respondents' motion and complaint counsel's reply thereto, having concluded that respondents have raised issues which may be more properly considered and disposed of on the basis of a full and complete record:

It is ordered, That respondents' Motion to Reconsider Order Denying Request to File Interlocutory Appeal be, and it hereby is, denied.

Commissioner Elman dissenting.

DIAMOND ALKALI COMPANY

Docket 8572. Order, Jan. 21, 1965

Order that respondent's motion for the postponement of oral argument be denied.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR POSTPONEMENT OF ORAL ARGUMENT

Respondent has filed a motion to postpone the date of oral argument before the Commission of the appeal in the above-captioned proceeding from January 26, 1965, to April 1, 1965, or any other date in April 1965. The ground for the motion is that respondent's attorneys are currently required to devote a large amount of time to other pending litigation and investigatory matters. Complaint counsel has filed an answer opposing respondent's request for a postponement.

Section 6(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act provides: "Every agency shall proceed with reasonable dispatch to conclude any matter presented to it except that due regard shall be had for the convenience and necessity of the parties or their representatives." A number of provisions of the Commission's Rules of Practice are designed to assure reasonable dispatch of Commission adjudicatory proceedings. For example, Section 3.16(d) provides that "Hearings shall proceed with all reasonable expedition" and that "all hearings shall be held at one place and shall continue without suspension until concluded." And Section 3.21 requires the hearing examiner to file his initial decision within ninety days after completion of the reception of evidence in a proceeding. Obviously, the effectiveness of these and other provisions requiring the expeditious handling and reasonable dispatch of Commission proceedings would be vitiated if the Commission were to allow repeated and undue delays in the filing and argument of appeals to the Commission from the hearing examiner's initial decision. The requirement of reasonable dispatch does not terminate with the filing of the initial decision.

The initial decision in the above-captioned proceeding was filed on May 15, 1964 [72 F.T.C. 700], and respondent has requested and been granted extensions of time for the filing of its apppeal and reply briefs. If the Commission were to grant the present motion to postpone the date of oral argument, the result would be that almost a year would be

INTERLOCUTORY, VACATING, AND MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

ALHAMBRA MOTOR PARTS ET AL.

Docket 6889. Order, Jan. 5, 1965

Order granting the request of an automotive parts trade association to file an *amicus curiae* brief.

Order Granting Leave To File Brief Amicus Curiae

Upon consideration of the application of Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc., filed December 21, 1964, for leave to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding pursuant to Section 3.9 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (effective August 1, 1963) or to file a brief as *amicus curiae*, and of the answers thereto filed by complaint counsel and respondents in the above-captioned proceeding on December 23 and 28, 1964, respectively; and it appearing that the applicant desires only to file a brief with the Commission in support of the appeal from the hearing examiner's initial decision,

It is ordered, That the applicant, Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc., be, and it hereby is, granted leave to file an *amicus curiae* brief, provided that such brief does not exceed sixty (60) pages in length and is filed within the period provided for the filing of the appeal brief in this proceeding.

RODALE PRESS, INC., ET AL.

Docket 8619. Order, Jan. 5, 1965

Order denying motion to reconsider order which denied request for permission to file interlocutory appeal.

Order Denying Motion To Reconsider Order Denying Request for Permission To File Interlocutory Appeal

Respondents having moved that the Commission reconsider its Order Denying Request for Permission to File Interlocutory Appeal, dated December 3, 1964; and the Commission, after duly considering