.	§ 121.262, table 1, item 2.1.
k. * * *	***	***	***	***	***
2.7 * * *	***	***	***	***	***
2.8 Ampromium.....	113.5-227 (0.0125% 0.025%)	3-Nitro-4-hydroxy-phenylarsonic acid.	22.7-45.4 (0.0025% 0.005%)	For broiler chickens; withdraw 5 days before slaughter; as sole source of organic arsenic.	Prevention of coccidiosis; growth promotion and feed efficiency; improving pigmentation. Do.
2.9 Ampromium.....	113.5-227 (0.0125% 0.025%)	Ethopabate..... + 3-Nitro-4-hydroxy-phenylarsonic acid.	3.6 (0.0004%) 22.7-45.4 (0.0025% 0.005%)	For broiler chickens; for replacement chickens intended for use as caged layers only; withdraw 5 days before slaughter; as sole source of organic arsenic.	Do.
e. 2.1, 2.2, or 2.9..	***	***	***	***	***
q. [Reserved]	***	***	***	***	***

Title 21—FOOD AND DRUGS**Chapter I—Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare****SUBCHAPTER B—FOOD AND FOOD PRODUCTS****PART 121—FOOD ADDITIVES****Subpart C—Food Additives Permitted in the Feed and Drinking Water of Animals or for the Treatment of Food-Producing Animals****SUBCHAPTER C—DRUGS****PART 144—ANTIBIOTIC DRUGS; EXEMPTIONS FROM LABELING AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS****Ampromium, Ethopabate, 3-Nitro-4-Hydroxyphenylarsonic Acid, Bacitracin**

A. The Commissioner of Food and Drugs, having evaluated the data submitted in a petition (FAP 6C1932) filed by Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, Division of Merck and Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J. 07065, and other relevant material, has concluded that the food additive regulations should be amended to provide for the safe use in chicken feed of a combination drug containing ampromium, ethopabate, 3-nitro-4-hydroxyphenylarsonic acid, and bacitracin, for specified conditions of chickens. Therefore, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 409(c) (1), 72 Stat. 1786; 21 U.S.C. 348(c) (1)), and under the authority delegated to the Commissioner by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (21 CFR 2.120), Part 121 is amended in the following respects:

1. In § 121.210(c), table 1 is amended by changing item 1.1k in the fifth and sixth columns, by adding new items 2.8 and 2.9, by amending in the first column subitem e under item 2.9, and by deleting and reserving subitem q under item 2.9. The affected portions are as follows:

§ 121.210 Ampromium.

(c) * * *

2. In § 121.262(c), table 1 is amended by adding new items 1.7, 1.8, and 1.9, by amending in the first column subitem 1 under item 1.9, and by deleting subitems k and l under item 1.9. The affected portions are as follows:

§ 121.262 3-Nitro-4-hydroxyphenylarsonic acid.

(c)

TABLE 1—3-NITRO-4-HYDROXYPHENYLARSONIC ACID IN COMPLETE CHICKEN AND TURKEY FEED

Principal ingredient	Grams per ton	Combined with—	Grams per ton	Limitations	Indications for use
1.6					
1.7 3-Nitro-4-hydroxyphenylarsonic acid.	22.7-45.4 (0.0025%—0.005%)	Amprolium.	113.5-227 (0.0125%—0.025%)	For broiler chickens; withdraw 5 days before slaughter; as sole source of organic arsenic.	Prevention of coccidiosis; growth promotion and feed efficiency; improving pigmentation.
1.8 3-Nitro-4-hydroxyphenylarsonic acid.	22.7-45.4 (0.0025%—0.005%)	do. + Ethopabate.	113.5-227 (0.0125%—0.025%) 3.6 (0.0004%)	For broiler chickens; for replacement chickens intended for use as egg layers only; withdraw 5 days before slaughter; as sole source of organic arsenic.	Do.
1.9 3-Nitro-4-hydroxyphenylarsonic acid.	22.7-45.4 (0.0025%—0.005%)	do.	36.3-113.5 (0.004%—0.0125%)	For replacement chickens; withdraw 5 days before slaughter; as sole source of organic arsenic; as follows:	Growth promotion and feed efficiency; improving pigmentation; development of active immunity to coccidiosis.
				Amount of amprolium in feed for birds by age groups	
				Growing conditions	
				Up to 5 weeks of age	From 5 to 8 weeks of age
				Severe exposure to coccidiosis.	72.6-113.5 (0.0125%)
				Moderate exposure to coccidiosis.	72.6-113.5 (0.006%—0.0125%)
				Slight exposure to coccidiosis.	36.3-113.5 (0.004%—0.0125%)
1.11, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15 . . .					
k. [Deleted]					
l. [Deleted]					

§ 144.26 [Amended]

B. Pursuant to the provisions of the act (sec. 507, 59 Stat. 463, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 357) and under the authority delegated as cited above, § 144.26 *Animal feed containing certifiable antibiotics* is amended by changing in the first sentence of paragraph (b) (54) the words "arsanilic acid," to read "arsanilic acid or 3-nitro-4-hydroxyphenylarsonic acid."

