

Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, effective at 0901 UTC on the dates specified, as follows:

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

1. The authority citation for part 97 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 40103, 40113, 40120, 44701; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.49(b)(2).

2. Part 97 is amended to read as follows:

§§ 97.23, 97.25, 97.27, 97.29, 97.31, 97.33, 97.35 [Amended]

By amending: § 97.23 VOR, VOR/DME, VOR or TACAN, and VOR/DME

or TACAN; § 97.25 LOC, LOC/DME, LDA, LDA/DME, SDF, SDF/DME; § 97.27 NDB, NDB/DME; § 97.29 ILS, ILS/DME, ISMLS, MLS, MLS/DME, MLS/RNAV; § 97.31 RADAR SIAPs; § 97.33 RNAV SIAPs; and § 97.35 COPTER SIAPs, identified as follows:

* * * Effective Upon Publication

FDC date	State	City	Airport	FDC No.	SIAP
07/05/95	MO	Kansas City	Kansas City Intl	5/3163	ILS RWY 1L AMDT 12 ...
07/06/95	MO	Sedalia	Sedalia Memorial	5/3182	NDB RWY 36 AMDT 8 ...
07/07/95	MN	Bemidji	Bemidji-Beltrami County	5/3200	ILS RWY 31 AMDT 3A ...
07/07/95	WA	Spokane	Felts Field	5/3206	VOR OR GPS RWY 3L, AMDT 2 ...
07/07/95	WA	Spokane	Felts Field	5/3207	NDB RWY 3L, AMDT 1 ...
07/12/95	AR	El Dorado	South Arkansas Regional at Goodwin Field.	5/3325	VOR/DME OR GPS RWY 4 AMDT 9 ...
07/12/95	AR	El Dorado	South Arkansas Regional at Goodwin Field.	5/3326	VOR OR GPS RWY 22 AMDT 13 ...

[FR Doc. 95-17909 Filed 7-19-95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 236

Guide for Avoiding Deceptive Use of Word "Mill" in the Textile Industry

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Rescission of the guide for avoiding deceptive use of word "Mill" in the textile industry.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission (the "Commission"), as part of its periodic review of all its guides and rules, announces that it has concluded a review of its Guide for Avoiding Deceptive Use of Word "Mill" in the Textile Industry ("Guide" or "Use of Word 'Mill' Guide"). The Commission has decided to rescind the Guide.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ann M. Guler, Investigator, Federal Trade Commission, Los Angeles Regional Office, 11000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 13209, Los Angeles, CA 90024, (310) 235-7890.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Use of Word 'Mill' Guide was issued by the Commission in 1967.¹ The Guide states that the word "mill"

¹ Industry guides are administrative interpretations of laws administered by the Commission for the guidance of the public in conducting its affairs in conformity with legal requirements. 16 CFR 1.5.

should not be used in the corporate, business, or trade name of any person or concern handling textiles, unless the person or concern actually owns and operates or controls the manufacturing facility in which all textile materials sold under that name are produced. The Guide includes examples where use of the word "mill" has been found to be deceptive.

On April 15, 1994, the Commission published a Notice in the **Federal Register** soliciting comment on the Guide.² Specifically, the Commission solicited comments on the costs and benefits of the Guide and its regulatory and economic effect. The comment period closed June 14, 1994. The Commission received three comments in response to the Notice. They are discussed in Part II below.

II. Comments Received

The Commission received comments from three organizations: The American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI), National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers (NAHM), and the Better Business Bureau of Nashville/Middle Tennessee, Inc. All of the commenters supported the continuation of the Guide in its present form. The ATMI and NAHM both stated that the Guide is beneficial to the textile manufacturing industry and to consumers because it prevents possible false claims by companies that may distribute but do not actually manufacture textile products. They further stated that the guide does not impose costs or burdens on industry or on consumers. The Better

² 59 FR 18005.

Business Bureau of Nashville/Middle Tennessee, Inc.'s comment asserted that the Guide is necessary "to prevent misleading the public and unfair competition in the marketplace."

The Nashville/Middle Tennessee BBB comment also raised the issue of other words used in trade names. The BBB recommended that the Commission restrict the use of words such as "factory" and "manufacturer" in corporate, business, or trade names "unless the entity so named actually owns, operates or controls the manufacturing facility which produces all merchandise being advertised and/or sold under the name."

