Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 92

[Docket No. 83-053]

Specifically Approved States To Receive Stallions Imported From CEM-Affected Countries

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Affirmation of interim rule.

SUMMARY: This document affirms the interim rule which added New York to the list of specifically approved States authorized to receive certain stallions imported into the United States from countries affected with contagious equine metritis (CEM). This action is taken because the Deputy Administrator, Veterinary Services, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, determined that New York has laws or regulations in effect to require the additional inspection, treatment and testing of such horses to further ensure their freedom from CEM as required by the regulations. This action was necessary in order to avoid the imposition of unnecessary restrictions on importers of stallions from countries affected with CEM.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 3, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Mark P. Dulin, VS, APHIS, USDA, Room 844-AAA, Federal Building, Hyattsville, MD 20782, 301-436-8170.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 92.2(i)(2) of the regulations in 9 CFR Part 92, among other things, authorizes the importation of certain male horses (stallions over 731 days of age) into the United States from countries affected with contagious equine metritis (CEM) when specific requirements to prevent their introducing CEM into the United States are met, and the animals imported are moved into approved States for further inspection, treatment and testing.

A document published in the **Federal Register** on June 7, 1982 (47 FR 24540-24541), set forth an interim rule amending § 92.4(a)(5)(ii) of the regulations in 9 CFR Part 92 by adding New York to the list of States approved to receive these stallions. The addition of New York to the list was based on the finding that it meets certain criteria concerning treatment, testing, and handling procedures for these stallions.

The interim rule was made effective on the date it was signed, June 1, 1982, in order to relieve as soon as possible unnecessary restrictions that had been placed on importers of these stallions.

Comments were solicited for 60 days after publication of the amendment. No comments were received. The factual situation which was set forth in the document of June 7, 1982, still provides a basis for the amendment. Accordingly, it has been determined that the amendment should remain effective as published in the **Federal Register** on June 7, 1982.

Executive Order 12291 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This action has been reviewed in conformance with Executive Order 12291 and Secretary's Memorandum 1512-1, and has been determined to be not a "major rule." The Department has determined that this action will not have a significant annual effect on the economy, will not cause a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State or local government agencies, or geographic regions; and will not have any adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

For this rulemaking action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived their review process required by Executive Order 12291 and the Department of Agriculture has waived the requirements of Secretary's Memorandum 1512-1.

This action affirms an interim rule which provides a means by which stallions over 731 days of age from countries affected with CEM and bound for New York can be imported directly into New York. Otherwise, the stallions would be allowed to be imported only to other States which have been approved to receive these stallions from countries affected with CEM. The nearest States to New York approved to receive these stallions from countries affected with CEM are Ohio, Maryland, and Virginia. This action should result in a decrease of transportation costs for such horses.

It is anticipated that the number of these stallions imported into the United States from countries affected with CEM will be insignificant compared with horses of all classes imported into the United States. In the last year only 9 of these stallions were imported into New York and 70 into the entire United States from countries affected with CEM, compared with 38,983 horses of all classes imported into the United States.

Under the circumstances explained above, Mr. Bert W. Hawkins, Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 92

Animal Diseases, Canada, Imports, Livestock and livestock products, Mexico, Poultry and poultry products, Quarantine, Transportation, Wildlife.

(Sec. 2, 32 Stat. 792, as amended, secs. 2, 4, 11, 76 Stat. 129, 130, 132; 21 U.S.C. 111, 134a, 134c, 134f; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(d)).

Done at Washington, D.C., this 27th day of May 1983.

K. R. Hook,

Acting Deputy Administrator, Veterinary Services.

[FR Doc. 83-14869 Filed 6-2-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-M

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

14 CFR Part 252

[Economic Regulations Amendment 1; Docket 29044]

Smoking Aboard Aircraft

AGENCY: Civil Aeronautics Board.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The CAB affirms and provides further explanation for its earlier decision not to ban smoking on short flights and not to include vague language in its smoking rule prohibiting unreasonable burdens on nonsmokers from breathing tobacco smoke. The Board also republishes provisions previously eliminated regarding cigars and pipes and ventilation systems. This action is taken in response to a decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

DATES: Adopted: May 19, 1983. Effective: July 3, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David E. Schaffer, Office of the General Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20428, 202-673-5442.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By ER-1245, 46 FR 45934, September 16, 1981, the Board adopted a new version of 14 CFR Part 252, *Smoking Aboard Aircraft*. This was the culmination of a rulemaking proceeding that began in 1976 with a petition from Action on Smoking and Health (ASH), and included five notices of proposed rulemaking, one prior final rule, dozens of formal comments, thousands of individual letters and an oral argument.

In ER-1245, the Board decided to replace the then-existing rule with a less

detailed regulation. The new rule required airlines to provide separate seating for smokers and nonsmokers and to guarantee a seat in the no-smoking section for all nonsmokers with confirmed reservations who arrived by the airline's check-in deadline. As before, smokers had no right to smoke under this rule. The Board rejected arguments for ending its regulation of smoking, banning all smoking, banning smoking on small aircraft and short flights, and requiring special provisions for passengers especially sensitive to smoke. Details concerning cigars and pipes and ventilation systems, and language prohibiting unreasonable burdens were not included in the new rule.

ASH filed suit challenging ER-1245. The Air Transport Association of America and Transamerica Airlines intervened challenging the Board's authority to regulate smoking. On January 28, the Court issued it decision. *Action on Smoking and Health v. CAB*, F. 2d (D.C. Cir. 1983). It upheld the Board's authority to regulate smoking. It also did not question the Board's decision not to ban smoking on all flights and to permit airlines to establish a check-in deadline for guaranteeing a no-smoking seat. It did, however, direct the Board to provide further explanation for not adopting its proposals to (1) ban smoking on small aircraft, (2) ban smoking on short flights, and (3) provide special protections for persons especially sensitive to smoke. It also required further explanations for not continuing the previous requirements that (1) cigar and pipe smokers be specially segregated, (2) smoking be banned when the ventilation system is not fully functioning, and (3) nonsmokers not be unreasonably burdened by breathing smoke.

After the Court issued its decision, ASH filed a motion for oral argument, which we are granting, and a petition for rulemaking. In its petition ASH asked the Board to republish the three requirements above that had not been continued from the previous rule. It also asked the Board to reopen the smoking docket, or in the alternative, to institute a new rulemaking to consider the three provisions above that had been proposed but not adopted.

This notice responds to the Court's directive and the ASH petition with respect to some of the provisions summarized above. The others are the subject of a new rulemaking and are therefore discussed in EDR-461, issued simultaneously.

Short Flights

In EDR-377, 44 FR 29846, May 21, 1979, the Board proposed a ban on smoking during flights of one hour or less. This proposal was singled out for particular criticism. Delta argued that the nonsmoker's annoyance is less on a short flight because the duration of exposure would not be as long. The Association of Flight Attendants was concerned that it would be difficult to administer. PSA pointed out that there may be enforcement problems, especially if the Board does not clarify whether the 1 hour refers to scheduled or actual flight time. The Tobacco Institute considered the 1-hour cutoff to be arbitrary. ASH favored a 90-minute or 2-hour cutoff so that carriers could not evade the ban by listing a 1-hour flight as being 65 minutes.

The Board here reaffirms its decision not to adopt a ban on smoking on short flights. Unlike the proposal to ban smoking on small aircraft, there does not appear to be any characteristic of short flights that causes nonsmokers any greater problem than flights of longer duration. Indeed, the opposite is the case since smoking is limited to a briefer period of time. We also agree with those commenters that found it would be difficult to administer and enforce. It would be particularly troublesome on multisegment flights where smoking would be permitted at some times, and then prohibited during other parts of the trip. In addition, such a ban would require arbitrary line drawing. It might create a perverse incentive for some carriers to rearrange their schedules to evade it. We conclude on balance that the limited benefits are outweighed by the difficulties associated with this proposal.

Unreasonable Burden

The Board's smoking rule, as revised by ER-1245, did not include the "unreasonably burdened by breathing smoke" language formerly in § 252.2. This language has been viewed by the Board as an objective to be achieved by the rule rather than as a specific regulatory requirement. In addition the Board recognized that it had no sufficient justification for banning the practice of sandwiching nonsmokers between two smoking sections, so it dealt with the complaints about sandwiching by adding this hortatory language to paragraph (e) of § 252.2.

The Board concludes that this language is too vague to be effectively enforced and merely serves to create confusion over exactly which airline practices are prohibited. Some have tried to use this language as a basis for prohibiting longitudinal separation of smokers and nonsmokers, although the airlines and others have not viewed it as prohibiting that arrangement. Indeed, at least one aircraft manufacturer has stated that longitudinal separation would be the most effective way to separate smokers and nonsmokers.

The Board therefore reaffirms its decision not to include the "unreasonably burdened" language in the revised Part 252 and denies ASH's petition insofar as it asked the Board to republish it. We continue to view protecting nonsmokers from an unreasonable burden, whether from sandwiching or other airline practices, as one of the main purposes of its rule. There is no persuasive evidence, however, that the current required separation is not the most practical way to achieve this.

ASH did attach to its petition letters from people who claimed to be bothered by smoke even though they were in the no-smoking section. Most did not complain that they had been sandwiched between two smoking sections but rather were concerned about drifting smoke.

The problem thus appears to be primarily one of drifting smoke. The Board is not persuaded that it will help the situation to include hortatory language in a rule that nonsmokers should not be unreasonably burdened. There has been no showing that the level of complaints was affected by either the adoption or elimination of this language. It would be much better, from a regulatory standpoint, to propose specific requirements. ASH suggested none in its recent petition. The Board, however, has tried to do so. In EDR-377, it proposed to require physical barriers or buffer zones as a means of protecting nonsmokers from drifting smoke. The buffer zone, under this proposal, would have been composed of one row of seats that were either vacant or occupied by persons who did not object to being placed next to the smoking section.

Most nonsmokers who addressed this aspect of the proposal did not favor it, expressing doubt whether partitions or buffer zones would be effective. Some did suggest that the Board require carriers to install a wall-to-wall, floor-to-ceiling plexiglass divider between smoking and no-smoking sections. The Association of Flight Attendants viewed a one-row buffer zone as adequate. Donald Pevsner and other nonsmokers did not consider one row to be enough.

Several arguments were raised by airlines against the use of barriers or buffer zones. Delta viewed a Board-imposed requirement that carriers install

barriers to be contrary to section 401(e)(4) of the Act, prohibiting the Board from restricting a carrier's use of its accommodations and facilities. ATA and PSA stated that barriers would limit flexibility of carriers to expand the no-smoking section to accommodate an unexpectedly large number of nonsmoking passengers. TIA claimed that there was no FAA-approved structure that could be moved at the last minute. PSA and the Association of Flight Attendants were concerned that any partition would be unsafe. PSA added that its studies indicate that barriers would not protect non-smokers from smoke. ATA stated that attempts to establish a buffer zone comprised of nonsmokers who do not object to smoke would delay check-in and necessitate the hiring of more airline personnel, thereby increasing carrier costs and fares.

In light of the lack of enthusiasm for these proposals on the part of non-smokers, the operational, enforcement, safety, and financial problems they may cause if imposed as described above, and the lack of any clear evidence that prohibiting sandwiching or requiring partitions or buffer zones would minimize complaints about drifting smoke, we have decided not to adopt these proposals. Their difficulties and costs, in the Board's judgment, would far outweigh their uncertain benefits.

Cigars and Pipes and Ventilation

Prior to ER-1245, the Board's smoking rule required carriers to provide for special segregation of cigar and pipe smokers and to ban smoking when the aircraft ventilation system was not fully functioning. As revised by ER-1245, the rule no longer included these requirements. The Court of Appeals vacated this aspect of that decision. ASH has now asked the Board to republish them.

The Board recognizes that cigar and pipe smoke causes greater discomfort for some nonsmokers than cigarettes. The Board, in EDR-461, issued simultaneously, is therefore proposing to ban cigar and pipe smoking entirely. The Board is also here republishing the special segregation requirement so that that requirement will be in effect while the rulemaking to ban cigar and pipe smoking is pending.

For generally the same reasons, the Board is also republishing the ventilation requirements. Although, for the reasons discussed more fully in EDR-461, the Board has doubts about the appropriateness of that provision, it has decided to republish it while it is considering what the proper ventilation standard should be.

Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

The Board's final regulatory flexibility analysis of this rule is contained in ER-1245 as supplemented by the discussion above. Copies of these documents can be obtained from the Distribution Section, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C. 20428 (202-673-5432) by referring to the "ER" number at the top of the document.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 252

Air carriers, Consumer protection, Smoking.

Accordingly:

PART 252—[AMENDED]

1. For the reasons discussed above, the Board affirms its decision in ER-1245, 46 FR 45934, September 16, 1981, not to ban smoking on short flights;

§ 252.2 [Amended]

2. For the reasons discussed above, the introductory paragraph and paragraph (e) of § 252.2 of 14 CFR Part 252, *Smoking Aboard Aircraft* (1981), are again removed; and

3. A new § 252.1a is added to read:

§ 252.1a Special segregation of cigar and pipe smokers.

Carriers shall adopt and enforce rules providing for special segregation of cigar and pipe smokers, and for such other procedures as may be necessary to avoid exposing persons seated in no-smoking areas to smoke from cigars and pipes.

4. A new § 252.2a is added to read:

§ 252.2a Ban on smoking when ventilation systems not fully functioning.

Carriers shall adopt and enforce rules prohibiting the smoking of tobacco whenever the ventilation system is not fully functioning. A ventilation system shall be considered fully functioning only when all parts are in working order and operating at the capacity designed for normal service.

(Secs. 204, 404, 407, and 416 of Pub. L. 85-726, as amended, 72 Stat. 743, 760, 766, 771, 49 U.S.C. 1324, 1374, 1377, 1386.)

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Phyllis T. Kaylor,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 83-14944 Filed 6-2-83; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6320-01-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 423

Amendment to Trade Regulation Rule Concerning Care Labeling of Textile Wearing Apparel and Certain Piece Goods

Correction

FR Doc. 83-13576 was published on page 22733 in the issue of Friday, May 20, 1983. The trade regulation rule requires manufacturers and importers of textile wearing apparel and certain piece goods to provide labels for their products which disclose information for cleaning and care of the product. The document was published in the Proposed Rules section of the **Federal Register**. It should have appeared in the Rules section.

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 131

[Docket No. 77N-0143]

Standards of Identity for Cultured and Acidified Milks, Cultured and Acidified Buttermilks, Yogurts, and Eggnog; Confirmation of Effective Date and Extension of Effective Date of Previously Confirmed Provisions

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration.

ACTION: Final rule; confirmation of effective date and extension of effective date of previously confirmed provisions.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is confirming the effective date for compliance with the amendments to the standards of identity for acidified milk, acidified lowfat milk, acidified skim milk, cultured milk, cultured lowfat milk, cultured skim milk, eggnog, yogurt, lowfat yogurt, and nonfat yogurt. FDA is also extending the effective date of the previously confirmed provisions of the standards to coincide with this effective date.

DATES: Effective July 1, 1985, for all affected products initially introduced or initially delivered for introduction into interstate commerce on or after this date. Voluntary compliance with the amendments to the standards of identity published in the **Federal Register** of September 21, 1982 (47 FR 41519), may have begun November 22, 1982. Voluntary compliance with the provisions of the standards published in

the **Federal Register** of January 30, 1981 (46 FR 9924), and confirmed in the **Federal Register** of September 21, 1982 (47 FR 41519), may have begun March 31, 1981.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eugene T. McGarrahan, Bureau of Foods (HFF-215), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202-245-1155.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of January 30, 1981 (46 FR 9924), FDA published a final rule that established standards of identity for acidified milk (21 CFR 131.111), cultured milk (21 CFR 131.112), acidified lowfat milk (21 CFR 131.136), cultured lowfat milk (21 CFR 131.138), acidified skim milk (21 CFR 131.144), cultured skim milk (21 CFR 131.146), eggnog (21 CFR 131.170), yogurt (21 CFR 131.200), lowfat yogurt (21 CFR 131.203), and nonfat yogurt (21 CFR 131.206). The final rule also redesignated 21 CFR 131.145 *Skim milk* as 21 CFR 131.143 *Skim milk*. Except for provisions that were stayed by the filing of proper objections, the final rule would be effective July 1, 1983.

In the **Federal Register** of September 21, 1982 (47 FR 41519), FDA confirmed the effective date of July 1, 1983, for certain provisions of the standards of identity for acidified and cultured milks, eggnog, and yogurts. FDA also stayed certain provisions of these standards of identity because FDA had received objections and requests for hearing. In the same document, the agency issued further amendments to §§ 131.111 (d) and (e)(6); 131.112(d)(6); 131.136 (d) and (e)(6); 131.138(d)(6); 131.144 (d) and (e)(6); 131.146(d)(6); 131.170(a); 131.200 (a), (b), and (f)(1)(iii); 131.203 (a), (b), and (f)(1)(iv); and 131.206 (a), (b), and (f)(1)(iii). Any person adversely affected by the amendments could have, at any time on or before October 21, 1982, filed written objections and requested a hearing.

FDA received one objection and request for a hearing from the Milk Industry Foundation to extend the effective date of the previously confirmed provisions of these standards from July 1, 1983, to July 1, 1985. The Milk Industry Foundation stated that extending the effective date to July 1, 1985, would provide a uniform effective date for all confirmed provisions of the standards of identity for cultured and acidified milks, yogurts, and eggnog, which would serve the best interests of both the consumer and the affected industry.

The objection does not involve an issue of fact that warrants a hearing. FDA agrees, however, that it is reasonable to have one effective date. Therefore, FDA is extending the effective date of those provisions of the standards of identity that were confirmed in the **Federal Register** of September 21, 1982 to July 1, 1985.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 131

Cream; Food standards; Milk; Yogurt.

PART 131—MILK AND CREAM

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (secs. 401, 701(e), 52 Stat. 1046, 70 Stat. 919 as amended (21 U.S.C. 341, 371(e))) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs (21 CFR 5.10), notice is given that the amendments to §§ 131.111, 131.112, 131.136, 131.138, 131.144, 131.146, 131.170, 131.200, 131.203, and 131.206, published in the **Federal Register** of September 21, 1982 (47 FR 41519), will become effective July 1, 1985, and that the effective date for compliance with the amendments published in the **Federal Register** of January 30, 1981 (46 FR 9924), and confirmed in the **Federal Register** of September 21, 1982 (47 FR 41519), is extended from July 1, 1983, to July 1, 1985. Voluntary compliance with the amendments to the standards of identity published in the **Federal Register** of September 21, 1982 (47 FR 41519), may have begun November 22, 1982. Voluntary compliance with the amendments to the standards of identity published in the **Federal Register** of January 30, 1981 (46 FR 9924), may have begun March 31, 1981.

Dated: May 26, 1983.

William F. Randolph,

Acting Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs.

[FR Doc. 83-14697 Filed 5-27-83; 2:17 pm]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-M

---

21 CFR Parts 175 and 178

[Docket No. 81F-0268]

Indirect Food Additives; Adhesive Coatings and Components

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the food additive regulations to provide for the safe use of *alpha* olefin sulfonate [alkyl group is in the range of C_{10}–C_{18} with not less than 50 percent C_{14}–C_{16}], ammonium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, and sodium salts as emulsifiers and/or surface active agents in adhesives, vinyl chloride copolymer coatings, acrylic coatings, and certain acrylonitrile-butadiene copolymers. Witco Chemical Corp. petitioned for this use.

DATES: Effective June 3, 1983; objections by July 5, 1983.

ADDRESS: Written objections to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, Rm. 4-62, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Garnett R. Higginbotham, Bureau of Foods, Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202-472-5690.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a notice published in the **Federal Register** of October 2, 1981 (46 FR 48767), FDA announced that a petition (FAP 1B3567) had been filed by Witco Chemical Corp., Houston, TX 77045, proposing that the food additive regulations be amended to provide for the safe use of *alpha* olefin sulfonate [alkyl group is in the range of C_{10}–C_{18} with not less than 50 percent C_{14}–C_{16}], ammonium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, and sodium salts, as emulsifiers and/or surface-active agents in the manufacture of articles or components of articles intended for food-contact applications.

FDA has evaluated data in the petition and other relevant material and concludes that the proposed food additive use is safe and that the regulations should be amended as set forth below.

In accordance with § 171.1(h) (21 CFR 171.1(h)), the petition and the documents that FDA considered and relied upon in reaching its decision to approve the petition are available for inspection at the Bureau of Foods (address above) by appointment with the information contact person listed above. As provided in § 171.1(h)(2), the agency will delete from the documents any materials that are not available for public disclosure before making the documents available for inspection.

The agency previously considered the

potential environmental effects of this rule as announced in the notice of filing published in the **Federal Register.** No new information or comment has been received that would alter the agency's previous determination that there is no significant impact on the human environment and that an environmental impact statement is not required.

List of Subjects

21 CFR Part 175

Adhesives; Food additives; Food packaging.