Any person who will be adversely affected by the foregoing order may at any time within 30 days from the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER file with the Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Room 5440, 330 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20201, written objections thereto, preferably in quintuplicate. Objections shall show wherein the person filing will be adversely affected by

the order and specify with particularity the provisions of the order deemed objectionable and the grounds for the objections. If a hearing is requested, the objections must state the issues for the hearing. A hearing will be granted if the objections are supported by grounds legally sufficient to justify the relief sought. Objections may be accompanied by a memorandum or brief in support thereof.

Effective date. This order shall become effective on the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(Secs. 409(c) (1), 507, 59 Stat. 463, as amended, 72 Stat. 1786; 21 U.S.C. 348(c) (1), 357)

Dated: April 21, 1967.

J. K. KIRK,
Associate Commissioner
for Compliance.

[P.R. Doc. 67-5060; Filed, May 5, 1967; 8:45 a.m.]

Title 26—INTERNAL REVENUE

Chapter I—Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury

SUBCHAPTER A—INCOME TAX

[T.D. 6916]

PART 1—INCOME TAX; TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DE- CEMBER 31, 1953

Certain Reacquisitions of Real Property

Correction

In F.R. Doc. 67-4044, published at page 5923 in the issue dated April 13, 1967, the following corrections should be made:

1. In § 1.1034-1(a) following the sentence reading "Any gain realized upon disposition of other property in exchange for the new residence is not affected by section 1034" and preceding the last sentence, a sentence was inadvertently omitted. This sentence reads as follows: "For special rules relating to the sale or exchange of a principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained age 65, see section 121 and paragraph (g) of § 1.121-5."

2. In Example (5) under § 1.1038-1(h), in paragraph (a), "requisition" in the last line should read "reacquisition", and in paragraph (b), the fifth line under "Limitation on amount of gain", the word "at" should read "as".

3. In Example (1) under § 1.1038-2(h), in the first sentence of paragraph (a) the words "an adjusted sales price of" should be deleted.

Title 32—NATIONAL DEFENSE

Chapter XIV—The Renegotiation Board

SUBCHAPTER B—RENEGOTIATION BOARD REGULATIONS UNDER THE 1951 ACT

PART 1457—FISCAL YEAR BASIS FOR RENEGOTIATION AND EXCEPTIONS

Carryforward of Renegotiation Losses

Section 1457.9 *Losses on renegotiable business in other years: extent allowable in fiscal years ending on or after December 31, 1956*, is deleted in its entirety and the following is inserted in lieu thereof:

§ 1457.9 Carryforward of renegotiation losses.

(a) *Statutory provision.* Section 103 (m) of the act provides as follows:

(m) *Renegotiation loss carryforwards.*—(1) *Allowance.* Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the renegotiation loss deduction for any fiscal year ending on or after December 31, 1956, shall be allowed as an item of cost in such fiscal year, under regulations of the Board.

(2) *Definitions.* For the purposes of this subsection—

(A) The term "renegotiation loss deduction" means—

(i) for any fiscal year ending on or after December 31, 1956, and before January 1, 1959, the sum of the renegotiation loss carryforwards to such fiscal year from the preceding 2 fiscal years; and

(ii) for any fiscal year ending after December 31, 1958, the sum of the renegotiation loss carryforwards to such fiscal year from the preceding 5 fiscal years (excluding any fiscal year ending before December 31, 1956).

(B) The term "renegotiation loss" means, for any fiscal year, the excess, if any, of costs (computed without the application of this subsection and the third sentence of subsection (f)) paid or incurred in such fiscal year with respect to receipts or accruals subject to the provisions of this title over the amount of receipts or accruals subject to the provisions of this title which were received or accrued in such fiscal year, but only to the extent that such excess did not result from gross inefficiency of the contractor or subcontractor.

(3) Amount of carryforwards to 1956, 1957, and 1958. For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A) (i), a renegotiation loss for any fiscal year (hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as the "loss year") shall be a renegotiation loss carryforward to the first fiscal year succeeding the loss year. Such renegotiation loss, after being reduced (but not below zero) by the profits derived from contracts with the Departments and subcontracts in the first fiscal year succeeding the loss year, shall be a renegotiation loss carryforward to the second fiscal year succeeding the loss year. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the profits derived from contracts with the Departments and subcontracts in the first fiscal year succeeding the loss year shall be computed as follows:

(A) If such first fiscal year ends on or after December 31, 1956, such profits shall be computed by determining the amount of the renegotiation loss deduction for such first fiscal year without regard to the renegotiation loss for the loss year.

(B) If such first fiscal year ends before December 31, 1956, such profits shall be computed without regard to any renegotiation loss for the loss year or any fiscal year preceding the loss year.

(4) Amount of carryforwards to fiscal years ending after 1958. For the purposes of paragraph (2) (A) (ii), a renegotiation loss for any fiscal year (hereinafter in this paragraph referred to as the "loss year") ending on or after December 31, 1956, shall be a renegotiation loss carryforward to each of the 5 fiscal years following the loss year. The entire amount of such loss shall be carried to the first fiscal year succeeding the loss year. The portion of such loss which shall be carried to each of the other 4 fiscal years shall be the excess, if any, of the amount of such loss over the sum of the profits derived from contracts with the Departments and subcontracts in each of the prior fiscal years to which such loss may be carried. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the profits derived from contracts with the Departments and subcontracts in any such prior fiscal year shall be computed by determining the amount of the renegotiation loss deduction without regard to the renegotiation loss for the loss year or for any fiscal year thereafter, and the profits so computed shall not be considered to be less than zero.

(This subsection (m) added by Pub. Law 870, 84th Cong., approved Aug. 1, 1956, as amended by Pub. Law 86-89, approved July 13, 1959.)

(b) In general. Except as provided in this section, losses on renegotiable business in fiscal years prior to the fiscal year under review shall not be allowed as an

item of cost in the fiscal year under review. The rules set forth in this section, although stated in terms of the 5-year loss carryforward provided in section 103(m) (2) (A) (i) and (4) of the act, are also applicable to the 2-year loss carryforward provided in section 103(m) (2) (A) (i) and (3) of the act.

(c) Interpretation. (1) The amount of a "renegotiation loss" carried forward to the fiscal year under review from a "loss year" is a "renegotiation loss carryforward" to the fiscal year under review. The sum of the renegotiation loss carryforwards to the fiscal year under review is the "renegotiation loss deduction" for such fiscal year and is the amount which, under these regulations, is allowed as an item of cost in the fiscal year under review.

(2) If a contractor has a renegotiation loss in the first year, renegotiable profits in the second year, and renegotiable profits in the third year, the loss of the first year is first absorbed by the profits of the second year; the amount of loss remaining, if any, is then carried forward and applied against the profits of the third year; and so on until the loss is wholly absorbed by renegotiable profits in the five fiscal years following the loss year.

(3) If a contractor has renegotiation losses in 2 consecutive years, and renegotiable profits in subsequent years, the full amount of the first year's loss is absorbed by such profits before any part of the second year's loss is so applied.

(d) Limitations. (1) In computing the amount of a renegotiation loss, any losses resulting from gross inefficiency of the contractor will be excluded.

(2) Any contractor claiming allowance of a renegotiation loss deduction must show that it has reasonably pursued available remedies for obtaining relief from such loss.

(e) Carryforward upon acquisition of business. When a contractor acquires the business of another contractor within the 5 fiscal years following the close of a fiscal year in which such other contractor sustained a renegotiation loss, such loss, after being absorbed by renegotiation profits in any fiscal year between the loss year and the fiscal year under review, as provided in this section and § 1464.12 of this subchapter, shall be allowed as a renegotiation loss carryforward for the acquiring contractor if the loss contractor has ceased to exist and, in the opinion of the Board, such allowance is necessary to avoid inequity.

(f) Application to consolidated groups. For regulations pertaining to the carryforward of a renegotiation loss sustained by a contractor who was a member of a consolidated group in the loss year, or is a member of a consolidated group in the fiscal year under review, see § 1464.12 of this subchapter.

(Sec. 109, 65 Stat. 22; 50 U.S.C. App., Sup. 1219)

Dated: May 3, 1967.

LAWRENCE E. HARTWIG,
Chairman.

[F.R. Doc. 67-5105; Filed, May 5, 1967;
8:48 a.m.]

