be for the purpose of advising the Economic Development Administration whether such plans are compatible with the approved plans of their respective regional commissions.

h. Shall consult with the Special Assistant for Regional Economic Coordination on research plans related to the objectives of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, which are to be carried out under the direction of the Special Assistant.

.04 In carrying out his responsibilities, under Executive Order 11386, and under Executive Order 11182 of October 2, 1964, as amended, which established the Field Committee, the Chairman of the Field Committee shall observe the provisions of paragraph .03 above, as applicable to the Field Committee.

Effective date: July 2, 1970.

LARRY A. JOBE,
*Assistant Secretary for Administration.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10030; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:45 a.m.]

---

[Dept. Organization Order 30-2B, Amdt. 3]

## NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

### Organization and Functions

This material amends the material appearing at 33 F.R. 19255 of December 25, 1968; 34 F.R. 5611 of March 25, 1969; and 35 F.R. 9295 of June 13, 1970.

Department Organization Order 30-2B, dated December 11, 1968, is hereby further amended as follows:

1. In section 10, *Institute for Basic Standards*, the listing which opens paragraph .04 is revised to read:

.04 The other organization units of the Institute for Basic Standards are as follows:

Located at Bureau Headquarters:
- Applied Mathematics Division.
- Electricity Division.
- Heat Division.
- Mechanics Division.
- Optical Physics Division.

Located at Boulder, Colo.:
- Cryogenics Division.
- Electromagnetics Division.
- Laboratory Astrophysics Division.
- Quantum Electronics Division.
- Time and Frequency Division.

2. The organization chart of May 28, 1970, attached to Amendment 2 to DOO 30-2B, is amended under "Institute for Basic Standards" by substituting Electromagnetics Division* for "Radio Standards Engineering Division*" and Quantum Electronics Division* for "Radio Standards Physics Division*."

Effective date: June 30, 1970.

LARRY A. JOBE,
*Assistant Secretary for Administration.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10031; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:45 a.m.]

# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## Food and Drug Administration

### AMERICAN CYANAMID CO.

### Notice of Filing of Petition Regarding Pesticides

Pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408 (d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(1)), notice is given that a petition (PP 0F0999) has been filed by American Cyanamid Co., Post Office Box 400, Princeton, N.J. 08540, proposing the establishment of tolerances (21 CFR Part 120) for residues of the insecticide dimethoate (*O,O*-dimethyl-*S*-(*N*-methylcarbamoylmethyl) phosphorodithioate), including its oxygen analog (*O,O*-dimethyl-*S*-(*N*-methylcarbamoylmethyl) phosphorothioate) in or on the raw agricultural commodities cucumbers at 2 parts per million, sorghum forage at 0.5 part per million, and sorghum grain at 0.1 part per million (negligible residue).

The analytical method proposed in the petition for determining residues of the insecticide is a gas-liquid chromatographic procedure using a flame photometric detector equipped with a phosphorus filter (526 millimicrons).

Dated: July 27, 1970.

R. E. DUGGAN,
*Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10034; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:46 a.m.]

---

### CHEVRON CHEMICAL CO.

### Notice of Filing of Petition Regarding Pesticide Chemicals

Pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(1)), notice is given that a petition (PP 0F0986) has been filed by Chevron Chemical Co., 940 Hensley Street, Richmond, Calif. 94804, proposing establishment of tolerances (21 CFR Part 120) for residues of the herbicide paraquat cation derived from application of either the dichloride or the bis(methylsulfate) salt in or on the raw agricultural commodities alfalfa, birdsfoot trefoil, clover, pasture grass, and range grass at 50 parts per million; and in milk and the meat, fat, and meat byproducts of cattle, goats, and sheep at 0.05 part per million (negligible residue).

The analytical method proposed in the petition for determining residues of the herbicide is a colorimetric procedure in which the residues are reduced by reaction with sodium dithionite to an unstable free radical that has an intense blue color. The color intensity is determined with a spectrophotometer at 394 millimicrons.

Dated: July 27, 1970.

R. E. DUGGAN,
*Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10035; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:46 a.m.]

---

### DOW CHEMICAL CO.

### Notice of Filing of Petition Regarding Pesticide Chemical

Pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(1)), notice is given that a petition (PP 0F0963) has been filed by The Dow Chemical Co., Post Office Box 512, Midland, Mich. 48640, proposing that 21 CFR 120.1001(d) be amended by revising the item "α - (Di - *sec* - butyl) phenyl - poly (oxypropylene) block polymer with poly (oxyethylene); the poly(oxypropylene) content averages 4 moles, the poly(oxyethylene) content averages 5 moles, the molecular weight averages 600" to read "α - (Di - *sec* - butyl) phenyl - poly(oxypropylene) block polymer with poly (oxyethylene); the poly(oxypropylene) content averages 4 moles, the poly(oxyethylene) content averages 5 to 12 moles, the molecular weight averages 600 to 965."

The analytical method proposed in the petition for determining residues of the inert ingredient is that of R. A. Greff et al., "Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society," vol. 42, page 180 (1965).

Dated: July 27, 1970.

R. E. DUGGAN,
*Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10036; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:46 a.m.]

---

### E. I. du PONT de NEMOURS & CO., INC.

### Notice of Filing of Petition Regarding Pesticide Chemicals

Pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408(d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(1)), notice is given that a petition (PP 0F1000) has been filed by E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., Wilmington, Del. 19898, proposing the establishment of tolerances (21 CFR Part 120) for residues of the fungicide benomyl (methyl 1-(butylcarbamoyl)-2-benzimidazolecarbamate) in or on the raw agricultural commodities, apricots, cherries, nectarines, peaches, plums, and prunes at 15 parts per million from both preharvest and postharvest applications.

The analytical method proposed in the petition for determining residues of the fungicide is the method of H. L. Pease and J. A. Gardiner published in the "Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry," vol. 17, pages 267-70 (1969).

Dated: July 27, 1970.

R. E. DUGGAN,
*Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10037; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:46 a.m.]

## UNIROYAL, INC.

### Notice of Filing of Petition Regarding Pesticide Chemical and Food Additive

Pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 408 (d)(1), 68 Stat. 512; 21 U.S.C. 346a(d)(1)), notice is given that a petition (PP 0F0990) has been filed by Uniroyal Chemical Division, Uniroyal, Inc., Bethany, Conn. 06525, proposing the establishment of tolerances (21 CFR Part 120) for residues of the plant regulator succinic acid 2,2-dimethyl hydrazide in or on the raw agricultural commodities peanuts at 20 parts per million, peanut hay and hulls at 10 parts per million, and poultry kidney at 1 part per million.

Notice is also given, pursuant to provisions of the act (sec. 409(b)(5), 72 Stat. 1786; 21 U.S.C. 348(b)(5)), that the same firm has filed a related petition (FAP 0H2553) proposing the issuance of a food additive regulation (21 CFR Part 121) to provide for residues of the plant regulator in peanut meal from application during the growing of peanuts.

The analytical method proposed in the pesticide petition for determining residues of the plant regulator is a colorimetric method in which the residue is hydrolyzed with 50 percent sodium hydroxide, distilled, and reacted with trisodium pentacyanoamine ferrate to form a specific red color at pH 5.0. The color is measured spectrophotometrically.

Dated: July 27, 1970.

R. E. DUGGAN,
*Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10038; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:46 a.m.]

## ENRICHED FLOUR DEVIATING FROM IDENTITY STANDARD

### Temporary Permit for Market Testing

Pursuant to § 10.5 (21 CFR 10.5) concerning temporary permits for market testing foods deviating from the requirements of standards of identity promulgated pursuant to section 401 (21 U.S.C. 341) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, notice is given that a temporary permit has been issued to The Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250. This permit covers interstate marketing tests of enriched flour deviating from the standard of identity for enriched flour (21 CFR 15.10).

The U.S. Department of Agriculture will assume possession of the food at the point of manufacture and will be responsible for its introduction into interstate commerce. The marketing is to take place pursuant to a study being conducted by the sponsor through its direct food distribution program.

The product will contain lysine hydrochloride in a quantity not less than 0.30 percent, an ingredient not presently provided for in the standards. Nutrients will be added as specified in § 15.10(a) except that the specified quantities of thiamine, riboflavin, niacin, and iron (Fe) will be increased approximately two-fold. The labels of the product will declare by common name the ingredients used as well as the percentage of the minimum daily requirements for the vitamins and minerals present in the enriched flour.

This temporary permit expires July 24, 1971.

Dated: July 24, 1970.

R. E. DUGGAN,
*Acting Associate Commissioner for Compliance.*

[F.R. Doc. 70-10039; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:46 a.m.]

[DESI 2855]

## CERTAIN MOUTHWASH AND GARGLE PREPARATIONS

### Drugs for Human Use; Drug Efficacy Study Implementation

The Food and Drug Administration has evaluated reports received from the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Drug Efficacy Study Group, on the following preparations:

1. Pepsodent Antiseptic Mouthwash containing hexachlorophene and alcohol; Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022 (NDA 10-094).

2. Cepacol Mouthwash/Gargle containing cetylpyridinium chloride and alcohol; The William S. Merrell Co., Division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio 45215 (NDA 2-855).

3. Sterisol containing hexedine and alcohol; Warner Lambert Pharmaceutical Co., 201 Tabor Road, Morris Plains, N.J. 07950 (NDA 11-419).