21 CFR Part 178

Food additives; Food packaging; Sanitizing solutions.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act (secs. 201(s), 409, 72 Stat. 1784–1788 as amended (21 U.S.C. 321(s), 348)) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs (21 CFR 5.10) and redelegated to the Bureau of Foods (21 CFR 5.61 as revised February 4, 1983; 48 FR 5251), Parts 175 and 178 are amended as follows:

PART 175—INDIRECT FOOD ADDITIVES: ADHESIVE COATINGS AND COMPONENTS

1. Part 175 is amended in § 175.105(c)(5) by alphabetically inserting a new item in the list of substances to read as follows:

§ 175.105 Adhesives.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(5) * * *

Substances	Limitations
* * * * *	
alpha Olefin sulfonate [alkyl group is in the range of C_{12}–C_{18} with not less than 50 percent C_{14}–C_{16}], ammonium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, and sodium salts	
* * * * *	

PART 178—INDIRECT FOOD ADDITIVES: ADJUVANTS, PRODUCTION AIDS, AND SANITIZERS

2. Part 178 is amended in § 178.3400 (c) by alphabetically inserting a new item in the list of substances to read as follows:

§ 178.3400 Emulsifiers and/or surface-active agents.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

List of substances	Limitations
alpha Olefin sulfonate [alkyl group is in the range of C_{12}–C_{18} with not less than 50 percent C_{14}–C_{16}], ammonium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, and sodium salts.	For use only: 1. In acrylonitrile-butadiene copolymers identified in § 177.2600(c)(4)(i) of this chapter. 2. At levels not to exceed 1 percent by weight of acrylic coatings complying with § 175.300(b)(3)(xx) of this chapter and having a maximum thickness of 0.051 millimeter (0.002 inch). The finished polymers contact food only of the types V, VIII, and IX as identified in table 1 of § 176.170(c) of this chapter. 3. At levels not to exceed 2 percent by weight of vinyl chloride copolymer coatings having a maximum thickness of 0.051 millimeter (0.002 inch) and complying with § 175.300(b)(3)(xv) of this chapter. The finished polymers contact food only of the types V, VIII, and IX as identified in table 1 of § 176.170(c) of this chapter. 4. As provided in § 175.105 of this chapter.
* * * * *	

* * * * *

Any person who will be adversely affected by the foregoing regulation may at any time on or before July 5, 1983, submit to the Dockets Management Branch (address above) written objections thereto and may make a written request for a public hearing on the stated objections. Each objection shall be separately numbered and each numbered objection shall specify with particularity the provision of the regulation to which objection is made. Each numbered objection on which a hearing is requested shall specifically so state; failure to request a hearing for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on that objection. Each numbered objection for which a hearing is requested shall include a detailed description and analysis of the specific factual information intended to be presented in support of the objection in the event that a hearing is held; failure to include such a description and analysis for any particular objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing on the objection. Three copies of all documents shall be submitted and shall be identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this regulation. Received objections may be seen in the office above between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Effective date. This regulation shall become effective June 3, 1983.

(Secs. 201(s), 409, 72 Stat. 1784–1788 as amended (21 U.S.C. 321(s) 348))

Dated: May 20, 1983.

Sanford A. Miller,

Director, Bureau of Foods.

[FR Doc. 83-14699 Filed 5-27-83; 2:14 pm]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-M

21 CFR Part 510

New Animal Drugs; Change of Sponsor

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to reflect a change of sponsor for several new animal drug applications (NADA's) from Evsco Pharmaceuticals Corp., subsidiary of Damon Corp., to Evsco Pharmceuticals, an Affiliate of ImmunoGenetics, Inc. Supplements to the affected NADA's provide for this change.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 3, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David L. Gordon, Bureau of Veterinary Medicine (HFV–238), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301–443–6243.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Evsco Pharmaceuticals, an Affiliate of ImmunoGenetics, Inc., Box 209, Harding Hwy., Buena, NJ 08310, has filed several supplemental NADA's providing for a change of sponsor from Evsco Pharmaceutical Corp., Subsidiary of Damon Corp.

This change of sponsor for several NADA's does not involve changes in manufacturing facilities, equipment, procedures, or personnel. The list of sponsor names and addresses in 21 CFR 510.600(c) is amended to reflect the change of sponsor.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 510

Administrative practice and procedure, Animal drugs, Labeling, Reporting requirements.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 512(i), 82 Stat. 347 (21 U.S.C. 360b(i))) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs (21 CFR 5.10) and redelegated to the Bureau of Veterinary Medicine (21 CFR 5.83), § 510.600 is amended in paragraph (c)(1) by revising the entry for Evsco Pharmaceutical Corp., and in paragraph (c)(2) by removing the sponsor name in the entry for "017030" and inserting the new sponsor name, to read as follows:

PART 510—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS

§ 510.600 Names, addresses, and drug labeler codes of sponsors of approved applications.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) * * *