PART 1464—CONSOLIDATED RENEGOTIATION OF AFFILIATED GROUPS AND RELATED GROUPS

Renegotiation Losses of Consolidated Contractors

Section 1464.12 Overall loss of consolidated group is deleted in its entirety and the following is inserted in lieu thereof:

§ 1464.12 Renegotiation losses of consolidated contractors.

(a) Scope and effect of section. This section explains how a renegotiation loss sustained by a contractor in a fiscal year prior to the fiscal year under review will be treated pursuant to section 103(m) of the act when such contractor (1) was a member of a consolidated group in the loss year, or (2) is a member of a consolidated group in the fiscal year under review. For regulations pertaining to the carryforward of a renegotiation loss sustained by a single contractor, see § 1457.9 of this subchapter.

(b) Definitions. As used in this section:

(1) The term "consolidated renegotiation loss" means the amount by which the aggregate costs paid or incurred by the members of a consolidated group with respect to renegotiable receipts or accruals in a fiscal year exceed the aggregate renegotiable receipts or accruals of such group in such fiscal year.

(2) The term "loss member" means a contractor which sustains a renegotiation loss for a fiscal year in which it is a member of a group that sustains a consolidated renegotiation loss.

(c) Carryforward for loss member of a consolidated group. If a contractor who was the sole loss member of a consolidated group in a loss year is renegotiated separately for subsequent fiscal years, the amount of the consolidated renegotiation loss sustained by the group shall be a renegotiation loss carryforward for such contractor to each of the 5 fiscal years following the loss year, and shall be subject to the provisions of this section and § 1457.9 of this subchapter. If the group included more than one loss member and the members are renegotiated separately thereafter, the consolidated renegotiation loss will be allocated among the loss members in proportion to the amount of loss sustained by each, and the share so allocated to each loss member shall be a renegotiation loss carryforward for such contractor to each of the 5 fiscal years following the loss year, and shall be subject to the provisions of this section and § 1457.9 of this subchapter.

Example. In Year 1, A, B, and C were members of a consolidated group. A realized renegotiable profits of \$240,000; B sustained a renegotiation loss of \$200,000; and C sustained a renegotiation loss of \$100,000. The consolidated renegotiation loss of the group was \$60,000. If the members are renegotiated separately in Year 2, \$40,000 will be allowed as a cost to B and \$20,000 to C.

No amount of a consolidated renegotiation loss will be allowed as a carryforward (1) if such loss resulted from gross inefficiency; and (2) unless it is shown that any loss member of such group has

reasonably pursued available remedies for obtaining relief from such loss.

(d) *Carryforward to consolidated group*—(1) *When group was identical in loss year.* If a group consolidated in the fiscal year under review sustained a consolidated renegotiation loss in a prior fiscal year, the amount of such loss shall be a renegotiation loss carryforward for the group to each of the 5 fiscal years following the loss year, and shall be carried forward in the manner provided in this section and § 1457.9 of this subchapter.

(2) *When members were separate or in different groups in loss year.* If the members of a group consolidated in the fiscal year under review did not constitute a consolidated group of identical membership in a prior fiscal year in which one or more of such contractors sustained renegotiation losses, such losses shall be carried forward as provided in this section and § 1457.9 of this subchapter. Such losses will be allowed as carryforwards to the consolidated group in the fiscal year under review; but no such amount will be so allowed unless the members of such group would have qualified for consolidation in the loss year, and the aggregate amount so allowed will be limited to the amount, if any, which would have been the consolidated renegotiation loss of such group in the loss year. In computing such amount, if any member of the consolidated group was not a renegotiable contractor in the loss year, but succeeded thereafter to the business of a renegotiable contractor and was owned during the fiscal year under review by the same person or substantially the same persons who owned such predecessor in the loss year, the receipts or accruals and costs of such predecessor will be included in the computation. The following examples illustrate how the limitation in this subparagraph is computed and applied:

(i) *Members were all separate in loss year.* In Year 1, A, B, and C would have qualified for consolidated renegotiation, but were not consolidated. A realized renegotiable profits of \$240,000; B sustained a renegotiation loss of \$200,000; and C sustained a renegotiation loss of \$100,000. If A, B, and C were renegotiated separately in Year 2, \$200,000 would be allowed as a cost to B and \$100,000 to C. However, A, B, and C are a consolidated group in Year 2, with renegotiable profits of \$40,000. Had they been consolidated in Year 1, the consolidated renegotiation loss of the group would have been only \$60,000. It is this amount of \$60,000, and not the aggregate of \$300,000 of renegotiation losses sustained by B and C, which is allowed as a cost to the consolidated group in Year 2. The \$20,000 of loss remaining after such allowance is carried forward to Year 3 and is allowed as a cost to the consolidated group in that year.

(ii) *Members were in different groups in loss year.* In Year 1, A, B, and C were

members of a consolidated group; D and E were members of another consolidated group; and all five would have qualified for consolidation as a single group. Their renegotiable profits and losses were as follows: A, profit \$240,000; B, loss \$200,000; C, loss \$100,000; D, profit \$100,000; and E, loss \$150,000. The consolidated renegotiation loss of A, B, and C was \$60,000, allocable \$40,000 to B and \$20,000 to C. The consolidated renegotiation loss of D and E was \$50,000, allocable entirely to E. In Year 2, A, B, D, and E form a consolidated group, without C. If A, B, D, and E had consolidated in Year 1, the consolidated renegotiation loss of the group would have been only \$10,000. Although the allocable shares of B and E as shown above aggregate \$90,000, the amount allowable to the consolidated group in Year 2 is limited to \$10,000. The \$20,000 allocable to C is allowable to C in that amount in Year 2.

(iii) *Some members were separate and others were in different group in loss year.* (a) In Year 1, A (loss \$500,000), B (profit \$100,000), and C (profit \$300,000) were members of a consolidated group. The consolidated renegotiation loss of A, B, and C was \$100,000, allocable entirely to A. D (profit \$200,000) was renegotiated separately for the same year and made a renegotiation refund in the amount of \$30,000, retaining \$170,000 after renegotiation. E, a partnership (profit \$40,000) was also renegotiated separately. In Year 2 the partners dissolved E and formed a corporation F, which continued the partnership business. Assume A, B, C, D and E would have qualified for consolidation in Year 1.

(b) In a Year 2 consolidated group composed of A, B, C, and D, no amount of loss carryforward would be allowed to the group because A, B, C, and D as a group in Year 1 would have realized a group profit of \$70,000. In making this computation, D's profits are reduced by its \$30,000 renegotiation refund.

(c) In a Year 2 consolidated group composed of A, B, and D, the full amount of the \$100,000 consolidated renegotiation loss allocable to A would be allowed to the group.

(d) In a Year 2 consolidated group composed of A, B, C, and F, their consolidated renegotiation loss as a group in Year 1 would have been \$60,000; hence that amount would be allowed as a loss carryforward to the group.

(e) *Carryforward upon acquisition of business.* The provisions of § 1457.9(e) of this subchapter shall apply to the carryforward of losses under this section. (Sec. 109, 65 Stat. 22; 50 U.S.C. App., Sup. 1219)

Dated: May 3, 1967.

LAWRENCE E. HARTWIG,
Chairman.

[F.R. Doc. 67-5106; Filed, May 5, 1967;
8:48 a.m.]

Chapter XVI—Selective Service System

PART 1624—APPEARANCE BEFORE LOCAL BOARD

PART 1626—APPEAL TO APPEAL BOARD

PART 1627—APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT

PART 1628—PHYSICAL EXAMINATION

PART 1632—DELIVERY AND INDUCTION

Miscellaneous Amendments

CROSS REFERENCE: For miscellaneous amendments to the Selective Service Regulations, see Title 3, Executive Order 11350, *supra*.

Title 33—NAVIGATION AND NAVIGABLE WATERS

Chapter IV—Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

PART 401—SEAWAY REGULATIONS AND RULES

Hazardous Cargo Vessel; Correction

F.R. Doc. 67-4505, published at pages 6394-6396 in the issue dated April 25, 1967, is corrected by changing the word "omitting" to read "emitting" in the second line of § 401.105-6(g), Hazardous Cargo Vessel.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
[SEAL] JOSEPH H. McCANN,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 67-5080; Filed, May 5, 1967;
8:46 a.m.]

Title 39—POSTAL SERVICE

Chapter I—Post Office Department

PART 531—DOMESTIC AIR TRANSPORTATION

Air Carriers' Responsibilities and Handling of Mail

A notice of proposed revisions in §§ 531.3 and 531.5 of Title 39, Code of Federal Regulations, was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of March 7, 1967 (32 F.R. 3778), concerning new procedures for airmail flights. Interested persons were given 30 days in which to submit written comments regarding the proposals.

After careful consideration of the comments received, the Department has reached the conclusion to adopt the proposed amendments with the modification that carriers are requested and not