4. Betadine Mouthwash/Gargle containing povidone-iodine and alcohol; The Purdue Frederick Co., 99-101 Saw Mill River Road, Yonkers, N.Y. 10701 (NDA 10-290).

5. Isodine Gargle and Mouthwash containing providone-iodine complex and alcohol; Isodine Pharmacal Corp., Division of International Latex Corp., Dover, Del. 19901 (NDA 10-290).

6. Kasdenol Mouthwash and Gargle containing calcium hypochlorite; Kasdenol Corp., subsidiary of Guardian Chemical Corp., 41-45 Crescent Street, Long Island City, N.Y. 11101 (NDA 9-394).

7. Micrin Oral Antiseptic containing dequalinium acetate, cetylpyridinium chloride, oil of peppermint, menthol, and alcohol; Johnson and Johnson, 501 Georges Street, New Brunswick, N.J. 08901 (NDA 12-233).

8. Tosis containing sodium chloride, sodium bicarbonate, sodium borate, sodium benzoate, sodium salicylate, thymol, menthol, and flavoring agents; Cole Pharmacal Co., Inc., 3721 Laclede Avenue, St. Louis, Mo. 63108 (NDA 4-116).

9. Tyrolaris Mouthwash containing tyrothricin 0.02 percent, panthenol 0.02 percent, and alcohol 10 percent; Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J. 07065 (NDA 7-521).

The Food and Drug Administration concludes that:

1. The article "Tosis" is effective for its claim as an aromatic mouthwash.

2. There is a lack of substantial evidence that the preparation "Tyrolaris" is effective for the purposes claimed in its labeling. The antibiotic regulation providing for certification of this preparation was revoked March 19, 1967, on a finding that such evidence was lacking.

3. There is a lack of substantial evidence that the other articles listed above are effective for their respective claims relating to antimicrobial, antiseptic, germicidal, and analgesic uses and including the following: "effectively destroys bacteria that cause bad breath in the mouth—and stays active against bacteria for hours * * *"; "combat cold symptoms and minor throat irritations * * *"; "use * * * on skin shaving nicks, skin cuts, * * * to help against the spread of infection"; "* * * temporary relief of minor sore throat and mouth irritations"; "combats odor-causing bacteria"; "long-acting antibacterial action"; "temporary relief of minor sore throat due to the common cold and minor throat irritations from smoking or speaking"; "effective as a dental preoperative and postoperative rinse, prevents odors associated with periodontal packs, reduces postoperative healing time, helps relieve gingival irritation in orthodontics after adjustment of bands and appliances and after scaling"; "oral antiseptic"; "for the temporary relief of minor sore throat pain"; "stops both causes of bad breath germs, kills bad breath germs and destroys food odors"; "germicidal mouthwash"; "symptomatic treatment of sore bleeding gums"; "germicidal gargle"; "deodorant"; "cleansing agent"; "astringent"; "an aid in the relief of bleeding gums."

Claims such as "reduce oral bacteria", "remove oral debris", and "reduces air contamination during oral operative procedures" based upon a reduction of oral bacterial count, or on comparative data on oral debris removal with water, are misleading and unsupported by substantial evidence in the absence of evidence showing some prophylactic or therapeutic benefit resulting from bacterial-count reduction or debris removal. Articles labeled with such claimed effects lack substantial evidence of effectiveness for the implied therapeutic and hygienic benefits to be derived from bacterial-count reduction and from debris removal. Even though some of these products may be shown to reduce the total bacterial count of the oral flora, there is no evidence that this will have any prophylactic or therapeutic effect or benefit.

The Commissioner of Food and Drugs intends to initiate proceedings to withdraw approval of those new-drug applications listed above for the drugs which have claims for which substantial evidence of effectiveness is lacking.

Prior to initiating action to withdraw approval of the new-drug applications, the Commissioner invites the holders of these new-drug applications, and any interested person who would be adversely affected by removal of these drugs from the market, to submit pertinent data bearing on the proposal within 30 days following the date of publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER. To be considered acceptable for review, the material must be well-organized and consist of adequate and well-controlled studies bearing on the efficacy of the products and must not have been previously submitted.

This announcement of the proposed action and implementation of the NAS–NRC report for these drugs is made to give notice to persons who might be adversely affected by withdrawal of these drugs from the market. Promulgation of an order withdrawing approval of the new-drug applications will cause any such mouthwash or gargle preparation on the market, offered for these indications, to be a new drug for which an approved new-drug application is not in effect and will make it subject to regulatory action.

The Administration will not object to labeling which offers mouthwashes for nonprophylactic or nontherapeutic uses such as: An aromatic mouth freshener (provided the product contains aromatic ingredients); as a refreshing mouth rinse; as an aid to daily care of the mouth; and for causing the mouth to feel clean.

The label declaration or implication that an ingredient of such an article is active, when this is used to imply that the article has a prophylactic or therapeutic effect, may cause the article to be misbranded and a new drug for which substantial evidence of effectiveness is lacking. However, an ingredient may continue to be listed on the label if it does in fact contribute to the nonprophylactic and nontherapeutic usefulness of the article (e.g., wetting agent, foaming agent).

The holders of the new-drug applications for these drugs have been mailed a copy of the NAS–NRC reports. Any interested person may obtain a copy of the NAS–NRC reports on these drugs by writing to the office named below.

Communications forwarded in response to this announcement should be identified with the reference number DESI 2855 and be directed as shown below:

Requests for NAS–NRC report: Food and Drug Administration, Attention of Press Relations Staff (CE–200), 200 C Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20204.

All other communications: Food and Drug Administration, Attention of Special Assistant for Drug Efficacy Study Implementation (BD–201), Bureau of Drugs, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Md. 20852.

This notice is issued pursuant to the authority vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (secs. 502, 505, 52 Stat. 1050–53, as amended; 21 U.S.C. 353, 355) and delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs (21 CFR 2.120).

Dated: July 23, 1970.

CHARLES C. EDWARDS,
*Commissioner of Food and Drugs.*

[F.R. Doc. 70–10113; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:52 a.m.]

# ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–83]

## UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

### Notice of Issuance of Facility License Amendment

The Atomic Energy Commission (the Commission) has issued, effective as of the date of issuance, Amendment No. 10 to Facility License No. R–56. The license presently authorizes the University of Florida to possess, use, and operate its training reactor located on the University's campus in Gainesville, Fla., at steady-state power levels up to 100 kilowatts (thermal). The amendment (1) incorporates new Technical Specifications for operation of the facility which include provisions for an increase (from 0.6 percent to 2.3 percent delta k/k) in the core excess reactivity, and (2) restates the license in its entirety to consolidate all pertinent provisions of amendments previously issued.

The Commission has found that the application for the amendment complies with the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's regulations published in 10 CFR Chapter I. The Commission has made the findings required by the Act and the Commission's regulations which are set forth in the amendment, and has concluded that the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Within fifteen (15) days from the date of publication of the notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, the applicant may file a request for a hearing and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's rules of practice in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene is filed within the time prescribed in this notice, the Commission will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

For further details with respect to this amendment, see (1) the licensee's application for license amendment dated September 11, 1969, as revised May 11, 1970, (2) the amendment to the facility license, including new Technical Specifications, and (3) the related Safety Evaluation by the Division of Reactor Licensing, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room at 1717 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. Copies of items (2) and (3) above may be obtained upon request sent to the Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545, Attention: Director, Division of Reactor Licensing.

Dated at Bethesda, Md., this 22d day of July 1970.

For the Atomic Energy Commission.

DONALD J. SKOVHOLT,
*Assistant Director for Reactor Operations, Division of Reactor Licensing.*

[F.R. Doc. 70–10054; Filed, Aug. 3, 1970; 8:47 a.m.]

# CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Docket No. 22264; Order 70–7–127]

## AIR INDIES CORP.

### Order To Show Cause Regarding Establishment of Final Service Mail Rates

Issued under delegated authority July 28, 1970.

Air Indies Corp. (Air Indies) is an air taxi operator providing services pursuant to Part 298 of the Board's economic regulations. By petition filed June 10, 1970, Air Indies requested the Board to establish final mail rates for the transportation of priority and nonpriority mail by aircraft between St. Croix and St. Thomas, V.I.

By Order 70–7–108, July 23, 1970, in this docket the Board granted Air Indies exemption authority to engage in the carriage of mail by aircraft in that market.

No service mail rates are currently in effect for this transportation by Air Indies. The petitioner requests that the multielement service mail rates in effect for Caribbean-Atlantic Airlines, Inc., in the market be made applicable to Air Indies. The rates applicable to Caribbean-Atlantic Airlines, Inc., were established for priority mail by Order E–25610, August 28, 1967, in the Domestic Service Mail Case, and for nonpriority mail by Order 70–4–9, April 2, 1970, in Nonpriority Mail Rates.[1]

On June 16, 1970, the Postmaster General filed a reply supporting the petition provided that Air Indies will be subject to all of the provisions of Orders E–25610 and 70–4–9, as amended. We propose to establish service rates for the transportation of mail by aircraft in this market by Air Indies at the levels established in Orders E–25610 and 70–4–9, as amended.

[1] Present service rates provide for terminal charges per pound of 2.34 cents at St. Thomas and 4.68 cents at St. Croix plus line-haul charges per mail ton-mile of 24 cents for priority mail and 11.33 cents for nonpriority mail.