bank holding company by acquiring at least 80 percent of the voting shares of Bank of Mountain View, Mountain View, Arkansas.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 24, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–7797 Filed 3–29–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

Helena Bancshares, Inc.; Notice of Application to Engage de novo in Permissible Nonbanking Activities

The company listed in this notice has filed an application under § 225.23(a)(1) of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.23(a)(1)) for the Board's approval under section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) and § 225.21(a) of Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.21(a)) to commence or to engage *de novo*, either directly or through a subsidiary, in a nonbanking activity that is listed in § 225.25 of Regulation Y as closely related to banking and permissible for bank holding companies. Unless otherwise noted, such activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

The application is available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the question whether consummation of the proposal can ''reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices.'' Any request for a hearing on this question must be accompanied by a statement of the reasons a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

Comments regarding the application must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than April 13, 1995.

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

1. Helena Bancshares, Inc., Helena, Arkansas; to engage *de novo* through its subsidiary Helena National Leasing Company, Inc., Memphis, Tennessee, in leasing tangible personal property, consisting primarily of business machines, pursuant to § 225.25(b)(15) of the Board's Regulation Y.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 24, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–7798 Filed 3–29–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Notice of a Regional Public Hearings of the Commission on Research Integrity

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of two regional public hearings and meetings of the Commission on Research Integrity. All proceedings are open to the public.

The first meeting will be on Monday and Tuesday, April 10 and 11, 1995, at the Countway Library Auditorium, Harvard Medical Center, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, MA. The Commission will meet from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on the first day to listen to testimony, and from 9:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on the second day to deliberate Commission issues.

The second meeting will be on Thursday and Friday, May 4 and 5, 1995, at the University of Alabama, the Great Hall and Alumni Auditorium respectively, Hill University Center, 1400 University Boulevard, Birmingham, AL. The Commission will meet from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on the first day to deliberate Commission issues, and from 9:00 a.m. until 4:45 p.m. on the second day to listen to testimony.

Interested parties are advised to call the Executive Secretary shortly before the meeting to verify the date, place, and agenda.

The mandate of the Commission is to develop recommendations for the Secretary of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Congress on the administration of Section 493 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by and added to by Section 161 of the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993.

In its deliberations, the Commission has confirmed that there are no quick and easy answers for fair, effective, and realistic administrative solutions to a number of issues in research integrity and scientific misconduct. An essential component of the Commission's information-gathering is to interact extensively with relevant constituencies of the scientific community—including junior and senior scientists, witnesses, respondents, academic administrators, as well as students—to understand their particular experiences and views and to explore possible improvements.

Four major areas are currently of great interest to the Commission:

1. *A New Definition of Research Misconduct.* The Commission believes that any definition needs to address the full extent of serious research misconduct, but must avoid a definition that is too broad, vague, and potentially unfair. In addition, a two-tiered approach for research integrity, or failures thereof, would be useful; it would emphasize institutional responsibility, and reserve an oversight role for the Federal Government.

2. *Assurance for Institutions and Accountability for Federally Funded Research.* The Commission is considering that each institution receiving Federal funds develop and submit for Federal review and approval assurances concerning the establishment and implementation of: (a) Good research practices and professional norms; (b) procedures for disseminating that information throughout its community; and (c) educational activities designed to foster practice of the highest ethical standards in the conduct of research for all researchers. Topics affecting good research practices that might be addressed in institutional assurances include: data recording and retention; supervisory responsibility; authorship practices; protection of witnesses; and other professional conduct bearing directly on the integrity of Federally supported research.

3. *Bill of Rights for Witnesses.* Testimony from witnesses (also called ''whistleblowers'') who have challenged perceived research misconduct reaffirms the Commission's mandate to propose effective whistleblower protection. Witnesses have stated that retaliation occurs with sufficient frequency and impact to have a chilling effect on potential witnesses throughout the research community. The Commission is considering a Witness Bill of Rights.

4. *Codes of Ethics.* Professional organizations have a unique role in the preservation of scientific integrity. The Commission endorses their existence, their continual use in teaching and standard checking, and their ongoing development to keep pace with the ethical issues of the times. The Commission is considering that, to reinforce and augment the influence of normative professional standards, professional organizations should

become more active in defining, promulgating, and promoting compliance with these standards.

The Commission will also continue discussion of other issues on which the Commission may make recommendations in its final report.

The Commission invites oral or written statements from interested parties. Lengthy statements exceeding 10 or 15 minutes of oral presentation should be submitted in writing or via internet to the Executive Secretary before the meeting. Written statements will be reviewed by Commission Members.

Henrietta D. Hyatt-Knorr, Executive Secretary, Commission on Research Integrity, at Rockwall II, Suite 700, 5515 Security Lane, Rockville MD 20852; (301) 443–5300 (phone); (301) 443–5351 (fax); and hhyatt@oasch.ssw.dhhs.gov (internet) will furnish a preliminary report of the Commission including the Committee charter and roster of the Committee members, and/or a meeting agenda upon request. Individuals wishing to make presentations should contact the Executive Secretary. Depending on the number of presentations and other considerations, the Executive Secretary will allocate a reasonable timeframe for each speaker.

Henrietta D. Hyatt-Knorr,

Executive Secretary, Commission on Research Integrity.

[FR Doc. 95–7782 Filed 3–29–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–17–P

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

[ATSDR–91]

Notice of Proposed Revised Publication Schedule for the Priority List of Hazardous Substances that will be the Subject of Toxicological Profiles

AGENCY: Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Public Health Service (PHS), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces a proposed change in the publication schedule for the ''Priority List of Hazardous Substances that will be the Subject of Toxicological Profiles.'' According to the proposal, the list would be shifted to a 2-year publication schedule with a yearly informal review and revision. Therefore, the next scheduled publication would be in late 1995 when the 1995 Priority List of Hazardous Substances is made publicly available from ATSDR. At that time, a **Federal Register** notice would be published announcing the availability of the list.

DATES: Comments concerning this notice must be received by May 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this notice should bear the docket control number ATSDR–91 and should be sent to the attention of Dr. Jim Holler, Emergency Response and Scientific Assessment Branch, Division of Toxicology, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, 1600 Clifton Road, NE., Mailstop E–29, Atlanta, Georgia 30333.

Comments on this notice will be available for public inspection at the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Building 4, Executive Park Drive, Atlanta, Georgia (not a mailing address), from 8 a.m. until 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except for legal holidays. Because all public comments are available for public inspection, no confidential business information should be submitted in response to this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Emergency Response and Scientific Assessment Branch, Division of Toxicology, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, 1600 Clifton Road, NE., Mailstop E–29, Atlanta, Georgia 30333, telephone (404) 639–6308.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA or Superfund), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), establishes certain requirements for ATSDR and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with regard to hazardous substances most commonly found at facilities on the CERCLA National Priorities List (NPL). Specifically, section 104(i)(2) of CERCLA, as amended by SARA (42 U.S.C. 9604(i)(2)), requires that the agencies maintain a list, in order of priority, of the hazardous substances found at NPL sites posing the most significant potential threat to human health. This listing is called the ''Priority List of Hazardous Substances that will be the Subject of Toxicological Profiles.'' Each substance on the Priority List is a candidate to become the subject of a toxicological profile prepared by ATSDR and the subsequent identification of priority data needs for that substance.

The history of the Priority List is as follows: The first 100 substances were published in 1987 (52 FR 12866); an additional 100 in 1988 (53 FR 41280); 25 more in 1989 (54 FR 43619); 25 more in 1990 (55 FR 42067); and a revision of the priority-list algorithm, including publication of the final target of 275 substances, was published in 1991 (56 FR 52166). The list of 275 has been reviewed annually, in 1992 (57 FR 48801) and 1993 (59 FR 9486), as called for by the legislation.

The 1991 revision of the algorithm represented a significant advance in the prioritization methodology. This listing now uses information from ATSDR's Hazardous Substance Release/Health Effects Database (HazDat), an active database of contaminants at NPL sites, as found in ATSDR's public health assessments. While the algorithm's use of current data keeps its conclusions contemporary, experience has shown that with this new approach, the Priority List has not changed substantially from year to year, particularly for high-priority substances. ATSDR believes that this stability reflects that the listing activity has fully developed. However, the amount of staff time needed to generate and publish the Priority List each year is not insignificant; substantial resources are still required for quality assurance and preparation and dissemination of results. ATSDR would like to shift some of these resources to implement promising new ideas to enhance the algorithm and data.

For these reasons, ATSDR and EPA would like to shift the Priority List activity to a 2-year publication schedule with a yearly informal review and revision. The informal review and revision would result in an interim list that would not be published or announced in the **Federal Register**, but would be made available on request. The agencies believe that the Priority List activity is mature enough that little is lost by reducing the frequency of publication and much is gained for other activities. This schedule will allow staffers to concentrate on enhancing the quality of the algorithm and its underlying data. It should also allow enough time for (1) the underlying data to change sufficiently so results will be more notably affected, and (2) adequate analysis, feedback, and insight to have occurred in order to enact more valuable revisions with each release.

The publicly announced list would be used to develop toxicological profiles. Placement on the priority list is one factor used to determine if a substance is to be considered for profile development in a given year. However, the interim list may also be reviewed to identify candidate substances that could be targeted for profile development.

ATSDR and EPA would retain the option to re-publish the Priority List in less than 2 years, if important new