III. Conclusion

The Commission has concluded its regulatory review of the Guide for Avoiding Deceptive Use of the Word "Mill" by rescinding the Guide. The Commission has no evidence of circumstances associated with the use of the word "mill" that would require special protection for consumers or guidance for industry, such as evidence that consumers currently believe that textile industry entities with the word "mill" in their names are engaged in the manufacture of textiles. Today, the word "mill" is commonly used in business names both within and outside the textile industry. For example, many shopping malls use the word "mill" or "mills" in their names. The word "mill" is also frequently used in the names of businesses, including retail stores or shopping malls, that occupy the building or site of a former textile mill. Additionally, the word "mill" is used in various enterprises outside of the textile

industry. For example, firms in the food production or food service industry may use the word "mill" because of its association with grinding grain into flour. These uses would not be covered by the Guide, because the businesses do not handle textiles. Other businesses may use the word "mill" in a creative name that has nothing to do with the original meanings of the word for textile manufacturing, grain processing, or any other form of materials processing. The Commission considers it unlikely that such uses of the word "mill" mislead consumers in any material way in their purchasing decisions or otherwise cause any consumer injury.

Given the many and varied uses of the term "mill" in today's lexicon, the Commission has concluded that the Guide is obsolete. If, in the future, certain uses of this term (or any other term) in business or trade names are determined to be materially misleading, the Commission can address such practices under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 236

Advertising, trade name, textiles, mill.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-17878 Filed 7-19-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

19 CFR Part 201

Rules of General Application

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby amends its rules for Part 201 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (the "Commission's Rules"). The amended rules clarify those sections of the Commission's Rules dealing with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act Officers' initial denial authority. The amended rules will also reflect the Inspector General's authority, under both the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, (the "IG Act") and under Section 552a(b) of the Privacy Act to disclose Privacy Act information to contractor personnel who function as federal employees.

EFFECTIVE DATE: In accordance with the 30-day advance publication requirement imposed by 5 U.S.C. § 553(d), the

effective date of this rulemaking is August 21, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hilaire R. Henthorne, Esq., Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202-205-2210. Hearing impaired persons are advised that information on the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In 60 FR 26851, dated May 19, 1995, the Commission published a notice containing proposed amendments to Part 201 of the Commission's Rules. No comments were received concerning the proposed amendments. Thus, the substantive text of the final rule is identical to that of the proposed rule.

Statutory Authority

Section 335 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1335) authorizes the Commission to adopt such reasonable procedures and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out its functions and duties. This amendment will bring the Commission's Rules into conformity with Section 6 of the IG Act (5 U.S.C. app. 3) and with Section 552a(b) of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. § 552a(b)).

Section 6 of the IG Act authorizes Inspectors General to "enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with * * * private persons * * *." See 5 U.S.C. app. 3. When contractor personnel are employed to perform the authorized functions of an Office of Inspector General, and are, in the judgment of the Inspector General, performing such functions, they serve in the capacity of government employees. See generally *Coakley v. United States Dep't of Transportation*, No. 93-1420, slip op. at 3 (D.D.C. Apr. 7, 1994); and *Hulett v. Dep't of the Navy*, No. TH 85-310-C, slip op. at 3-4 (S.D. Ind. Oct. 26, 1987); *aff'd* 866 F.2d 432 (7th Cir. 1988) (table cite), *cert. denied*, 490 U.S. 1068 (1989). Section 552a(b) of the Privacy Act stipulates that Privacy Act disclosures are permissible when made to "employees of the agency * * * who have a need for the record in the performance of their duties * * *." See 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b).

Section 552a(c) of the Privacy Act specifically exempts disclosure to government employees from the Privacy Act's recordkeeping requirement. Thus, this amendment to the Commission's Rules clarifies the three categories of disclosure that are exempt, under the Privacy Act, from the recordkeeping

provisions: (1) disclosures made to officers and employees of the Commission who have a need for the information in the performance of their duties; (2) disclosures made to contractor personnel, pursuant to the IG Act or any other law, when such personnel are performing the functions of government employees; and (3) other contractor personnel who, in the judgment of the Director of Personnel, are acting as Commission employees.

Regulatory Analysis

Commission rules ordinarily are promulgated in accordance with the rulemaking provisions of section 553 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. § 551 *et seq.*) (APA). Under the APA, rulemaking entails the following steps: (1) publication of a notice of proposed rulemaking; (2) solicitation of public comment on the proposed rules; (3) Commission review of such comments prior to developing final rules; and (4) publication of the final rules thirty days prior to their effective date. See 5 U.S.C. § 553. This final rule is the last step in that procedure.

The amendments to the Commission's Rules adopted in this notice do not meet the criteria described in section 3f of Executive Order (EO) 12866 (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993) and do not constitute a "significant regulatory action" for purposes of the EO. In accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. § 601 note), the Commission hereby certifies pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 605(b) that the final rule set forth in this notice is not likely to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small business entities. This conclusion is premised on the fact that this final rule merely conforms to existing IG Act and Privacy Act provisions. Thus, it is not expected to have any significant economic impact.

List of Subjects in 19 CFR Part 201

Administrative practice and procedure, Freedom of information, and Privacy.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, the U.S. International Trade Commission hereby amends 19 CFR part 201 as follows:

PART 201—RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION

Subpart A—Miscellaneous

1. The authority citation for part 201 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Sec. 335 of the tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1335) and sec. 603 of the trade Act