modification at an average labor rate of $60 per work hours. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the modification proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $7,260 per airplane.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a “significant rule” under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39
Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment
Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES
1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:
Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

§ 39.13 [Amended]
2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding the following new airworthiness directive:
McDonnell Douglas: Docket 95–NM–188–AD.
Applicability: Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes, having manufacturer’s fuselage numbers 924 through 1094 inclusive; and 1095 through 2113 inclusive; and Model MD–90 airplanes, having manufacturer’s fuselage numbers 2094 through 2098 inclusive, and 2100; certificated in any category.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

Compliance: Required as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To ensure that oxygen mask lanyards of the PSU are not too long in length; excessive length lanyards may not activate the oxygen canister and could render the oxygen mask inoperative during an emergency, accomplish the following:
(a) For Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes, having manufacturer’s fuselage numbers 1095 through 2113 inclusive; and Model MD–90 airplanes: Within 2 years after the effective date of this AD, perform a one-time measurement of the length of the oxygen mask lanyards of the passenger service unit (PSU) from the loop on the firing pin or aluminum ring to the mask, in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD80–35–022, dated August 29, 1995 (for Model DC–9–80 series airplanes and Model MD–88 airplanes), or McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD90–35–001, dated August 29, 1995 (for Model MD–90 airplanes), as applicable.
(1) If the length of all oxygen mask lanyards is found to be within the limits specified in the applicable service bulletin, no further action is required by this paragraph.
(2) If the length of any oxygen mask lanyard is found to exceed the limits specified in the applicable service bulletin, prior to further flight, modify that oxygen mask lanyard of the PSU in accordance with the applicable service bulletin.
(b) For Model DC–9–80 series airplanes having manufacturer’s fuselage numbers 924 through 1094 inclusive: Within 2 years after the effective date of this AD, modify the oxygen mask lanyards of the PSU in accordance with McDonnell Douglas Service Bulletin MD80–35–022, dated August 29, 1995.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.
Issued in Renton, Washington, on February 6, 1996.
Darrell M. Pederson,
Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.
[FR Doc. 96–2999 Filed 2–9–96; 8:45 am]
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Regulation To Prohibit the Attraction of White Sharks in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary; Clarification of Exception To Discharge Prohibition
AGENCY: Sanctuaries and Reserves Division (SRD), Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (DOC).
ACTION: Proposed rule.
SUMMARY: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration proposes to amend the regulations governing the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS or Sanctuary) to prohibit the attraction of white sharks in the nearshore (seaward to three miles) areas of the Sanctuary. This proposed rule responds to the comments received in response to an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on the subject of attracting sharks in the Sanctuary. The proposed prohibition is to ensure that Sanctuary resources and qualities are not adversely impacted and to avoid conflicts among various users of the Sanctuary. The proposed rule would also clarify the "traditional fishing" exemption to the discharge prohibition in the existing regulations, and add definitions of "fishing" and "traditional fishing."
DATES: Comments must be received by March 13, 1996. A public hearing on this proposed rule will be held at a time and location which will be published in a separate document.
ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to Ed Ueber, Sanctuary Manager, Gulf of the Farallones and northern portion of the Monterey Bay National Marine...
Sanctuaries, Ft. Mason, Building 201, San Francisco, California 94123, or Elizabeth Moore, Sanctuaries and Reserves Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 1305 East West Highway, SSMC4, 12th Floor, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

Comments received will be available for public inspection at both addresses.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ed Uebel at (415) 556–3509 or Elizabeth Moore at (301) 713–3141.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In recognition of the national significance of the unique marine environment centered around Monterey Bay, California, the MBNMS was designated on September 18, 1992. SRD issued final regulations, effective January 1, 1993, to implement the Sanctuary designation (15 CFR Part 922 Subpart M; previously cited as 15 CFR Part 944). The MBNMS regulations at 15 CFR 927.132(a) prohibit a relatively narrow range of activities to protect Sanctuary resources and qualities.

In January 1994, SRD became aware that chum was being used to attract white sharks for viewing by SCUBA divers while in underwater cages. This activity occurred in the nearshore area off of Ano Nuevo in the MBNMS during the time of year white sharks come to feed. SRD received expressions of concern over this activity and inquiries as to whether attracting sharks for viewing and other purposes is allowed in the MBNMS. NOAA’s Sanctuaries and Reserves Division (SRD), with assistance from the MBNMS Advisory Council, and a number of interested parties, identified a number of concerns regarding the subject of attracting white sharks within the MBNMS. NOAA subsequently issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking on this issue to invite submission of written information, advice, recommendations and other comments. The following concerns have been identified throughout NOAA’s review of this issued: (1) Behavioral changes in the attracted species (e.g., feeding and migration); (2) increased risk of attack to other Sanctuary users (e.g., surfers, windsurfers, and swimmers), increased user conflicts in the area of the activity, and potential health hazards of the activity; and (3) adverse impacts to other Sanctuary resources and qualities (e.g., disruption of the ecosystem, aesthetic impacts). White California state law makes it unlawful to directly take (e.g., catch, capture, or kill) white sharks in state waters; it does not address attraction of white sharks. Nor does any Federal law or regulation address attracting white sharks in the waters off California.

There is currently no MBNMS regulation specifically addressing attracting white sharks in the MBNMS. There is a general regulatory prohibition against discharging or depositing any material or other matter in the Sanctuary (15 CFR 922.132(a) (2)). The discharge and deposit prohibition contains an exception for, inter alia, the discharge or deposit of “fish, fish parts, chumming materials or bait used in or resulting from traditional fishing operations in the Sanctuary.” While fishing activities in the Sanctuary are subject to various Federal and state regulations, traditional fishing activities are not regulated as part of the Sanctuary regulatory regime. Sanctuary regulations that could indirectly restrict traditional fishing operations were specifically crafted to avoid doing so. Thus, while fishing vessels are subject to the general regulatory prohibition against discharging or depositing any material or other matter in the Sanctuary, the exception for the discharge or deposit of “fish, fish parts, chumming materials or bait used in or resulting from traditional fishing operations in the Sanctuary” was designed to prevent the prohibition from indirectly restricting the conduct of traditional fishing operations. However, it was not intended to allow the discharge or deposit of “fish, fish parts, chumming materials or bait” at any time or in conjunction with any activity, as the discharge or deposit is of the same material “used in or resulting from” traditional fishing operations in the Sanctuary. Rather, it was intended solely to allow such discharges or deposits in the course of traditional fishing operations. Accordingly, NOAA proposes to amend the Sanctuary regulations that indirectly restrict the conduct of traditional fishing operations.

II. Comments and Responses

The following is a summary of comments received on the ANPR and NOAA’s responses.

(1) Comment: White sharks are already present in the Ano Nuevo region and other areas of the Sanctuary and shark attraction activities make no difference to their presence.

Response: NOAA agrees that white sharks are present in the Ano Nuevo region and other nearshore areas of the MBNMS in the autumn and winter seasons. However, NOAA is concerned that artificial (i.e., human induced) attraction activities may draw more white sharks to a specific location than might be present naturally and also cause them to remain in the area longer.

Researchers have documented that chumming can draw sharks from up to 5 km (3.1 miles) away and cause them to remain up to twelve hours after chumming has ceased.

(2)Comment: Artificially attracting white sharks causes short-term behavioral changes in the attracted or associated species, and may cause long-term changes.

Response: NOAA agrees. Research clearly supports that using attractants (e.g., chum) causes short-term behavioral changes in white sharks. This is further evidence by the fact that artificial shark attraction methods have been successful in bringing sharks into a targeted area for divers in cages to view. Both direct and indirect (e.g., more white sharks remain in a particular area longer; a situation which could alter predator-prey relationships) behavioral changes can result from attracting white sharks in nearshore waters of the Sanctuary. In addition, while few studies have been conducted on the long-term impacts of artificial attraction on white sharks, scientific studies and observations indicate that using human manipulation to attract other species of wild organisms has resulted in behavioral changes.

A report prepared by the Research Activity Panel (RAP Report), a working group of the Sanctuary Advisory Council, indicates that sharks are known to be drawn to a specific area based on sensory (sight and sound) changes in their environment. Some sharks have been trained to respond to
both of these stimuli, but the success of that training depends on sufficient frequency. Evidence strongly indicates white shark affinity to the Farallon Islands and Año Nuevo Island areas due to the frequency that they are found in these areas and the continued seasonality of their use of these areas. It has been found that individual white sharks often feed at the same location at similar times during successive years. It has also been found that white sharks at Dangerous Reef in Southern Australia show a clear tendency to revisit the places where they were previously observed, suggesting a relatively high degree of site attachment.

The white sharks exhibited an "island patrolling" pattern which may represent a home-ranging pattern. Shark feeding behavior seems to be indiscriminate; white sharks may take learned "prey-shaped" items as long as the target "matches" a known prey item (e.g., a surfer lying prone on a surfboard has a silhouette similar to a seal). Other findings from studies at Dangerous Reef suggest that white sharks select their prey by shape. However, at the Farallon Islands, it has been documented that white sharks select prey of various shapes and sizes.

The RAP Report found that sharks have been observed to alter their feeding behavior based on external clues (e.g., learned behavior). The Fisheries Division of the South Australia Department of Primary Industries has recommended that legislation be enacted to prohibit chumming at Dangerous Reef because of changes in the white shark's behavior resulting from chumming activities. Moreover, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Authority) has a policy that permits will not be issued for the feeding or attracting of sharks, identifying reasons similar to those NOAA has regarding its proposal to prohibit attraction of white sharks in the nearshore areas of the Sanctuary, including change in behavior caused by the activity.

The California legislature enacted a law prohibiting the direct take of white sharks in California waters due to their importance to the marine ecosystem. Further, research indicates that the California population of white sharks is small, that the white sharks have low reproductive rates, and that they have a slow rate of growth to maturity. Consequently, any disruption to the species can have a profound long-term adverse impact. This was evidenced in 1982, when a fisherman killed four adults when a shark was caught off the Farallon Islands. Researchers documented a significant decline in the occurrence of white sharks attacks on prey species (e.g., seals and sea lions) in that area between 1983-1985. This is significant because research indicates that white shark predation takes approximately 8-10% of the local elephant seal populations and an unknown percentage of California sea lion populations; this is enough of a predation rate to maintain a natural balance in fish and seabird populations.

Concern about the feeding of or attracting of other species of wild organisms has been addressed in other areas. Dolphin-feeding cruises in the Gulf of Mexico is one example of the use of attractants that has been determined to cause significant negative behavioral changes in marine mammals. NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) banned dolphin-feeding cruises in 1991 based on the scientific risks to both dolphins and humans. The ban was imposed based on evidence that feeding cruises exposed wild animals to disease and physical danger, and could alter their migratory and feeding behavior. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the ban in 1993, Strong v. U.S., 5 F.3d 905 (5th Cir. 1993). The Court agreed with NMFS that scientific evidence supported that feeding activities disturb normal behavior and, therefore, it was reasonable for the agency to restrict or prohibit the feeding of wild dolphins.

Other changes in animal behavior, resulting from people altering the natural feeding methods or locations, have been reported due to changing changes in prey items, location of feeding, and changes in behavioral patterns. Examples include feeding of bison in Yellowstone National Park, feeding of bear and deer in Parks, polar bears at Churchill, Canada, and feeding of fish in Hawaii. In all cases, the ensuing behavioral changes forced regulators to prohibit feeding activities to protect the animals and the people feeding them. In the Hawaii example, the feeding resulted in increases in selected fish species and thus affected natural community structure on the reefs. While not directly applicable to white sharks, these examples show that longer-term behavioral changes can and do result from using human-manipulated means to attract (in these instances, feed) wild organisms.

(3) Comment: Artificially attracting white sharks has adverse impacts on Sanctuary resources in general.

Response: NOAA agrees. NOAA considers that even a single instance of white shark attraction can create harm to Sanctuary resources, and there is no guarantee that the attraction would cease at a point where it is no longer financially viable. White shark attraction can result in adverse impacts to the aesthetic and recreational qualities for which the Sanctuary was designated.
of harm as a result of the conduct of this activity. Further, the chum slick may
cause not only a potential health hazard,
but also adversely impacts the aesthetics of the area. Consequently, NOAA has
determined that white shark attraction
in the nearshore areas of the Sanctuary
is generally incompatible with other
uses of these areas.

(9) Comment: Exposure to white
sharks through cage diving promotes
better conservation of sharks in general
and improves the public’s attitude
towards (and perception of) sharks.
Response: NOAA does not believe
that attracting white sharks for viewing
purposes without an associated,
permitted research protocol provides a
public benefit for the species, the
participants, or other Sanctuary
resources or qualities. NOAA also
believes promotion of shark
conservation is effectively addressed, in
part, by retaining some sharks in aquaria
for viewing. Within the area of the
MBNMS, two aquaria exist (Steinhart
Aquarium in San Francisco and the
Monterey Bay Aquarium in Monterey),
both of which are renowned for their skill
and research in captive shark
husbandry. Therefore, sufficient
opportunity exists for members of the
public who wish to view live sharks.
SRD recognizes that there are few, if
any, white sharks in capacity. For
individuals that wish to observe live
white sharks, therefore, one of the only
ways to do so is to observe them in their
natural environment. The regulation
SRD is proposing does not restrict
persons from SCUBA diving using shark
cages in the Sanctuary. The regulation
prohibits only the use of attractants that
can artificially alter white shark
behavior, create user conflict, and
adversely impact other Sanctuary
resources and qualities. This is the
primary reason the proposed regulation
is tailored specifically to attraction, and
is not a broader prohibition against the
“taking” (broadly defined in the existing
Sanctuary regulations) of white sharks
that could encompass non-attraction
viewing.

(11) Comment: Shark chumming has
been taking place in the Monterey Bay
area for quite some time, and should
therefore be considered a “traditional
glancing” method.

Response: NOAA disagrees. There is
evidence that a number of fisheries,
including certain shark fisheries, used
chumming methods for at least the past
forty years, though not in any
sustained or continuous fashion.

However, the white shark attraction
activities conducted in the nearshore
areas for recreational purposes are not
traditional fishing operations. In fact,
such activities are not any type of
fishing operation. Moreover, white
sharks have no significant commercial
value, and there is no and there never
has been a commercial white shark
fishery in the Monterey Bay area waters.
In addition, California state law now
generally prohibits fishing for, or
retention of, white sharks within
California waters. NOAA believes that a
regulation which would effectively
prohibit the attraction of white sharks is
a logical extension of, and consistent
with, the State law.
unique to nearshore areas due to the combined concentration of white sharks, associated species (e.g., pinnipeds), and people who also use and enjoy the nearshore areas of the Sanctuary. These concerns are not present in offshore areas of the MBNMS where this combination of factors does not exist. Consequently, NOAA believes that by prohibiting the attraction of white sharks within three miles from the coast (i.e., state waters; 16% of the Sanctuary), the identified concerns and risks will be fully addressed.

III. Summary of Regulations

Three amendments to the MBNMS regulations are proposed in this rulemaking.

1. Attraction of White Sharks

The first amendment is the addition to 15 CFR 922.132(a) of a prohibition against attracting, or attempting to attract, any white shark in California State waters (three miles seaward of mean high tide) in the Sanctuary. Section 922.131 would also be amended by adding a definition of "attract or attracting," defined as the conduct of any activity that lures by using food, bait, chum or any other means. As discussed above in the response to comments on the ANPR, this regulation is necessary to protect the white shark and other Sanctuary resources (e.g., pinnipeds); to minimize user conflict in the nearshore areas of the Sanctuary; and to protect the ecological, aesthetic, and recreational qualities of the Sanctuary. Concentration of white sharks, associated species, and people make nearshore areas of the Sanctuary uniquely susceptible to adverse impacts from attracting white sharks in such areas. The proposed regulation is narrowly tailored to attraction of white sharks in order to complement existing California law that prohibits the direct take of white sharks in California waters, and so as not to prohibit divers from viewing white sharks in their natural state without the use of attractants.

2. Discharge Regulations

Section 922.132(a)(2)(i) prohibits the discharging or depositing, from within the boundary of the Sanctuary, any material or other matter. Section 922.132(a)(2)(ii) prohibits the discharging or depositing, from beyond the boundary of the Sanctuary, any material or other matter that subsequently enters the Sanctuary and injures a Sanctuary resource or quality. There are five additions to these discharge prohibitions, one of which is the discharge of "fish, fish parts, chumming materials or bait used in or resulting from traditional fishing operations in the Sanctuary" (15 CFR 922.132(a)(2)(i)(A)). This exception is proposed to be made explicit to clearly define the scope of exceptions to the discharge regulations and is prohibited.

3. Traditional Fishing

There is presently no definition of traditional fishing in the MBNMS regulations. This term appears in four of the regulatory prohibitions. It was intended when the MBNMS was established in 1982, and has always been interpreted by NOAA to mean fishing using lawful commercial or recreational methods used within the Sanctuary prior to its designation. In order to ensure that there are no uncertainties as to the meaning of the term, NOAA is proposing to add to 15 CFR 922.131 definitions of "fishing" and "traditional fishing" to the Sanctuary regulations. The term "fishing" is proposed to be defined as: (i) The catching or harvesting of fish; or (ii) the attempted catching or harvesting of fish. The term "traditional fishing" is proposed to be defined as: "fishing using a lawful commercial or recreational fishing method used within the Sanctuary prior to its designation (September 18, 1992)." Addition of these definitions would provide clear understanding of the scope of certain exceptions to the regulatory prohibitions.

IV. Miscellaneous Rulemaking Requirements

Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Impact

This proposed rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 12612: Federalism Assessment

NOAA has concluded that this regulatory action does not have federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a federalism assessment under Executive Order 12612.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

NOAA has concluded that this regulatory action is not expected to have
a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, and the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation of the Department of Commerce has so certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration. A prohibition against white shark attraction in the nearshore areas of the Sanctuary would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because the number of commercial operators presently engaging in this activity is small; white shark attraction is not likely the sole source of business for such commercial operators because white sharks only inhabit the nearshore areas during the fall-winter season; and commercial operators would not be prohibited from bringing divers to dive in cages to observe white sharks in their natural state without the use of attractants. Accordingly, an initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis was not prepared.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule would not impose an information collection requirement subject to review and approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3500 et seq.

National Environmental Policy Act

NOAA has concluded that this regulatory action does not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not required.

List of Subjects in 15 CFR Part 922

Administrative practice and procedure, Coastal zone, Education, Environmental protection, Marine resources, Natural resources, Penalties, Recreation and recreation areas, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Research.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number 11.429 Marine Sanctuary Program)

Dated: February 1, 1996.

David L. Evans,
Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, 15 CFR Part 922 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 922—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 922 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.

Subpart—Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary

2. Section 922.131 is amended by adding three definitions in alphabetical order to read as follows:

§ 922.131 Definitions.
* * * * * * * *

Attract or attracting means the conduct of any activity that lures by using food, bait, chum or any other means.

* * * * * * * *

Fishing means: (1) The catching or harvesting of fish; or (2) The attempted catching or harvesting of fish.

* * * * * * * *

Traditional fishing means fishing using a lawful commercial or recreational fishing method used within the Sanctuary prior to its designation (September 18, 1992).

3. Section 922.132 is amended by revising paragraph (a)(2)(i)(A), and adding new paragraph (a)(10) to read as follows:

§ 922.132 Prohibited or otherwise regulated activities.

(a) * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

(2)(i) * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

(A) Fish, fish parts, chumming materials or bait produced and discarded incidental to and during traditional fishing operations in the Sanctuary.

* * * * * * * *

(10) Attracting or attempting to attract any white shark in California state waters (3 miles seaward of mean high tide) in the Sanctuary.

* * * * * * * *

[FR Doc. 96±2686 Filed 2±9±96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510±08±M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 303

Rules and Regulations Under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (Commission or FTC) has completed its regulatory review of the Rules and Regulations under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act (Textile Rules). Pursuant to that review, the Commission concludes that the Rules continue to be valuable to both consumers and firms. The regulatory review comments suggested various substantive amendments to the Rules.

The Commission has considered these proposals and other proposals that it believes merit further inquiry. The Commission seeks comment on whether it should amend the Textile Rules to: (1) allow the listing of generic fiber names for fibers that have a functional significance and are present in the amount of less than 5% of the total fiber weight of a textile product, without requiring disclosure of the functional significance of the fiber, as presently required by Textile Rule 3(b); (2) eliminate the requirement of Textile Rule 16(b) that the front side of a cloth label, which is sewn to the product so that both sides of the label are readily accessible to the prospective purchaser, bear the wording “Fiber Content on Reverse Side” when the fiber content disclosure is listed on the reverse side of the label; (3) allow for a system of shared information for manufacturer or importer identification among the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) countries; (4) add a provision to Textile Rule 20 specifying that a Commission registered identification number (RN) will be subject to cancellation if, after a change in the material information contained on the RN application, a new application that reflects current business information is not promptly submitted; (5) allow the use of abbreviations for generic fiber names; (6) allow the use of abbreviations and symbols in country of origin labeling; and (7) allow the use of new generic names for manufactured fibers if the name and fiber are recognized by an international standards-setting organization. In addition, the Commission seeks comment on the possible resolution of apparent conflict between the Commission’s country of origin disclosure requirements and new U.S. Customs Service regulations pursuant to the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994.

DATES: Written comments will be accepted until May 13, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be submitted to: Office of the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, Room H-159, Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20580. Submissions should be marked “Rules and Regulations under the Textile Act, 16 CFR Part 303—Comment.” If possible, submit comments both in writing and on a personal computer diskette in WordPerfect or other word processing format (to assist in processing, please identify the format and version used). Written comments should be submitted, when feasible and not burdensome, in five copies.