tion of such lower minimum grade for Florida seeded grapefruit is necessary to satisfy demand for such grapefruit during the period of seasonally reduced supply. The amended grade requirement for the specified varieties of oranges recognizes the lesser quality of such oranges estimated to be remaining for fresh shipment to export outlets.

Findings. (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 905, as amended (7 CFR Part 905), regulating the handling of oranges, grapefruit, tangerines, and tangelos grown in Florida, 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 recommendations of the committees established under the aforesaid amended marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found that the requirements applicable to grapefruit and oranges, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(2) The lower minimum grade requirement for domestic shipments of fresh seeded grapefruit is consistent with the remaining supply of and current and prospective demand for such grapefruit by fresh market outlets. Fresh shipments of Florida grapefruit for the season through June 9, 1974, totaled 25,166 carlots, and there were an estimated 1,084 carlots remaining for shipment. The lower grade requirement for export shipments of the specified varieties of oranges for the period June 24, 1974, through September 29, 1974, reflects the seasonal decline in the external appearance of such oranges and the prospective demand for such oranges by export outlets. For the season through June 2, 1974, export shipments of Florida fresh oranges totaled 765 carlots compared to 264 carlots during a comparable period last season.

(3) It is hereby further found that it is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rulemaking procedure, and postpone the effective date of these amendments until 30 days after publication thereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) in that the time intervening between the date when information upon which these amendments are based became available and the time when these amendments must become effective in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act is insufficient; and these amendments lower requirements applicable to the handling of grapefruit and oranges grown in Florida.

Order. 1. In § 905.551 (Grapefruit Regulation 74; 38 FR 25665, 28063, 31414, 34454, 34986; 39 FR 6605, 16231, 17970) the provisions of paragraph (b)(1) are amended to read as follows:

§ 905.551 Grapefruit Regulation 74.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) Any seeded grapefruit, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 1: *Provided*, That during the period June 14, 1974, through September 29, 1974, seeded grapefruit may be shipped if they grade at least Improved No. 2;

* * * * *

2. In § 905.554 (Export Regulation 23; 38 FR 25665, 28063; 39 FR 3812, 12105) the provisions of paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(9) are amended to read as follows:

§ 905.554 Export Regulation 23.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(1) Any oranges, except Navel oranges, Temple oranges, Murcott Honey oranges, and Valencia, Lue Gim Gong and similar late maturing oranges of the Valencia type, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 1: *Provided*, That during the period June 24, 1974, through September 29, 1974, such oranges may be shipped if they grade at least U.S. No. 2;

* * * * *

(9) Any Valencia, Lue Gim Gong, and similar late maturing oranges of the Valencia type, grown in the production area, which do not grade at least U.S. No. 1: *Provided*, That during the period June 24, 1974, through September 29, 1974, such oranges may be shipped if they grade at least U.S. No. 2;

* * * * *

(Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674))

Dated June 13, 1974, to become effective June 14, 1974.

CHARLES R. BRADER,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.74-13976 Filed 6-17-74;8:45 am]

Title 9—Animals and Animal Products

CHAPTER I—ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCHAPTER E—VIRUSES, SERUMS, TOXINS, AND ANALOGOUS PRODUCTS: ORGANISMS AND VECTORS

PART 113—STANDARD REQUIREMENTS

Miscellaneous Amendments

On March 15, 1974, a notice of proposed amendments to Part 113 was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, 39 FR 9983.

These amendments authorize the issuance of technical bulletins to be known as Supplemental Assay Methods (SAMs), standard reference preparations, standard test reagents, and seed cultures for laboratory test reagents as aids in conducting required tests.

They amend the test methods provided in § 113.26 to clarify the use of such methods to test materials used in the preparation of biological products. They authorize the testing of bulk material to satisfy the lymphoid leukosis requirements for products of avian origin.

The types of cells to be used when testing cell lines for purity are changed to those more appropriate and clarify the instructions for their use. Requirements for testing nutrient serum used in medium for growing bacteria are clarified.

After due consideration of all relevant matters, including the proposals set forth in the aforesaid notices of rulemaking, and the comments and views submitted by interested persons, and pursuant to the authority contained in the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act of March 4, 1913 (U.S.C. 151-158), the amendments of Part 113, of Subchapter E. Chapter 1, Title 9 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as contained in the aforesaid notices are hereby adopted and are set forth herein, subject to the following noted modifications:

§ 113.2 has been reworded for clarification. "Seed cultures" has been substituted for "seed virus" in paragraph (d).

§ 113.26 has been reworded by substituting "ingredients" for "materials" in the lead paragraph and subparagraph (c)(3). Subdivision (b)(2)(ii) has been reworded for clarity.

The lead paragraph in § 113.52(d)(4) has been reworded for clarity and authorization to use cell lines added to subdivision (v).

§ 113.53(b) has been reworded to permit the licensee to process nutrient serum other than by pasteurization and to clarify the application of the test requirements to such serums used in cell culture systems.

Also, the captions for § 113.36 and § 113.37 are revised by deleting the word "extraneous" from each and substituting the word "chicken" for "chick" in § 113.37 as being more accurate and uniform. These changes are editorial and do not substantively change the regulations affected.

1. Section 113.2 is amended to read:

§ 113.2 Testing aids.

To better insure consistent and reproducible test results when Standard Requirement tests prescribed in the regulations are conducted, Veterinary Services Laboratories, U.S. Department of Agriculture, may provide testing aids, when available, to licensees, permitees, and applicants for licenses and permits. Such aids shall be as follows:

(a) Supplemental Assay Method (SAM) is a technical bulletin containing detailed instructions for conducting an official required test. Such instructions shall be in accordance with the procedures currently being followed at Veterinary Services Laboratories and as improved, proven procedures are developed, shall be revised and reissued prior to application.

(b) Standard Reference Preparation is a serum, virus, bacterial culture, or antigen to be used in test systems for direct comparison with serials of biological products under test.

(c) Standard Test Reagent is a serum, antitoxin, fluorescent antibody conjugate, toxin, virus, bacterial cultural, or antigen to be used in test systems but not for direct comparison with serials of biological products under test.

(d) Seed cultures are small quantities of standard organisms to be propagated by the recipient to establish a supply for use.

2. The caption and introductory paragraph of § 113.26, and the provisions in § 113.26(b)(1), (b)(2), and (c)(3) are amended to read:

§ 113.26 Detection of viable bacteria and fungi except in live vaccine.

Each serial and subserial of biological product except live vaccines shall be tested as prescribed in this section unless otherwise specified by the Deputy Administrator. When ingredients used in the preparation of a biolgoical product are required to be free of viable bacteria and fungi, they shall also be tested as prescribed in this section.

* * * * *

(b) Test procedure:

(1) The media prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section shall be used in sufficient quantity to negate the bacteriostatic or fungistatic activity in the inoculum as determined in § 113.25(d).

(2) Inoculum:

(i) When completed product is tested, 10 final container samples for each serial and subserial shall be used. Inoculate 1 ml, or entire contents if less than 1 ml, from each sample to a corresponding individual test vessel of culture medium.

(ii) When cell lines or primary cells are tested, 10 samples having a total volume of at least five ml of resuspended cells shall be tested using media and procedures prescribed in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) If growth is found in any test vessel of the final test, the serial, subserial, or ingredients to be used in the preparation of a biological product, as the case may be, is unsatisfactory.

3. § 113.31(a)(2) is amended to read:

§ 113.31 Detection of avian lymphoid leukosis.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(2) When cell cultures are tested, 5 ml of the final cell suspension as prepared for seeding of production cell cultures shall be used as inoculum. When vaccines are tested, the equivalent of 200 doses of Newcastle disease vaccine or 500 doses of other vaccines for use in poultry, or one dose of vaccine for use in other animals shall be used as inoculum. Control cultures shall be prepared from the same cell suspension as the cultures for testing the vaccine.

* * * * *

4. § 113.52(d)(4) is amended to read:

§ 113.52 Requirements for selection of cell lines.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(4) At least one monolayer, at the conclusion of the required observation period, shall be alternately frozen and thawed three times. A 1.0 ml aliquot of disrupted cells shall be dispensed onto at least one monolayer of each of the cells designated in paragraph (d)(4)(i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of this section. Use of such designated cells is a mandatory cell requirement; *Provided*, That, if the species for which the vaccine is recommended is not represented by such designated cells, use of the cells designated in paragraph (d)(4)(v) of this section is also mandatory.

