mile east of its junction with State Secondary Road 1207.

The Sasser, Johnny, farm located on the west side of State Secondary Road 1931 and 0.3 mile south of its junction with State Secondary Road 1930.

The Smith, Allen J., farm located on both sides of State Secondary Road 1953 and 0.5 mile north of State Highway 55.

The Wayne County Landfill property located on the southeast side of State Secondary Road 1726 and 0.5 mile northeast of its junction with State Highway 111.

South Carolina

(1) *Generally infested areas.* None.

(2) *Suppressive areas.*

Dillon County. The entire county.

Florence County. The Isgett, Otto, Estate farm located on the southeast side of State Secondary Road 24 and 1.4 mile east of the junction of this road and State Secondary Road 57.

The Munn, F.M., farm located on the southeast side of State Secondary Road 24 at the intersection with Jeffries Creed. This intersection being 1.6 mile northeast of the junction of State Secondary Road 24 and State Secondary Road 57.

Horry County. That area bounded by a line beginning at a point where State Secondary Highway 33 intersects the South Carolina-North Carolina State line and extending south along this highway to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 306, then west along this highway to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 142, then south along this highway to its junction with State Primary Highway 9, then northwest along this highway to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 59, then southwest and south along this highway to its junction with State Primary Highway 917, then southwest along this highway to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 19, then south and southeast along Highway 19 to its intersection with U.S. Highway 701 at Allsbrook, then northeast along this highway to its intersection with State Primary Highway 9, then southeast and south along this highway to its intersection with the Waccamaw River, then northeast along this river to its intersection with the South Carolina-North Carolina State line, then southeast along this State line to its intersection with U.S. Highway 17, then southwest along this highway to its junction with State Primary Highway 90, then west along this highway to its intersection with a dirt road known as Telephone Road, this intersection being 1.3 miles west of Wampee, then southwest and south along Telephone Road to its end, then northwest along a projected line for 1.9 miles to its junction with Jones Big Swamp, then northwest along this swamp to its junction with the Waccamaw River, then west along this river to its intersection with Stanley Creek, then north along this creek 1.6 miles, then northwest along this creek 2.8 miles, then north along a line projected from a point beginning at the end of the main run of this creek, and extending north to the junction of this line with State Primary Highway 905, then southwest along this highway to its junction with State Secondary Highway 19, then north along this highway 2.4 miles to its junction with a dirt road.

Then southwest along this road to its intersection with Maple Swamp, then north along this swamp to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 65, then southwest along this highway to its junction with U.S. Highway 701, then south along this highway to its intersection with U.S. Highway 501, then northwest along this highway to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 548, then west along this highway to its junction with a dirt road, then west along a dirt road to its junction with State Secondary Highway 78, then north along this highway to its junction with State Secondary Highway 391, then northeast along this highway to its junction with U.S. Highway 501, then southeast along this highway to its junction with State Secondary Highway 591, then north along this highway to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 97, then east 0.2 mile to its intersection with a dirt road, then north along this dirt road to its junction with State Primary Highway 319, then northwest along this highway to its junction with State Secondary Highway 131, then east and north along this highway to its intersection with Loosing Swamp, then west and northwest along this swamp to its intersection with State Secondary Highway 45, then southwest along this highway to its junction with State Secondary Highway 129, then northwest along this highway to its junction with U.S. Highway 501, then northwest along the latter highway to its intersection with Little Pee Dee River, then northwest along this river to its junction with the Lumber River, then northeast along this river to its intersection with the South Carolina-North Carolina State line, then southeast along this State line to the point of beginning, excluding the area within the corporate limits of the towns of Conway and Loris.

The Alford, Alex, farm located on the south side of a dirt road and being 2 miles southwest and west of the junction of this dirt road and State Secondary Highway 99, this junction being 1.75 miles north of the junction of this highway and State Secondary Highway 87.

The Cooper, Thomas B., farm located northeast of a dirt road and 0.75 mile northwest of the intersection of this dirt road with rural paved road No. 109, this intersection being 2.25 miles northeast of the junction of rural paved road No. 109 with rural paved road No. 79.

The Cox, Nancy T., farm located on the northwest corner of the intersection of two dirt roads. This intersection being 0.8 mile northeast of the junction of State Secondary Road 105 and State Secondary Road 377. One of the dirt roads is an extension of State Secondary Road 105.

The Cox, Velma, farm located on the west side of a dirt road and 1.0 mile northwest of junction of this dirt road and State Primary Highway 90. This junction being 3.2 miles south of junction of State Primary Highway 90 and State Secondary Road 31.

The Harden, John, farm located on the northwest side of a dirt road and 0.4 mile northeast of junction of this dirt road with the junction of State Secondary Roads 105 and 377.

The Holmes, Marie T., farm located on the west side of dirt road and 0.7 mile northwest of this dirt road with its junction with State Primary Highway 90. This junction being 3.2 miles south of junction of State Primary Highway 90 and State Secondary Road 31.

The Livingston, W.S., farm located on the south side of a dirt road and 0.6 mile east of its junction with a second dirt road, this junction being 0.5 mile south of the junction of the second dirt road and State Primary Highway 90, this junction being 0.8 mile south of junction of State Primary Highway 90 and State Secondary Road 31.

The Martin, Daniele E., farm located on the east side of State Primary Highway 90 and 0.9 mile northeast of the junction of this highway and State Secondary Highway 377.

The Vaugh, Ruth, farm located on the east side of a dirt road and 0.7 mile northwest of this dirt road and its junction with State Primary Highway 90. This junction being 3.2 miles south of junction of this State Primary Highway 90 and State Secondary Road 31.

Marion County. The entire county.

Done in Washington, DC, this 11th day of October, 1990.

