whether, among other things, paragraph 10 subjects MVG and Humble's other G-1 customers to any undue prejudice, disadvantage, or discrimination. Therefore, it appears that a public hearing should be held in order to afford all parties opportunity to present evidence concerning the issues raised by those pleadings.

Humble, on November 2, 1965, filed a motion in the above-entitled proceedings requesting the Commission to consolidate the complaint proceeding with the proceeding involved in Docket No. CP65-395. By order issued September 17, 1965, in Docket No. CP65-395, Humble was ordered to show cause "why the Commission should not find and determine that [paragraph 10] in [its] filed tariff is unjust and unreasonable." In its motion, Humble states that MVG, in its formal complaint, requested consolidation of these proceedings and that these proceedings appear to raise a common question.

On November 12, 1965, MVG filed an answer to the motion for consolidation requesting the Commission to deny that motion. MVG there asserts that the order issued September 17, 1965, in Docket No. CP65-395 relates to the issue of the reasonableness of paragraph 10 as well as the issue of certificating the proposed sale to Diamond, and, therefore, a determination of the discrimination issue in Docket No. CP65-395 "will almost certainly make further proceedings unnecessary in" Docket No. RP66-9. However, MVG does not seek to withdraw its complaint nor does it suggest any other procedure for disposing of its complaint. Additionally, MVG, in its answer, alleges that no useful purpose will be served by consolidation inasmuch as consolidation will result in a delay of the proceedings and will result in considerable controversy as to which party has the burden of proving discrimination or the lack of it.

MVG's objections to consolidation are without merit. The issue involved, i.e., the propriety of paragraph 10, is common in both proceedings, and therefore, should be tried in one proceeding. Any alleged conflict that may arise during the consolidated proceedings as to which party has the burden of proof or the burden of going forward with the evidence can be resolved by the Presiding Examiner. Furthermore, the possibility of such conflict does not warrant the trial of the same issue in two separate hearings.

The Commission finds: It is necessary and proper in the public interest and to aid in the enforcement of the provisions of the Natural Gas Act that the issues raised by the complaint filed by MVG be set for public hearing; that the complaint proceeding be consolidated with the proceeding involved in Docket No. CP65-395 for purposes of hearing and decision; and that the consolidated proceedings be tried in accordance with the procedures set out below.

The Commission orders:

(A) Pursuant to the authority of the Natural Gas Act, particularly sections 4, 5, 15, and 16 thereof, the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, and the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR ch. I) a public hearing shall be held on a date to be fixed by notice from the Presiding Examiner concerning the issues raised in the formal complaint filed by MVG in Docket No. RP66-9.

(B) The motion to consolidate the proceedings involved in Docket No. RP66-9 with the proceeding in Docket No. CP65-395 filed by Humble on November 2, 1965, is granted and those proceedings are consolidated for the purposes of hearing and decision.

(C) The time for filing of evidence as prescribed by our order issued September 17, 1965, in Docket No. CP65-395, is modified as follows: Humble, in Docket No. CP65-395, and MVG, in Docket No. RP66-9, shall file their direct testimony and exhibits with the Presiding Examiner on or before January 10, 1966, and shall serve copies upon all other parties in the consolidated proceedings.

(D) Pursuant to § 1.18 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, a prehearing conference before the Presiding Examiner shall commence at 10 a.m., e.s.t. on January 18, 1966, in a Hearing Room of the Federal Power Commission, 441 G Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20426, for the purpose of reaching such agreements as will expedite the determination to be made herein, including, but not limited to, stipulation of facts, narrowing and defining of issues, and establishment of dates for the service of answering and rebuttal testimony and for the cross-examination of all testimony.

(E) The cross-examination, when commenced, shall be continuous unless the Presiding Examiner finds that extraordinary circumstances preclude such procedure.

(F) Presiding Examiner Harry W. Frazee, or any other officer designated by the Chief Examiner for the purpose (see Delegation of Authority, 18 CFR 3.5 (d)), shall prescribe other relevant procedural matters not herein provided, shall preside at the prehearing conferences and at the hearing in these matters, and shall control these proceedings until the completed record is certified to the Commission, pursuant to the Commission's rules of practice and procedure.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] JOSEPH H. GUTRIDE, *Secretary.*

[F.R. Doc. 65-13252; Filed, Dec. 10, 1965; 8:45 a.m.]

[Docket No. E-7255]

NEW BEDFORD GAS AND EDISON LIGHT CO. AND PLYMOUTH COUNTY ELECTRIC CO.

Notice of Application

DECEMBER 3, 1965.

Take notice that on November 18, 1965, a joint application was filed with the Federal Power Commission, pursuant to section 203 of the Federal Power Act by New Bedford Gas and Edison Light Co. (New Bedford), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Massachusetts and authorized to do business in Massachusetts, with its principal business office located in New Bedford, Mass., and Plymouth County Electric Co. (Plymouth), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Massachusetts and authorized to do business in the State of Massachusetts, with its principal place of business in Cambridge, Mass., seeking authorization for the sale and transfer by Plymouth of certain facilities to New Bedford.

Plymouth, which purchases all of its electricity requirements from New Bedford, proposes to sell to New Bedford all of its operating facilities used for transmission and distribution. Plymouth currently sells electricity at retail in 13 communities in Plymouth, Bristol, and Barnstable Counties, Mass. The facilities sold will be operated by New Bedford for the same purpose as formerly. There will be no disruption of service, no changes in power supply or any effect on existing contracts.

The consideration for the property, plant, and equipment included in this sale will be the depreciated original cost per books of such facilities to be transferred, calculated as of January 1, 1966 and will be paid in cash. The total utility plant of Plymouth, as of August 31, 1965, amounts to $11,537,454.

Subsequent to the acquisition, New Bedford intends to file, immediately after the closing date, new retail electric rates which will result in annual savings to customers in both franchise areas totaling $177,600. Applicants state that as far as operations are concerned, many of its functions are already performed on an integrated system basis and that New Bedford's ownership and operation of transmission lines and distribution facilities will complete this unification. It is contended that Plymouth's transmission lines, extending from Plymouth to Kingston constitute a gap in New Bedford's transmission system which will be eliminated by the proposed acquisition and thus provide New Bedford with a contiguous transmission system.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before December 27, 1965, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., 20426, petitions or protests in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). The application is on file and available for public inspection.

JOSEPH H. GUTRIDE, *Secretary.*

[F.R. Doc. 65-13253; Filed, Dec. 10, 1965; 8:45 a.m.]

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

FAILURE TO DISCLOSE FOREIGN ORIGIN ON RADIOS, ETC.

Notice of Adjourned Hearing With Opportunity To Present Additional Views

On October 19, 1965, there was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (30 F.R.

13299) a Notice of Public Hearing Relating to Failure to Disclose Foreign Origin on Radios, Televisions, Phonographs, Tape Recorders, and Component Parts Thereof. Interested parties were afforded opportunity to submit written data, views, or arguments and to be heard at a public hearing. Pursuant to such notice, the public hearing was held in Washington on December 6, 1965.

The Commission will hold an adjourned hearing on January 5, 1966, commencing at 10 a.m., e.s.t., in Room 532, Federal Trade Commission Building, at which time interested or affected parties may orally express their views in the matter. Parties desiring to be heard at that time should inform the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, not later than December 29, 1965. The time for presenting written data, views, or arguments is hereby extended to January 5, 1966.

The data, views, or arguments presented orally or in writing will be available for examination by interested parties at the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

Issued: December 10, 1965.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] JOSEPH W. SHEA, *Secretary.*

[F.R. Doc. 65-13272; Filed, Dec. 10, 1965; 8:46 a.m.]

DISCLOSURE OF FOREIGN ORIGIN OF WATCHES, ETC.

Opportunity To Present Data, Views, or Arguments

Notice is hereby given that the Federal Trade Commission will hold a public hearing on Friday, January 7, 1966, commencing at 10 a.m., e.s.t., in Room 532, Federal Trade Commission Building, Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C., at which time and place all interested and affected parties may verbally present data, views, arguments, and suggestions relevant to the disclosure of the foreign origin of watches, watch cases, watch movements, watch bands, and parts thereof, marketed in the United States of America. Written data, views, arguments, and suggestions will also be considered if mailed to the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20580, on or before January 3, 1966. Persons submitting written presentations exceeding 2 pages should file 12 copies thereof, and persons desiring to make verbal presentations at the hearing on January 7, 1966, should notify the Secretary of the Commission to this effect, with an estimate of the time required for his verbal presentation, not later than January 3, 1966.

The purpose of this hearing is to afford the Commission the benefit of the views of all concerned to assist it in reaching a determination as to what action, if any, the Commission should take in the public interest under the statutes administered by it.

To assist the Commission information and suggestions on the following points are desired.

1. The approximate number of watches being sold annually in the United States, and an approximation of the percentage thereof having jeweled movements and the percentage having pin lever movements.

2. With respect to movements assembled in the United States, an approximation of the number, types, and value of component parts which are of foreign manufacture; and with respect to watches or movements assembled in the Virgin Islands, an approximation of the numbers, types and value of component parts (including cases and dials) which are of foreign origin, broken down by country of origin; an approximation of the watches and movements entering the United States from the Virgin Islands, and an approximation of the percentage of the movements contained in such watches which were assembled in the Virgin Islands.

(NOTE. Such estimates should separately specify the percentage of jeweled watches and those of the pin lever type.)

3. Whether the purchasing public has a preference for watches having movements made in the United States (1) over those made in any foreign country, or (2) over those made in any foreign country except Switzerland.

4. Identification of the parts of watch cases, and of the principal and more important parts of watch movements. How many parts are involved in the assembly of men's jeweled wrist watches of the usual design and size?

5. Should there be requirement of disclosure of the fact that one or more parts of a watch movement are of foreign manufacture? If so, how can this be accomplished with likely notice of the disclosure to the purchasing public prior to consummation of purchases, and in a manner which will assure of the disclosure carrying through to purchasers and prospective purchasers.

6. Whether there should be requirement of disclosure of the fact that a watch has a case or part thereof made in a foreign country.

7. Is it important to consumer purchasers of watches whether the movements, or parts of movements, of such watches have been made in a foreign country; or have been made by an American or foreign manufacture? What is to be regarded as the country of origin of a watch movement?

Interested persons are invited to submit any information pertinent to these matters or other aspects of the subject.

The data, views, or arguments presented orally or in writing will be available for examination by interested parties at the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C.

The public hearing which will be held on January 7, 1966, will be before the full Commission.

Issued: December 10, 1965.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] JOSEPH W. SHEA, *Secretary.*

[F.R. Doc. 65-13327; Filed, Dec. 10, 1965; 8:47 a.m.]

INTERAGENCY TEXTILE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

CERTAIN COTTON TEXTILE PRODUCTS PRODUCED OR MANUFACTURED IN POLAND

Levels of Restraint

DECEMBER 2, 1965.

On November 30, 1965, the U.S. Government, in furtherance of the objectives of, and under the terms of, the Long Term Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962, including Article 6 relating to nonparticipants, informed the Government of Poland that it was renewing for an additional 12-month period, through December 3, 1966, the arrangements in effect between the two governments on the export of cotton textile products in Categories 19, 26, 28, and 34 produced or manufactured in Poland.

There is published below a letter of December 2, 1965, from the Chairman, President's Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee, to the Commissioner of Customs, directing that the amount in Categories 19, 26, 28, and 34 of cotton textile products produced or manufactured in Poland, which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the United States from December 4, 1965, through December 3, 1966, be limited to designated levels.

STANLEY NEHMER,
Chairman, Interagency Textile Administrative Committee, and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Resources.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

PRESIDENT'S CABINET TEXTILE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Washington, D.C.
December 2, 1965.

COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: Under the terms of the Long Term Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles done at Geneva on February 9, 1962, including Article 6 relating to nonparticipants, and in accordance with the procedures outlined in Executive Order 11052 of September 28, 1962, you are directed to prohibit, effective December 4, 1965, and for the 12-month period extending through December 3, 1966, entry into the United States for consumption, and withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, of cotton textile products in Categories 19, 26, 28, and 34 produced or manufactured in Poland, in excess of the following levels of restraint: