Sharon Ayres of Harry Browne for President Advisory Opinion 1995–47: Congressman Robert Underwood. Legislative Recommendations 1996 (continued from meeting of March 21, 1996, if necessary) Administrative Matters.

PERSON TO CONTACT FOR INFORMATION:

Mr. Ron Harris, Press Officer, Telephone: (202) 219–4155.

Delores Hardy,

Administrative Assistant.

[FR Doc. 96-7072 Filed 3-19-96; 3:50 pm]

BILLING CODE 6715-01-M

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

Federal Employees; Criteria To Be Applied in Determining Whether To Transfer Employees From One Collective Bargaining Unit to Another When Both Affected Labor Organizations Agree on the Transfer

AGENCY: Federal Labor Relations Authority.

ACTION: Notice of opportunity to file briefs as *amici curiae* in a proceeding before the Federal Labor Relations Authority in which the Authority is determining whether to grant a petition seeking to transfer employees from one established collective bargaining unit to another.

SUMMARY: The Federal Labor Relations Authority provides an opportunity for all interested persons to file briefs as amici curiae on significant issues arising in a case pending before the Authority. The Authority is considering this case pursuant to its responsibilities under the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute, 5 U.S.C. 7101–7135 (1988) and its regulations set forth at 5 CFR part 2422 (1994). The issues concern the criteria to be applied to determine whether to grant a petition seeking to transfer employees from one established, nationwide, consolidated collective bargaining unit to another such unit when the exclusive representatives of both units agree on the transfer.

DATES: Briefs submitted in response to this notice will be considered if filed by close of business on April 19, 1996. Extensions of time will not be granted. The date of filing shall be determined by the date of mailing, as indicated by the postmark date. If no postmark date is evident on the mailing, it shall be presumed to have been mailed 5 days prior to receipt. If filing is by personal delivery, it shall be considered filed on the date it is received by the Authority.

ADDRESSES: Mail or deliver briefs to James H. Adams, Acting Director, Case Control Office, Federal Labor Relations Authority, 607 14th Street, NW., Suite 415, Washington, DC 20424–0001.

FORMAT: All briefs shall be captioned "National Association of Government Employees/Service Employees International Union, Local 5000 and Service Employees International Union and U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, No. WA–AC–50071, Amicus Brief' and shall contain separate, numbered headings for each issue discussed. Parties must submit an original and four (4) copies of each amicus brief, with any enclosures, on $81/2 \times 11$ inch paper.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James H. Adams, Acting Director, Case Control Office, Federal Labor Relations Authority, 607 14th Street, NW., Suite 415, Washington, DC 20424–0001, Telephone: FTS or Commercial (202) 482–6540.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 15, 1996, the Authority granted, in part, an application for review of the Regional Director's Decision and Order in National Association of Government Employees/Service Employees International Union, Local 5000 and Service Employees International Union and U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, No. WA-AC-50071. A copy of the decision may be obtained in the Authority's Case Control Office at the aforementioned address; a copy will be forwarded (by mail or facsimile) to any person who so requests by contacting James H. Adams at the same address. A brief summary of the case follows.

The petition in this case, which was filed jointly by the National Association of Government Employees/Service Employees International Union, Local 5000 (NAGE/SEIU or NAGE) and the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), seeks an amendment of certification to transfer employees from a bargaining unit for which SEIU is the exclusive representative to a unit for which NAGE is the exclusive representative. The Agency maintained a "neutral position" regarding the petition in proceedings before the RD, and filed no submissions with the Authority.

In 1978, the National Association of Government Employees was certified as the exclusive representative of a nationwide, consolidated bargaining unit composed of certain nonprofessional employees of the Agency. In 1982, the National Association of Government Employees affiliated with SEIU and became NAG/SEIU. SEIU "has jurisdiction over

NAGE." Currently, NAGE represents approximately 10,200 nonprofessional employees in this unit.

Since 1980, SEIU has represented a nationwide, consolidated bargaining unit of other nonprofessional employees of the Agency, including approximately 900 employees at the Agency's Medical Center in San Diego, California, who are represented by SEIU Local 102. There are approximately 9,800 employees in SEIU's consolidated unit. SEIU, Local 102 and the Agency's Medical Center in San Diego are parties to a collective bargaining agreement.

The joint petitioners seek to "sever" the San Diego Medical Center employees from SEIU's consolidated unit and include them in NAGE's consolidated unit. The petition was filed after a "special meeting" was held among SEIU Local 102 members, at which the sole subject was the transfer of affiliation from SEIU to NAGE. All SEIU Local 102 members were invited to the meeting. Following a discussion of the issue of the transfer of affiliation, a total of five members voted unanimously, by secret ballot, to transfer representation from SEIU to NAGE.

The RD dismissed the petition on the ground that the joint petitioners had failed to establish the "unusual circumstances" necessary under Authority case law to justify severance of employees from a bargaining.

The Authority granted review under § 2422.17(c)(1) of the Authority's regulations, 5 CFR 2422.17(c)(1), on the ground that there is an absence of precedent on the following issues:

- 1. Should the facts that the joint petitioners agree that the San Diego employees should be severed from the SEIU unit and included in the NAGE unit, and/or that the agency does not oppose such agreement, be considered in resolving the petition in this case?
- 2. If those facts are considered, what principles should be used to determine whether to grant the petition?
- (a) As to severance, for example, should SEIU's agreement be accorded the same effect as the disclaimer in *Treasury*? It is noted, in this regard, that there is no suggestion that SEIU would disclaim interest in representing the San Diego employees if the petition is dismissed.
- (b) As to accretion, for example, should the joint petitioners' agreement be considered dispositive in light of the Agency's neutral position? Are there any circumstances that would override the agreement? Are there any circumstances in which an election should be directed?

The Authority directed the parties to file briefs on the foregoing issues as well as an issue whether, if the petition were to be granted, the resulting units would continue to be appropriate within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 7112. As these matters are likely to be of concern to agencies, labor organizations, and other interested persons, the Authority finds it appropriate to provide for the filing of amicus briefs addressing these issues.

Dated: March 18, 1996. For the Authority. James H. Adams, Acting Director, Case Control Office. [FR Doc. 96-6843 Filed 3-20-96; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6727-01-M

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Automated Tariff Filing and Information System, Firms Certified for **Batch Filing Capability**

[Of At Least One Type of Tariff]

As of March 13, 1996

Calcutta, East Coast of India and Bangladesh/U.S.A. Conference, Metuchen, New Jersey

Dart Maritime Service, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Distribution Publications, Inc. ("DPI"), Oakland, California

D.X.I., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Effective Tariff Management Corporation ("ETM"), Bowie, Maryland

Expeditors International ("EI"), Seattle, Washington

Flexible Business Systems, Inc., Miami, Florida

Glenserve Company, Glendora, New Jersey

Insight Consulting Group, Saddle Brook,

Japan-Atlantic and Gulf Freight Conference, Tokyo, Japan

Japan-Puerto Rico & Virgin Island Freight Conference, Tokyo, Japan Japan-United States Eastbound Freight

Conference, Tokyo, Japan King Ocean Central America, S.A., ("KOCA"), Gundo Alt, Panama

King Ocean Service de Venezuela, S.A. ("KOSDV"), Chuao, Caracas Logistical Concepts Ltd. ("LCL"), Drexel

Hill, Pennsylvania

Maersk Inc., Šan Francisco, California Mariner Systems, Inc. San Francisco, California

Maritime Management International, Inc., Miami, Florida

Matson Navigation Company, Inc., San Francisco, California

Matson Terminals, Inc., San Francisco, California

Miller Traffic service, Inc., Maywood, California

Nippon Yusen Kaisha ("NYK"), San Francisco, California

NVO Tariff Services, Fremont, California

NX Corp., Columbia, Maryland Ocean Tariff Bureau, Long Beach, California

Pacific Coast Tariff Bureau ("PCTB"), San Francisco, California

Paramount Tariff Services, Ltd. ("PTS"), Torrance, California

Rijnhaave Information Services, Inc., and World Tariff Services, Inc. ("WTS"), Union, New Jersey

Simple Transportation Solutions International, Titusville, Florida Star Shipping A/S, San Francisco, California

Sumner Tariff Services, Inc. Washington, D.C.

Tariff Data Services, Houston, Texas Transamericas T.I.S., Inc., Falls Church, Virginia

Transax Systems, Bridgewater, New Jersey

Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan, Tokyo, Japan

Transportation Services, Inc. ("TSI"), Fort Lauderdale, Florida

U.S. Traffic Service, Torrance, California

Wallenius Lines AB, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey

Wallenius Lines North America, Inc., Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey

Zim Container Service, Inc., New York, New York

Note: In the certification process, some certificants used software developed by other firms and may not be holding themselves out of file tariffs for the public, generally.

Joseph C. Polking,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96-6821 Filed 3-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730-01-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Change in Bank Control Notices: Acquisitions of Shares of Banks or **Bank Holding Companies**

The notificants listed below have applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notices are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the notices have been accepted for processing, they will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for that notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than April 4, 1996.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (Randall C. Sumner, Vice President) 411 Locust Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63166:

 Rickie L. Wiggs, and Gary F. Hileman, both Grand Tower, Illinois; each to acquire an additional 13.3 percent each, for a total of 33.3 percent, of the voting shares of Shawnee Bancshares, Inc., Grand Tower, Illinois.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 15, 1996.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96-6785 Filed 3-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-F

Formations of, Acquisitions by, and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied to the Board for approval, pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841 et seq.) (BHC Act), Regulation Y (12 CFR part 225), and all other applicable statutes and regulations to become a bank holding company and/or to acquire the assets or the ownership of, control of, or the power to vote shares of a bank or bank holding company and all of the banks and nonbanking companies owned by the bank holding company, including the companies listed below.

The applications listed below, as well as other related filings required by the Board, are available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the standards enumerated in the BHC Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)). If the proposal also involves the acquisition of a nonbanking company, the review also includes whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company complies with the standards in section 4 of the BHC Act, including whether the acquisition of the nonbanking company can "reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices" (12 U.S.C. 1843). Any request for