(i) Vero line of African Green Monkey kidney cell line.

(ii) Embryonic bovine kidney cells.

(iii) Neonatal canine kidney cells.

(iv) BHK_{21} hamster kidney cell line.

(v) Embryonic cells, neonatal cells, or cell lines of the species for which the vaccine is recommended.

* * * * *

5. The introductory paragraph of § 113.53(b) is amended to read:

§ 113.53 Requirements for ingredients of animal origin.

* * * * *

(b) Nutrient serum added to cell culture systems used in the preparation of biological products shall be tested according to the tests prescribed in this paragraph. Nutrient serum added to medium used for growing bacteria shall meet the requirements in paragraph (b)(1) of this section and shall be processed in accordance with methods written into the filed Outline of Production.

* * * * *

§ 113.36 Detection of pathogens by the chicken inoculation test.

§ 113.37 Detection of pathogens by the chicken embryo inoculation test.

6. The headings for §§ 113.36 and 113.37 are amended to read as set forth above.

It is hereby found that notice of rulemaking and public procedure thereon are impracticable and unnecessary, and this amendment should be made effective June 28, 1974.

Effective date. This amendment takes effect July 22, 1974.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 13th day of June 1974.

PIERRE A. CHALOUX,
Acting Deputy Administrator, Veterinary Services, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc.74-13903 Filed 6-17-74;8:45 am]

Title 10—Energy

CHAPTER II—FEDERAL ENERGY OFFICE

APPENDIX; RULINGS

[FEO Ruling 1974-15]

PORTABLE SANITATION INDUSTRY

Facts. Firm A is engaged in the delivery, maintenance, and servicing of portable sanitation facilities to locations at which no permanent toilet facilities are available, such as construction sites, sporting events, recreation areas and the scenes of natural disasters and accidents. Firm A delivers and installs portable chemical toilets and provides regular maintenance of the units, including pumping and disposal of the toilet effluent and furnishing fresh chemicals, toilet paper, deodorant blocks and other supplies.

Issue. Is Firm A engaged in "sanitation services," as defined in § 211.51 of the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation Regulations (10 CFR 211.51), for purposes of determining the allocation level under which it is entitled to purchase motor gasoline?

Ruling. Yes. As defined in § 211.51, "sanitation services" means "the collection and disposal for the general public of solid wastes, whether by public or private entities, and the maintenance, operation and repair of liquid purification and waste facilities during emergency conditions." In its business, Firm A collects and disposes of solid wastes for the general public at sporting events and recreational areas. In addition, although equipment installed and maintained at construction sites is primarily for the use of the parties involved in the construction project, such facilities are frequently available for the use of the general public. At times Firm A is called upon to maintain and operate waste facilities during emergency conditions, such as those prevailing after floods, storms and other natural disasters, or at scenes of accidents or rescue operations. Firm A is therefore engaged in sanitation services as defined under the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation Regulations.

The allocation level for sanitation services is one hundred percent of current requirements, subject to the supplier's allocation fraction. Firm A is therefore entitled under § 211.103(c)(1)(iii) to purchase one hundred percent of its current requirements of motor gasoline, reduced by an allocation fraction, if it is a wholesale purchaser-consumer as defined in §211.51, or a bulk purchaser as defined in § 211.102, subject to any other applicable provisions of the regulations.

WILLIAM N. WALKER,
General Counsel, Federal Energy Office.

JUNE 12, 1974.

[FR Doc.74-13891 Filed 6-17-74;8:45 am]

[FEO Ruling 1974-16]

ALLOWABLE USE OF MULTIPLE ALLOCATION FRACTIONS

Section 211.10(b), Chapter II of Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, requires suppliers to have a single allocation fraction for all purchasers except to the extent permitted by § 211.14 or unless permitted or required by order of the FEO. Suppliers with two or more distribution subsystems or regions independent of one another may petition the National FEO for permission to use multiple allocation fractions whenever use of a single fraction would be impracticable or inconsistent with the objectives of the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation Program.

FEO has concluded that suppliers which are engaged in distribution of allocated products both in the 48 contiguous States and in Alaska, Hawaii, or any territory or possession of the United States will be able to justify the use of multiple allocation fractions under § 211.10(b) because of geographical considerations. FEO will therefore permit the use of allocation fractions for Alaska, Hawaii, or any territory or possession of the United States which are different from the single fraction used for the 48 contiguous States, without the filing of a petition otherwise required by § 211.10 (b).

A supplier which uses multiple allocation fractions pursuant to this ruling must notify FEO if its allocation fraction in Alaska, Hawaii, or any state, territory or possession of the United States exceeds by 0.3 or more or falls below the allocation fraction of the supplier used in the 48 contiguous States. If it appears that a supplier's allocation fraction in any such area varies greatly from its allocation fraction in its distribution subsystem or subsystems in the 48 contiguous States, or is otherwise impracticable or inconsistent with the objectives of the Mandatory Petroleum Allocation Program, FEO may require the supplier to submit information justifying its practice, and may order modification of the allocation fractions used, including the use of a single allocation fraction for all purchasers.

WILLIAM N. WALKER,
General Counsel,
Federal Energy Office.

JUNE 12, 1974.

[FR Doc.74-13892 Filed 6-17-74;8:45 am]

[FEO Ruling 1974-17]

BASE PRICE COMPUTATION

Facts. Firm R is a refiner of covered petroleum products subject to the Mandatory Petroleum Price Regulations of the Federal Energy Office (10 CFR Part 212). Under Subpart E of Part 212, to determine its lawful selling prices, Firm R must first compute its base prices. The base price for sales of an item by a refiner is defined in 10 CFR 212.82(f) as the "weighted average price at which the item was lawfully priced in transactions with the class of purchaser concerned on May 15, 1973" plus increased product costs incurred since that date.

Firm R computes its weighted average May 15, 1973 selling price for a product sold to a particular class of purchaser. Firm R, however, does not determine prices to individual customers within that class of purchaser by use of this weighted average May 15, 1973 selling price. Instead, to determine its "base prices," Firm R adds an equal amount of increased product costs to each May 15, 1973 selling price to each individual customer within that class of purchaser, and thereby maintains the price differences between customers within that class of purchaser which existed on May 15, 1973. By so doing, Firm R asserts that it is maintaining a weighted average May 15, 1973 selling price, plus increased product costs, even though some of the firm's sales to customers within that class are now at prices above, and some are now at prices below, the actual weighted average May 15, 1973 selling price, plus increased product costs.

To illustrate, Firm R's base price determination for sales of a product to a particular class of purchaser may be represented as follows, assuming that each customer within the class was sold an equal number of units on May 15:

[In cents]

Customers in a class of purchaser	May 15 selling price	Weighted average price	Increased product cost	Base price	New unit price charged
A	10				12
B	11	11	2	13	13
C	12				14
Average					13

The price to B was Firm R's prevailing market price on May 15, 1973; the lower price to A was due to a special, temporary deal in effect on May 15; and the higher price to C was caused by the provisions of a short-term agreement under which C purchased its product. These price differences within the same class of purchaser were random differentials. They did not constitute customary price differentials, which would have served to establish separate classes of purchaser, because they were not consistently and historically applied price distinctions based on differences in volume, grade, quality, or location or type of purchaser or a term or condition of sale or delivery.

Issue. Has Firm R correctly applied the FEO price regulations?

Ruling. No. Firm R's efforts to "maintain" price differences among its customers within a particular class of purchaser are not permitted by FEO price regulations. When a seller computes its base prices, those are established with respect to a "class of purchaser." Section 212.31 defines a "class of purchaser" as "purchasers or lessees to whom a person has charged a comparable price for a comparable property or service pursuant to customary price differential between those purchasers or lessees and other purchasers or lessees." A class of purchaser is, therefore, the smallest unit for which a uniform selling price may be computed because, by definition, no customary price differentials exist within a class of purchaser. It should be noted, however, that a class of purchaser may consist of only a single customer, if that particular customer alone was charged a comparable price for a comparable property or service pursuant to a customary price differential between the customer and all other customers.

The base price computed for a class of purchaser must be a single price for all customers within that class of purchaser. In the case of Firm R, the base price for customers A, B, and C is 13 cents. By charging a unit price of 14 cents to Customer C, Firm R is charging a price in excess of the base price which would only be permissible if prenotified and cost-justified pursuant to the provisions of § 212.82(c)-(k). The same general principles also apply to the calculation of lawful selling prices under 10 CFR 212.93.

WILLIAM N. WALKER,
General Counsel,
Federal Energy Office.

JUNE 12, 1974.

[FR Doc.74-13893 Filed 6-17-74;8:45 am]

[FEO Ruling 1974-18]

GASOLINE; DISCOUNTED MAY 15, 1973 PRICE TO A CLASS OF PURCHASER

Facts. G&M, a firm engaged in refining and marketing petroleum products, distributes its gasoline products in retail sales through its own retail stations and through sales to branded and unbranded independent sellers. G&M establishes the tankwagon and terminal prices for the gasoline to be sold within specified areas. One May 15, 1973, G&M sold gasoline to Company A, a branded independent retailer, which operated a high volume retail outlet in a favorable location, at a net price which was 1½ cents per gallon less than G&M's established tankwagon price in that area. G&M regularly extended this type of competitive discount or allowance to various retailers for a variety of reasons. Company A's discount was a competitive inducement for it to continue to purchase gasoline from G&M. In this case, Company A received the discount by a contract addendum made on January 1, 1973, which was to be in effect for an indefinite period, subject to discontinuance upon notice by G&M.

On May 15, 1973, another branded independent retailer, Company B, also received a discount of 1½ cents off G&M's tankwagon price for its gasoline. The discount to Company B was first placed in effect on April 15, 1973, and represented a form of subsidy to Company B (and to other retailers in Company B's pricing zone) for the purpose of alleviating the impact of a "price war" situation. The discount to Company B was not intended to be of indefinite duration, but was intended to be temporary and to remain in effect only for as long as the "price war" situation lasted.

On June 1, 1973, G&M notified all its purchasers that no further sales of gasoline would be made at less than the tankwagon price.

Issue. May G&M discontinue these discounted sales to its purchasers under the price regulations of the Federal Energy Office?

Ruling. G&M's discount to Company A may not be discontinued under FEO regulations. G&M is not, however, required by FEO rules to maintain the discount to Company B.

G&M must calculate its base prices according to the rule of 10 CFR 212.82(f). This price rule requires that G&M establish a weighted average May 15, 1973 selling price to each "class of purchaser." To determine a class of purchaser, 10 CFR 212.31 requires that G&M identify those "purchasers * * * to whom [G&M] has charged a comparable price for comparable property * * * pursuant to customary price differentials between those purchasers * * * and other purchasers * * *." Section 212.31 identifies a customary price differential to include a price distinction based on a discount.

In the case of Company A, the tankwagon price is not the appropriate price to apply when calculating the base price under § 212.82 because that Company customarily paid a price less than the tankwagon price. Company A could not, therefore, be included in any class of purchaser which is charged the tankwagon price. The lower price based on a discount, which Company A customarily paid, establishes Company A as a member of a class of purchaser separate from those purchasers which customarily paid the tankwagon price.

Company B, however, may be included in the class of purchaser which includes persons customarily paying the full tankwagon price. The reason that Company B's lower May 15, 1973 price need not be separately maintained in a separate class of purchaser is that the discount price to Company B was intended to be temporary and did not, therefore, constitute a "customary price differential." Thus, although a price discount existed on May 15, 1973, for Company B, the discount was not a customary price differential but was limited to the situation in which a price "war" prevailed. After that time, G&M intended to return Company B's price to the tankwagon price level. Because of the temporary duration of the discount in this case, the fact that there was a discount on May 15, 1973 does not serve to establish a "customary" price which might distinguish Company B from other purchasers in the class otherwise associated with Company B.

As a further means of distinguishing between temporary and customary discounts, FEO will generally regard any discount that was in effect on May 15, 1973, and that had either been in effect or had been granted for a period of six months or more, to be a customary discount. This presumption may be rebutted in particular situations by appropriate factual showing.

The price rule of 10 CFR 212.82(f) nevertheless requires G&M to take into account the fact that a discount price was paid by Company B on May 15, 1973. The refiner's price rule of § 212.82(f) requires that in determining a lawful May 15, 1973 weighted average selling price to a class of purchaser, G&M may not exclude any temporary special sale, deal or allowance which was then in effect. The application of § 212.82(f) should therefore result in a weighted average May 15, 1973 selling price computed by including among the class of purchaser customarily paying the full tankwagon price, those customers temporarily paying a price which is lower than the May 15, 1973 tankwagon price. Company B's May 15, 1973 discount price, therefore, would be averaged with the May 15, 1973 selling prices to all other members of the class of purchaser to which Company B would belong if it had received no discount.

In summary, FEO price regulations require that price differentials customarily extended must continue in effect to members of those classes of purchaser which are identified by such customary price differentials. These same principles govern the price rules for resellers and retailers under 10 CFR 212.93.

WILLIAM N. WALKER,
General Counsel,
Federal Energy Office.

JUNE 12, 1974.

[FR Doc.74-13894 Filed 6-17-74;8:45 am]

Title 12—Banks and Banking

CHAPTER III—FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

SUBCHAPTER A—PROCEDURE AND RULES OF PRACTICE

PART 303—APPLICATIONS, REQUESTS, AND SUBMITTALS

Delegation of Authority To Act on Certain Applications

Correction

In FR Doc. 74-10567 appearing at page 16229 of the issue for Wednesday, May 8, 1974, in § 303.11(a)(8) on page 16230, the second line now reading "filed by State and members banks upon" should read "filed by State member banks upon".

Title 14—Aeronautics and Space

CHAPTER II—CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Reg. OR-82; Amdt. 40]

PART 385—DELEGATIONS AND REVIEW OF ACTION UNDER DELEGATION; NON-HEARING MATTER

Delegation to the General Counsel

Correction

In FR Doc. 74-12999 appearing at page 20058 in the issue for Thursday, June 6, 1974, the headings should read as set forth above.

Title 15—Commerce and Foreign Trade

CHAPTER III—DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PART 377—SHORT SUPPLY CONTROLS

Ferrous Scrap; Additional Quotas for Shipment to Certain Destinations in Second Quarter 1974

Notice is hereby given that, notwithstanding § 377.4 and Supplement No. 1 to Part 377, the Department of Commerce has allocated 119,400 additional short tons of ferrous scrap for export to certain countries from the second quarter 1974 contingency reserve. The new allocations are assigned, following consultations with the Department of State and the National Security Council, to fill special needs that are in consonance with U.S. foreign policy objectives. The countries eligible for these additional amounts and the quantities available to each are as follows:

Country	Contingency allocation per country (in short tons)	Limitation per exporter (in short tons)	Type "A" limitation per country (in short tons) [1]
Angola	10,000	5,000	10,000
Bangladesh	6,000	3,000	6,000
Brazil	10,000	5,000	10,000
Colombia	10,000	5,000	8,900
Dominican Republic	5,000	2,500	400
Egypt	15,000	5,000	5,000
Israel	15,000	5,000	5,000
Mexico	15,000	5,000	10,000
New Zealand	10,000	5,000	1,200
Pakistan	6,000	3,000	3,800
Peru	10,000	5,000	None permitted
Thailand	7,400	3,700	5,400

[1] The column designated "Type 'A' Limitation Per Country" indicates the total quantity of Type "A" grade ferrous scrap (as described in Supplement No. 1) which may be licensed from the contingency allocation for export to a particular country.

Any exporter who obtains an order dated June 11, 1974 or later, for export of ferrous scrap to a country which has received an additional allocation hereunder, may submit an application for an export license with respect thereto, whether or not he has a past history of exporting scrap to the country involved. The application must be clearly marked "Contingency Allocation," and submitted on Forms DIB-622P or FC-419 and DIB-623P or FC-420 to the Office of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.[2] Such application must be accompanied by: (1) A photocopy or certified copy of the order, and (2) where import permits are required by the country, a statement from the ultimate consignee (or other foreign party to the transaction), or other documentation, which indicates to the satisfaction of the Office of Export Administration that the permit has been obtained. In order for an application to be acceptable, the ferrous scrap must be described in sufficient detail so that the "Type" it belongs in may be ascertained and verified. The copy of the contract will serve in lieu of Form FC-842, which would otherwise be required pursuant to § 375.2 of this chapter.

No exporter will receive export licenses for any country under the rules announced herein in excess of 5,000 short tons, or half of the country's contingency

[2] Forms are available from any of the Commerce Department's Domestic and International Business Administration District Offices, or from the Office of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230.