Robert Melland,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 90-24387 Filed 10-16-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Immigration and Naturalization Service

8 CFR Parts 103 and 214

[Order No. 1447-90]

Withdrawal of Approval for School or School System To Enroll Foreign Students

AGENCY: Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule revises the procedures and authority to withdraw approval for a school to enroll foreign students. It corrects an existing procedure where an initial hearing is conducted outside the Immigration and Naturalization Service (Service) but an appeal is taken within the Service. Under the revised rule, a district director within the Service has authority to withdraw school approval, and that decision may be appealed to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 17, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joanna London, Senior Trial Attorney, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 425 I Street NW., Washington, DC 20536. Telephone: (202) 514-2895.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 5, 1986, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (Service) published a notice of proposed rulemaking in the **Federal Register** (51 FR 40207). The Service received four comments in response. The commenters uniformly opposed the proposal to have the district directors of the Service make the initial determination to withdraw school approval, with an appeal to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, although they agreed that the present procedure is anomalous and should be changed. Two commenters urged that, instead of the procedure proposed, the present hearing before an immigration judge be retained, with the appeal going to the Board of Immigration Appeals. Having considered these comments, the Service nevertheless has decided that a decision by a district director with a right to appeal to the Associate Commissioner, Examinations, satisfies the due process of law requirement in these cases.

Two commenters also urged the Service to withdraw the proposal and wait until discussions are completed with the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs on a more comprehensive revision of the regulations regarding sanctions against noncomplying schools. However, the Service believes that the anomaly in the present procedure needs to be corrected as soon as possible. Any further revision can be made at a future time. After due consideration of all the comments received, the Department has determined to publish the final rule using virtually the same language as the proposed rule.

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 605(b), the Attorney General certifies that this rule will not have a significant adverse impact on a substantial number of small entities.

This rule contains collection requirements; however, they are exempt from the Paperwork Reduction Act requirements in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.3(c)

This is not a major rule as defined in section 1(b) of E.O. 12291, nor does this rule have federalism implications warranting the preparation of a Federalism Assessment in accordance with E.O. 12612.

List of Subjects

8 CFR Part 103

Administrative practice and procedure, Authority delegations (Government agencies), Freedom of Information, Immigration, Privacy, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Surety bonds.

8 CFR Part 214

Administrative practice and procedure, Aliens, Employment, Foreign officials, Health professions, Immigration, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Schools, Students.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, chapter I of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 103—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SERVICE OFFICERS; AVAILABILITY OF SERVICE RECORDS

1. The authority citation for part 103 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552, 552a; 8 U.S.C. 1101, 1103, 1201, 1304; 31 U.S.C. 9701; E.O. 12356, 47 FR 14874, 15557; 3 CFR, 1982 Comp., p. 166; 8 CFR part 2.

2. In § 103.1, paragraph (f)(2)(ix) is revised to read as follows:

§ 103.1 Delegations of authority.

* * * * *

(f) * * *

(2) * * *

(ix) Decisions of district directors regarding withdrawal of approval of schools for attendance by foreign students under § 214.4 of this chapter.

* * * * *

PART 214—NONIMMIGRANT CLASSES

3. The authority citation for part 214 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 8 U.S.C. 1101, 1103, 1184, 1186a, 1187, and 8 CFR part 2.

4. In § 214.4, paragraphs (b) through (h) are revised to read as follows:

§ 214.4 Withdrawal of school approval.

* * * * *

(b) *Notice.* Whenever a district director has reason to believe that an approved school or school system in his/her district is no longer entitled to approval, a proceeding shall be commenced by service upon its designated official a notice of intention to withdraw the approval. The notice shall inform the designated official of the school or school system of the grounds upon which it is intended to withdraw its approval. The notice shall also inform the school or school system that it may, within 30 days of the date of service of the notice, submit written representations under oath supported by documentary evidence setting forth reasons why the approval should not be withdrawn and that the school or school system may, at the time of filing the answer, request in writing an interview before the district director in support of the written answer.

(c) *Assistance of counsel.* The school or school system shall also be informed in the notice of intent to withdraw approval that it may be assisted or represented by counsel of its choice qualified under part 292 of this chapter, at no expense to the Government, in preparation of its answer or in connection with the interview.

(d) *Allegations admitted or no answer filed.* If the school or school system admits all of the allegations in the notice of intent to withdraw approval, or if the school or school system fails to file an answer within the 30-day period, the district director shall withdraw the approval previously granted and he/she shall notify the designated school official of the decision. No appeal shall lie from the district director's decision if all allegations are admitted or no answer is filed within the 30-day period.

(e) *Allegations denied.* If the school or school system denies the allegations in the notice of intent to withdraw approval, then the school or school system shall, in its answer, provide all information or evidence on which the answer is based.

(f) *Interview requested.* (1) If in its answer to the notice of intent to withdraw approval the school or school system requests an interview, the school or school system shall be given notice of the date set for the interview.

(2) A summary of the information provided by the school or school system at the interview shall be prepared and included in the record. In the discretion of the district director, the interview may be recorded.

(g) *Decision.* The decision of the district director shall be in writing and shall include a discussion of the evidence and findings as to withdrawal. The decision shall contain an order either withdrawing approval or granting continued approval. The written decision shall be served upon the school or school system, together with the notice of the right to appeal pursuant to part 103 of this chapter.

(h) *Appeal.* Any appeal shall be taken within 15 days after the service of the written decision. The reasons for the appeal shall be stated in the notice of appeal, Form I–290B, and supported by a statement or brief specifically setting forth the grounds for contesting the withdrawal of the approval.

* * * * *

§ 214.4 [Amended]

5. Section 214.4 is further amended by removing paragraphs 214.4 (i), (j), and (k).

Dated: October 10, 1990.

Dick Thornburgh,

Attorney General.

[FR Doc. 90-24380 Filed 10-16-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 11

[Docket No. 90-071]

RIN: 0579-AA32

Horse Protection Inspection Guidelines

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are amending the Horse Protection regulations to expand and clarify the procedures to be followed by Designated Qualified Persons in conducting inspections at horse shows, exhibitions, and sales or auctions. These amendments are necessary to better protect horses under the Horse Protection Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 16, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. R.L. Crawford, Director, Animal Care Staff, Regulatory Enforcement and Animal Care, APHIS, USDA, room 269, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, MD 20782, (301) 436-7833.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The practice known as "soring" is the causing of suffering in show horses to affect their performance in the show ring. In 1970, Congress passed the Horse Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1821-1831), referred to below as the Act, to eliminate the practice of soring, by prohibiting the showing or selling of sored horses. Exercising our rulemaking power under the Act, we issued regulations published at 9 CFR part 11, referred to below as the regulations, that prohibit devices and methods that might sore horses. In 1979, in response to an amendment to the Act, we established guidelines under which show managements must, to avoid liability for any sore horses which are shown, hire individuals trained to conduct preshow inspections. These individuals, referred to as Designated Qualified Persons (DQP's), are trained and licensed under industry-sponsored DQP programs that we certify and monitor.

The requirements for DQP licensing are set forth in § 11.7 of the regulations. As part of the licensing process, prospective DQP's are trained in procedures we have established for examining a horse prior to exhibition or sale. The inspection procedures include both examination by palpation of the horse's pasterns and visual examination of the horse. In response to concerns of both the horse industry and animal welfare organizations that the guidelines for preshow DQP examination of a horse were not detailed enough to ensure a uniform and adequate inspection of all horses examined by DQP's, we published in the Federal Register an advance notice of proposed rulemaking on May 12, 1989 (54 FR 20605-20606, Docket No. 89-057), in which we solicited comments on how best to clarify and make more specific the DQP inspection procedures, so as to detect more effectively horses that are sore. We received seven comments in response to our notice. After review of the comments, we published a proposal in the Federal Register on March 28, 1990 (55 FR 11385-11387, Docket No. 89-222), to expand and make more specific the regulations regarding inspection of horses.

Comments on Proposed Rule

We invited written comments on our proposed rule, requiring that they be received on or before April 27, 1990. We received eight comments on the proposed rule by that date. The comments were from State agriculture officials, representatives of horse associations, representatives of animal protection associations, and horse owners and exhibitors. One commenter supported the proposal as written. Another commenter supported the proposed provisions but recommended other changes to the regulations. The remainder of the commenters either suggested changes to the proposed provisions or suggested interpretations of the proposed provisions for enforcement purposes. We carefully considered all comments prior to finalizing the proposed rule.

Preshow Observation of Horses' Movement

We proposed to specify procedures for the DQP to follow in conducting preshow inspections. We proposed that the DQP shall direct the custodian of the horse to walk and/or turn the horse in a manner that allows the DQP to determine whether the horse exhibits signs of soreness. While watching the horse move, the DQP would determine whether the horse moves in a free and easy manner and whether it is free of any signs of soreness, such as unusual posture, distressed expression, or a reluctance to move.

Several commenters recommended that walking a horse in a serpentine or "figure-8" pattern be made mandatory. One commenter stated that indicia of soreness are very likely to appear when a horse is forced to cross over its forelegs when turning. We agree that a horse that has been sored will likely give indications of that soreness when turning, and the wording in our proposal was intended to make it clear that a DQP should require such movement when necessary to help determine if a horse is sore. To clarify that intent, we are rewording the provisions as proposed to state that the DQP shall direct the custodian of the horse to walk and turn the horse in a manner that allows the DQP to determine whether the horse exhibits signs of soreness.

Preshow Inspection Techniques

We proposed that the DQP would be required to follow certain specified procedures in physically examining a horse. We proposed that the DQP shall digitally palpate the front limbs of the horse, with particular emphasis on the pasterns. Under our proposal, the DQP would be required to examine the posterior surface of the pastern by picking up the foot and examining the posterior (flexor) surface. The DQP would be further required to apply digital pressure to the pocket (sulcus), including the bulbs of the heel, and continue the palpation to the medial and lateral surfaces of the pastern, being careful to observe for responses to pain in the horse. The DQP would also be required to extend the foot and leg of the horse, while continuing to hold onto the pastern, to examine the front (extensor) surfaces, including the coronary band. We also proposed that the DQP may examine the rear limbs of the horse in like manner when he deems it necessary.

We proposed to specify that the DQP examine the horse to ensure that those pads, other devices, and substances prohibited by § 11.2 of the regulations are not used, that the DQP ensure that the restrictions on workouts and performances specified in § 11.2(d) are complied with, and that the DQP ensure that the "scar rule" provisions in § 11.3 of the regulations are not violated. We also proposed that the DQP may carry out additional inspection procedures as he deems necessary to determine whether a horse is sore.

One commenter suggested that the requirement that the front limbs of the horse be palpated should be expanded to state specifically that the DQP must

inspect and palpate the leg from the knee downward, with particular emphasis on the fetlock and pastern areas. The commenter's recommendation is consistent with the intent of our proposal, and we agree that making the proposed provision more specific will clarify our intent. We are therefore requiring in § 11.21(a)(2) that the DQP digitally palpate the front limbs of the horse, from knee to hoof, with particular emphasis on the pasterns and fetlocks.

One commenter recommended that DQP's be required to check for soreness from above the knee on the foreleg. We do not agree that examination above the knee is necessary. Soring between the knee and shoulder has not generally been evident and, if present, can be detected by observing the horse's movement.

One commenter recommended that the proposed requirement that the DQP inspect for violations of the "scar" rule be written more specifically to state that the DQP must look underneath any long hair on the fetlock and pastern for evidence of scarring or generalized edema violative of the scar rule. While we believe that the proposed provisions make it clear that inspections must include examinations for scar rule violations, we believe our intent can be strengthened with further clarification. We are therefore adding wording to the proposed provisions in § 11.21(a)(2) to require that the DQP shall inspect the horse to determine whether the scar rule provisions are being complied with, and particularly whether there is any evidence of inflammation, edema, or proliferating granuloma tissue.

Several commenters stated that any horse with puffy pasterns should be turned down at inspection as exhibiting evidence of soring. We do not agree that puffiness alone should be grounds for disqualification. Such a condition can be caused by a number of factors unrelated to soring, such as long-term standing, vascular problems, or insect bites.

One commenter stated that the regulations should prohibit long hair on the fetlock and pasterns, except for breeds for which "feathers" are part of the breed show standard. The commenter, stating that long hair tends to interfere with both visual examination and palpation, recommended that the hair be required to be clipped to no more than ¼ inch. We are making no changes based on this comment. Adequate inspections can be made of horses with long hair, and we do not believe that it is necessary or reasonable to prescribe a maximum hair length.

One commenter stated that enough evidence exists that soring of horses' rear limbs takes place to require that rear limbs be inspected at least from the hock downward on a routine basis, with particular emphasis given to the back of the pastern. The commenter recommended that, as a minimum, the regulations specify when inspection of the rear legs is necessary. Based on our experience conducting inspections at shows, we do not agree that the soring of horses' rear limbs is prevalent enough to warrant including their examination for every horse inspected prior to showing. However, we agree that the rear limbs of each horse that is inspected after showing should be examined. (The regulations require that all Tennessee Walking horses and racking horses tyed first in their class or event be inspected.) We are therefore requiring in this final rule that postshow examinations shall include inspection of the horse's rear limbs. The inspection required for the rear limbs will be the same as that required for the front limbs. In addition to requiring that postshow inspection include examination of a horse's rear limbs, we are also providing in this final rule that a DQP may examine the rear limbs of any horse during preshow inspection if he deems it necessary.

One commenter stated that the DQP guidelines should set forth the kinds of reactions that are symptomatic of soring. While we believe that it would be instructive to regulated parties to include general guidance on symptoms of soring, and have done so in this final rule, we do not agree that it is appropriate to attempt to include an exhaustive list of symptoms in the regulations. To adequately protect horses, a degree of discretion must be left to the inspector in detecting symptoms of soring. However, as general guidance, we are providing in this final rule that those horses that show signs of pain response on physical examination, have poor mobility, cannot move freely, or have difficulty walking or turning shall be considered sore. We are also specifying that all horses in violation of the scar rule shall be considered sore.

One commenter recommended that the regulations specify that no horse may be brought to a DQP inspection more than one class in advance. The commenter recommended further that, following inspection, the horse not be permitted to return to its stall or trailer. We agree that the possibility exists that a horse that has passed preshow inspection could, in certain situations, be sored before entering the show ring. We are therefore including in this final rule a provision that DQP's shall not inspect horses more than one class ahead of the time the inspected horses are to be shown. We are providing further that inspected horses are to be held in a designated area that is under observation by the DQP's or Department inspectors, and that the horses shall not be allowed to leave the designated area before showing.

One commenter stated that a limit should be set on the number of people permitted to enter the holding area after inspection. We agree that such a limit would reduce the possibility of soring after inspection, and are providing in this final rule that only the horse, the rider, and either a groom or trainer will be allowed in the designated areas.

One commenter stated that the regulations should require DQP's to weigh all action devices and measure all pad assemblies to determine compliance with the regulations. Proposed § 11.21(a)(3) only requires DQP's to observe and inspect horses to determine compliance with the provisions in § 11.2, including, among other things, pads and action devices. We agree with the comment that action devices, pads, and other equipment should be weighed and measured to assure compliance with the regulations. We are therefore changing our proposal based on this comment.

Several commenters recommended that the temperature, and the pulse and respiration rates, be taken of all horses suspected of being sore. The commenters stated that a sore horse will quite often have an elevated temperature, as well as an elevated pulse and respiration rate. We are making no changes based on this recommendation. We do not consider temperature, and pulse and respiration rates, valid diagnoses of sore horses. A horse that is warmed up will generally show some or all of the described conditions and, conversely, soring will not necessarily elicit such symptoms.

One commenter recommended that, when a horse is suspected of being sore, and it has not been determined that the soreness is solely in the pastern area, it be required that the horse have its shoes pulled and be checked for pressure shoeing. Another commenter recommended that shoes be pulled at the end of a show from all horses placing first or second in championship classes. We are making no changes based on these comments. Under the current regulations, inspectors already have the authority to pull shoes when they deem it necessary. We do not consider it advisable to require the removal of shoes unless there is some

reason to believe that removing the shoes will provide evidence of soring. Requiring routine pulling of shoes would not only be unnecessarily costly, it would also increase the chances of damaging the horse's hooves.

One commenter stated that when a horse displays a sore way of moving, its rear legs should be palpated for soreness, edema, or scars. We do not agree that incidence of soring in the rear legs has been prevalent enough to require preshow palpation of the rear legs on a routine basis. It is the DQP's prerogative to check the rear legs when he or she considers it necessary. Because of the danger to inspectors that can exist when palpating the rear legs of a horse, we do not consider it advisable or necessary to require such palpation prior to the horse's showing, unless some indication is given that the rear legs have been sored.

One commenter stated that when a horse is suspected of being sore, and the DQP cannot find the cause of the soreness, examination of the horse with hoof testers should be required. Hoof testers are devices for detecting pain in a horse's hoof. We do not consider it advisable to require DQP's to use hoof testers. Hoof testers, when not used by experts, can provide false readings and can be potentially harmful to a horse. Although some DQP's possess the expertise to use hoof testers, many have not had the training or experience to use them effectively, and we do not consider the use of such devices necessary in detecting soring on a routine basis.

Several commenters recommended that prior to actual inspection for soring, the horse be checked for alligator clips in the mouth, under the tail, on the vulva and on the sheath. Such clips, if used, can distract a horse from the DQP's inspection. Based on our experience inspecting horses at shows, we do not consider the use of alligator clips prevalent enough to require the DQP to look for them in every case, and are making no changes based on the commenters' recommendation. However, we do believe that DQP's should be observant for any signs of abnormal behavior in a horse.

Several commenters stated that during inspection, the horse should not be held by a trainer, groom, or exhibitor, to help prevent the practice of "stewarding." Stewarding is the training or handling of a horse in such a way that it does not react to pain during inspection. One commenter recommended that, during inspection, a handler be required to stand to the side of a horse, rather than in front of it, to guard against stewarding. We do not agree that it would be advisable to prohibit trainers, grooms, and exhibitors from holding a horse during inspection. Such persons can have a calming influence on the horse being inspected, and can therefore facilitate the inspection process and help safeguard the personnel conducting the inspection. We also do not consider it advisable to specify where the person holding the horse should stand, because the best position for holding a horse will vary from case to case. We agree with the commenters, however, that, to conduct adequate inspections, it is necessary to ensure that the person holding the horse does not interfere with the examination procedures. To this end, we are including in § 11.21(a)(4) a provision that provides that the DQP shall not inspect a horse if it is presented in any manner that might cause the horse not to react to a DQP's examination. We are providing that the DQP shall instruct the custodian of the horse to control it by holding the reins approximately 18 inches from the bit shank. Further, we are providing that a horse shall not be inspected if whips, cigarette smoke, or other actions or paraphernalia are used to distract the horse during examination.

Several commenters recommended that blood be drawn from any horse found to be sore, and be screened for chemicals used in the soring. We do not believe that it is necessary or advisable to require such a procedure. In addition to presenting the risk of infecting the horse, such a process would not be cost-effective. If a horse is determined to be sore, a violation has already occurred, and it is not necessary to determine whether specific chemicals are present in the horse's blood.

In § 11.21(a)(3) of our proposal, we provided that as part of the required inspection procedures, the DQP shall observe and inspect the horse to determine whether the provisions of § 11.2 of the regulations are complied with. In the supplementary information of our proposal, we stated that such a determination would include the DQP's ensuring that the restrictions on workouts and performances specified in § 11.2(d) are complied with. Such restrictions limit the length of workouts for 2-year-old horses. One commenter stated that it would be a practical impossibility for the DQP to monitor the workouts of these horses. The commenter stated that the inspection areas provided to the DQP are in most instances some distance from, and out of clear view of, the show ring. According to the commenter, because of this positioning it would be unworkable for the DQP, who must inspect and observe the horses preshow, to also be required to monitor the show ring. The commenter, representing a number of horse industry associations, stated that, according to current industry practice, the judge who is officiating the show enforces the time limitations set forth in § 11.2(d). Based on these concerns, the commenter requested that proposed § 11.21(a)(3) be deleted.

We do not consider it appropriate to delete § 11.21(a)(3), which we continue to believe is necessary to ensure that the DQP determines that the pads, other devices, and substances prohibited by § 11.2 are not used. We agree with the commenter, however, that it is not practical to make it the DQP's responsibility to also ensure that the time limitations on workouts for 2-year-old horses are complied with. We are therefore amending § 11.21(a)(3) of our proposal to make it clear that such monitoring of workouts will not be the DQP's responsibility.

Several commenters stated that the inspection area should be open to viewing by the general public. We are making no changes to the proposal based on this comment. While nothing in the regulations prohibits viewing of inspections by the public, how visible the inspection area is will necessarily vary from case to case. In many cases it would interfere with the efficiency of the inspection and the safety of personnel to allow unlimited access to the inspection area.

One commenter stated that some leeway should be granted the DQP in determining how detailed the inspection procedure should be. The commenter expressed the opinion that it may not be necessary for every horse in every show to be palpated and observed in motion. One of the reasons we initiated rulemaking regarding DQP inspection procedures was to help ensure uniformity in inspections at horse shows across the country. Our own experience, as well as recommendations made by the horse industry and animal welfare organizations, had indicated the need for more uniform procedures. We therefore do not agree with the commenter that a DQP should be given the discretion to "pass" certain horses without inspection, and we are not including such a provision in this final rule.

One commenter recommended that the regulations provide that the DQP be allowed to examine a horse without interference until making a decision with regard to the horse. It is unclear to us what type of interference the commenter is referring to, and we are making no changes based on this comment. However, we will examine the issue of whether DQP's are being

interfered with in conducting inspections and will take whatever action is appropriate.

Unloading and Barn Areas

We stated in the proposed rule our belief that inspection of horses in the unloading and barn areas of show or sale grounds would enable a DQP to detect soreness in horses and other violations of the regulations, such as the use of prohibited substances. In order to establish effective procedures for such inspections, we proposed to require that horse industry organizations or associations that are seeking, or that have been granted, certification of a DQP program submit to the Department for approval procedures for conducting such inspections. Under the proposal, those associations and organizations seeking DQP program certification would be required to submit the procedures for approval along with the other information required for Department approval under current § 11.7(b). Those organizations or associations with DQP programs that have already been certified will have 30 days from the publication date of this document to receive Department approval of such procedures.

Several commenters addressed the proposed provision that DQP programs have in place procedures for inspection of horses in the unloading and barn areas of show or sale grounds, prior to the horses' being shown. Two commenters recommended that the regulations not mandate mass inspection in the barn area. One of those commenters recommended that all proposed provisions regarding inspections in barn and unloading areas be deleted. The commenters stated that a major volume of barn-area inspections would deplete manpower and other resources that could be used most efficiently to ensure a high level of inspection of horses entering or leaving the show ring. Both commenters stated that any soring that would be detected in the unloading or barn areas would also be detected during the normal preshow examination. One of the commenters recommended that any requirements for inspections in barn and unloading areas allow for exemptions for small shows.

Conversely, another commenter recommended that the regulations require observation of horses being unloaded, and that the regulations require and empower the inspector to remove leg wraps at the time of unloading. The commenter recommended further that the regulations require regular inspection of barn areas during a show, in order to view horses and to examine those showing signs of soreness, and that the DQP be empowered during such inspections to check leg wrappings, tack boxes, and other equipment for illegal substances.

While we believe that in many cases DQP inspections in unloading and barn areas can be a valuable tool in detecting soring, we do not believe that it is appropriate to specify in the regulations that unloading and barn areas must be inspected at every show. Horse shows vary so greatly in size, physical layout, and duration that it would not be practical to make barn and unloading area inspections mandatory in all cases. As one commenter pointed out, many shows are for one night only, have no permanent stables, and are poorly lit outside the immediate show area. We continue to believe, however, that in many cases monitoring of barns and unloading areas can facilitate the detection of soring, and we are including in this final rule the requirement that DQP programs include procedures for monitoring of horses in the unloading and barn areas of show or sale grounds, as well as preparation and warmup areas and other such areas, prior to the horses being shown. To emphasize the authority of the DQP to conduct inspections wherever he deems necessary, we are revising § 11.7(b)(6) as proposed to provide that such procedures may include inspection of any horse that is stabled, loaded on a trailer, being prepared for show, exhibition, sale, or auction, being exercised, or that is otherwise on the grounds of, or present at, any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction.

With regard to the recommendation of one commenter that DQP's be given the authority to check equipment for illegal substances, such authority already exists under § 11.2(b) of the current regulations.

Additional Issues

One commenter stated that, in light of the additional inspection responsibilities contemplated by the proposed rule, the regulations should require that shows with more than 100 entries have two or more DQP's. We agree that the more entries in a show, the greater the time or personnel needed to complete preshow inspections in an adequate fashion. The horse industry already recognizes this fact, and is currently voluntarily assigning two or more DQP's to large shows. Consistent with industry practice, and in recognition of the practical requirements of large shows, we are providing in this final rule that if more than 100 entries are entered in a show, the show shall have at least two DQP's employed on the grounds.

Section 11.21(c) of the proposed provisions stated that the DQP shall assess appropriate penalties for violations, as set forth in the rule book of the certified program under which the DQP is licensed, and shall report all violations, in accordance with § 11.20(b)(3). One commenter correctly noted that, under current practice, DQP's are responsible for identifying horses in violation of the regulations, and for disqualifying these horses from competition or sale, but are not responsible for assessing penalties. Under the current system, penalties are assessed by the certifying organization. The commenter stated that this system helps ensure a uniform, consistent, and equitable assessment of penalties. We agree with the commenter that it would be inappropriate to transfer the responsibility for assessing penalties to the DQP, and are providing in this final rule that the certified DQP organization shall be responsible for assessing penalties.

One commenter stated that we should consult with the American Association of Equine Practitioners for suggestions on an effective inspection procedure. In formulating the regulations, we drew on our own enforcement experience under the Act, on comments from the public, and on scientific data available to us. Among the veterinary professionals on our staff is a member of the American Association of Equine Practitioners.

A number of the issues addressed by the commenters were outside the scope of the proposal. In particular, several commenters recommended that specific provisions be included in the regulations regarding the types of penalties to be imposed for violations of the regulations. Other commenters recommended changes or additions to the regulations regarding who should be licensed as a DQP, and what sort of violations, by whom, should lead to decertification of a DQP program. Several commenters either recommended changes to the scar rule provisions in § 11.3, requested the prohibition of the use of action devices and other items or equipment, or requested restrictions on or examination of the equipment that may be taken into holding areas after inspection. As noted, these issues are outside the scope of the proposed provisions. However, we will carefully review each of these recommendations, and will take whatever action is appropriate regarding them.

Executive Order 12291 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

We are issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Order 12291 and Departmental Regulation 1512–1, and have determined that it is not a "major rule." Based on information compiled by the Department, we have determined that this rule will have an effect on the economy of less than $100 million, 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 cause a significant adverse effect on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

The changes to the regulations specify the procedures Designated Qualified Persons (DQP's) must follow when inspecting horses in accordance with the Horse Protection Act regulations. The changes will help ensure that the procedures that DQP's are already trained in are uniformly followed. Additionally, the regulations require that DQP programs include procedures for inspection of horses in unloading and barn areas. We expect that implementation of these regulations will cause no change in the number of shows inspected by DQP's. Although we are providing in this rule that shows with more than 100 entries must have at least two DQP's, such a practice is already being followed by the horse industry. We do not believe that the cost to show management for a DQP's services will increase as a result of these changes.

Under these circumstances, the 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.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no new information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 11

Animal welfare, Horses, Humane animal handling, Soring of horses.

Accordingly, 9 CFR part 11 is amended as follows:

PART 11—HORSE PROTECTION REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 11 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C 1823, 1824, 1825, and 1828, 44 U.S.C. 3506.

2. In § 11.7, paragraphs (b) (6), (7), and (8) are redesignated as paragraphs (b) (7), (8), and (9), respectively, and a new paragraph (b)(6) is added to read as follows:

§ 11.7 Certification and licensing of designated qualified persons (DQP's).

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(6) Procedures for monitoring horses in the unloading, preparation, warmup, and barn areas, or other such areas. Such monitoring may include any horse that is stabled, loaded on a trailer, being prepared for show, exhibition, sale, or auction, or exercised, or that is otherwise on the grounds of, or present at, any horse show, horse exhibition, or horse sale or auction.

* * * * *

§ 11.7 [Amended]

3. In § 11.7, paragraph (f)(1), the first sentence is revised to read as follows: "Each horse industry organization or association having a DQP program certified by the Department shall issue a written warning to any DQP whom it has licensed who violates the rules, regulations, by-laws, or standards of conduct promulgated by such horse industry organization or association pursuant to this section, who fails to follow the procedures set forth in § 11.21 of this part, or who otherwise carries out his duties and responsibilities in a less than satisfactory manner, and shall cancel the license of any DQP after a second violation. * * *"

§ 11.7 [Amended]

4. In § 11.7, paragraph (g), the first sentence is revised to read as follows: "Any horse industry organization or association having a Department certified DQP program that has not received Department approval of the inspection procedures provided for in paragraph (b)(6) of this section, or that otherwise fails to comply with the requirements contained in this section, may have such certification of its DQP program revoked, unless, upon written notification from the Department of such failure to comply with the requirements in this section, such organization or association takes immediate action to rectify such failure and takes appropriate steps to prevent a recurrence of such noncompliance within the time period specified in the Department notification, or otherwise adequately explains such failure to comply to the satisfaction of the Department. * * *"

§ 11.20 [Amended]

5. In § 11.20, paragraph (b)(2), the third sentence is revised to read as follows: "* * * Such physical examination shall be conducted in accordance with the inspection procedures provided for in § 11.21 of this part."

6. In § 11.20, a new paragraph (c) is added to read as follows:

§ 11.20 Responsibilities and liabilities of management.

* * * * *

(c) The management of any horse show, exhibition, sale, or auction that designates and appoints a DQP to inspect horses shall appoint and designate at least two DQP's when more than 100 horses are entered.

* * * * *

7. Sections 11.21 and 11.22 are redesignated as §§ 11.22 and 11.23 respectively, and a new § 11.21 is added to read as follows:

§ 11.21 Inspection procedures for designated qualified persons (DQP's).

(a)(1) During the preshow inspection, the DQP shall direct the custodian of the horse to walk and turn the horse in a manner that allows the DQP to determine whether the horse exhibits signs of soreness. The DQP shall determine whether the horse moves in a free and easy manner and is free of any signs of soreness.

(2) The DQP shall digitally palpate the front limbs of the horse from knee to hoof, with particular emphasis on the pasterns and fetlocks. The DQP shall examine the posterior surface of the pastern by picking up the foot and examining the posterior (flexor) surface. The DQP shall apply digital pressure to the pocket (sulcus), including the bulbs of the heel, and continue the palpation to the medial and lateral surfaces of the pastern, being careful to observe for responses to pain in the horse. While continuing to hold onto the pastern, the DQP shall extend the foot and leg of the horse to examine the front (extensor) surfaces, including the coronary band. The DQP shall examine in a like manner the rear limbs of all horses inspected after showing, and may examine the rear limbs of any horses examined preshow when he deems it necessary. While carrying out the procedures set forth in this paragraph, the DQP shall also inspect the horse to determine whether the provisions of § 11.3 of this part are being complied with, and particularly whether there is any evidence of inflammation, edema, or proliferating granuloma tissue.

(3) The DQP shall observe and inspect all horses for compliance with the

provisions set forth in § 11.2(a) through § 11.2(c) of this part. All action devices, pads and other equipment shall be weighed and/or measured to determine if they are in compliance with the regulations.

(4) The DQP shall instruct the custodian of the horse to control it by holding the reins approximately 18 inches from the bit shank. The DQP shall not be required to examine a horse if it is presented in a manner that might cause the horse not to react to a DQP's examination, or if whips, cigarette smoke, or other actions or paraphernalia are used to distract a horse during examination. All such incidents shall be reported to the show management and the DQP licensing organization.

(b) The DQP shall inspect horses no more than one class ahead of the time the inspected horses are to be shown. Inspected horses shall be held in a designated area that is under observation by the DQP or Veterinary Services representative. Horses shall not be permitted to leave the designated area before showing. Only the horse, the rider, and either a groom or trainer shall be allowed in the designated area.

(c) The DQP may carry out additional inspection procedures as he deems necessary to determine whether the horse is sore.

(d) The certified DQP organization shall assess appropriate penalties for violations, as set forth in the rule book of the certified program under which the DQP is licensed, or as set forth by the Department, and shall report all violations, in accordance with § 11.20(b)(3) of this part.

§ 11.24 [Amended]

8. In § 11.24, paragraph (a), first sentence, the words "§ 11.21(a)(1) through § 11.21(a)(6)" are removed, and the words "§ 11.22(a) (1) through (6)" are added in their place.

Done in Washington, DC, this 11th day of October 1990.

Robert Melland,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 90-24390 Filed 10-16-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-M

---

9 CFR Part 78

[Docket 90-162]

Validated Brucellosis-Free States

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Interim rule.

SUMMARY: We are amending the brucellosis regulations concerning the interstate movement of swine by adding North Carolina to the list of validated brucellosis-free States. We have determined that North Carolina meets the criteria for classification as a validated brucellosis-free State. This action relieves certain restrictions on moving breeding swine from North Carolina.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Interim rule effective October 17, 1990. Consideration will be given only to comments received on or before December 17, 1990.

ADDRESSES: To help ensure that your comments are considered, send an original and three copies to Chief, Regulatory Analysis and Development, PPD, APHIS, USDA, room 866, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, MD 20782. Please state that your comments refer to Docket Number 90-162. Comments received may be inspected at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 am. and 4:30 pm., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Delorias M. Lenard, Senior Staff Veterinarian, Swine Diseases Staff, VS, APHIS, USDA, room 735, Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Road, Hyattsville, MD 20782, (301) 436-7767.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Brucellosis is a contagious disease affecting animals and man, caused by bacteria of the genus *Brucella*. The brucellosis regulations contained in 9 CFR part 78 (referred to below as the regulations) prescribe conditions for the interstate movement of cattle, bison, and swine.

Under the swine brucellosis regulations, States, herds, and individual animals are classified according to their brucellosis status. Interstate movement requirements for swine are based upon the disease status of the herd or State from which the animal originates.

We are amending § 78.43 of the regulations, which lists validated brucellosis-free States, to include North Carolina. Validated brucellosis-free status is based on a State having:

(1) The necessary authorities for classification as a validated brucellosis-free State for swine;

(2) No known focus of swine brucellosis at the time of validation and completion of one of several methods of surveillance; or no diagnosed case of swine brucellosis in the 12 month period preceding the classification, and a statistical analysis of the combined results of certain tests that indicate the testing is equivalent to either complete herd testing or slaughter surveillance during a period chosen by the State; and

(3) Certification by the appropriate State animal health official, the Veterinarian in Charge and the Deputy Administrator.

After reviewing its brucellosis program records, we have concluded that North Carolina meets the criteria for classification as a validated brucellosis-free State. We are therefore adding North Carolina to the list of States in § 78.43. This action relieves certain restrictions on moving breeding swine from North Carolina.

Immediate Action

James W. Glosser, Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, has determined that there is good cause for publishing this interim rule without prior opportunity for public comment. Immediate action is warranted to remove unnecessary restrictions on the interstate movement of breeding swine from North Carolina.

Since prior notice and other public procedures with respect to this interim rule are impracticable and contrary to the public interest under these conditions, and because this rule relieves a regulatory restriction, there is good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553 to make it effective upon publication. We will consider comments received within 60 days of publication of this interim rule in the **Federal Register**. After the comment period closes, we will publish another document in the **Federal Register**, including a discussion of any comments we receive and any amendments we make to the rule as a result of the comments.

Executive Order 12291 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

We are issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Order 12291, and we have determined that it is not a "major rule." Based on information compiled by the Department, we have determined that this rule will have an effect on the economy of less than $100 million; 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 cause a significant adverse effect on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

For this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived the review process required by Executive Order 12291.

Herd owners in North Carolina will be affected by this action. It will allow breeding swine to be moved interstate from North Carolina without being tested for brucellosis. Approximately 1,100 sows are tested annually for brucellosis, at an average cost to the seller of $5.00 per test, in order to be eligible for interstate movement from North Carolina. Using these numbers, we estimate that removing the testing requirement would result in a potential annual savings of $5,500 for swine herd owners in North Carolina. Of the approximately 3,000 swine herd owners nationwide who regularly ship breeding swine interstate, 92 regularly ship breeding swine interstate from North Carolina. All of these herd owners would be considered small entities.

Under these circumstances, the 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.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

Executive Order 12372

This program/activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.025 and is subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V.)

List of Subjects in 9 CFR part 78

Animal diseases, Brucellosis, Cattle, Hogs, Quarantine, Transportation.

Accordingly, we are amending 9 CFR Part 78 as follows:

PART 78—BRUCELLOSIS

1. The authority citation for part 78 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 111–114a–1, 114g, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123–126, 134b, 134f; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(d).

§ 78.43 [Amended]

2. Section 78.43 is amended by adding "North Carolina," immediately after "New York,".

Done in Washington, DC, this 11th day of October 1990.

Robert Melland,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 90–24388 Filed 10–16–90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–M

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

12 CFR PARTS 931, 933, 936, 938, 940, 941, 942, and 944

[No. 90–105]

Federal Home Loan Bank System; Technical Amendments

AGENCY: The Federal Housing Finance Board.

ACTION: Final rule; Technical amendments.

SUMMARY: The Federal Housing Finance Board ("FHFB") is amending its regulations in eight parts by removing those provisions that were inadvertently published in the **Federal Register** on September 5, 1989 (54 FR 36757). The provisions duplicate the old Federal Home Loan Bank Board ("FHLBB") regulations retained by the Office of Thrift Supervision pursuant to the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 ("FIRREA"), Public Law No. 101–73, 103 Stat. 183, signed into law on August 9, 1989.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 17, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Szlenker, Attorney, Office of General Counsel, (202) 408–2554, Federal Housing Finance Board, 1777 F Street NW., Washington, DC 20006.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. General

FIRREA abolished the FHLBB and established the FHFB as an independent regulatory agency in the executive branch of the Government responsible for overseeing the Federal home loan banks.

The regulations concerning the Federal Home Loan Bank System had been issued under the authority of the former FHLBB. Section 402(h) of FIRREA preserves the authority of the FHLBB regulations unless terminated or superseded by the appropriate successor agency.

On September 5, 1989, when the FHFB established 12 CFR chapter IX and redesignated its regulations into this chapter (54 FR 36757), it noted that technical amendments would be made at a later date.

The FHFB is today publishing these changes to its regulations.

B. Administrative Procedure Act

No new substantive regulations are being adopted that are not made necessary by changes in the statutory authority pursuant to which the FHFB will operate. Since this rule contains no substantive changes, the FHFB promulgates this final rule as a matter of agency organization and management. Therefore, for good cause shown under 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2) and (b)(3), this rule is exempt from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act and the 30-day delay in the effective date pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3).

C. Regulatory Flexibility Act

Because no notice of proposed rulemaking is required for this regulation, the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*) do not apply.

List of Subjects

12 CFR Parts 931 and 940

Federal home loan banks.

12 CFR Part 933

Federal home loan banks, Mortgages, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

12 CFR Part 936

Advertising, Federal home loan banks.

12 CFR Part 938

Advertising, Civil Rights, Credit, Fair housing, Federal home loan banks, Mortgages, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Signs and symbols.

12 CFR Part 941

Credit, Federal home loan banks.

12 CFR Part 942

Consumer protection, Electronic funds transfers, Federal home loan banks.

12 CFR Part 944

Credit, Federal home loan banks, Intergovernmental relations, Trade practices.

Accordingly, the FHFB hereby amends chapter IX, title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, set forth below.

CHAPTER IX—FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

SUBCHAPTER B—FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM

PART 931—DEFINITIONS

1. The authority citation for part 931 continues to read as follows: