warranted products or services affected by the Act?

(a) What changes, if any, should be made to the Interpretations, Rules, and Guides to increase the benefits to consumers?

(b) How would these changes affect the costs the Interpretations, Rules, and Guides impose on firms subject to their requirements?

4. What changes, if any, should be made to the Interpretations, Rules and Guides to minimize any burden or cost imposed on firms subject to their requirements?

5. Do the Interpretations, Rules, and Guides overlap or conflict with other federal, state, or local government laws or regulations?

6. Since the Interpretations, Rules, and Guides were issued, have changed in technology or economic conditions affected the need or purpose for them?

7. What has been the effect of Rule 701 on the costs, profitability, competitiveness, and employment of small business entities?

(a) What would be the economic impact on small businesses from leaving Rule 701 unchanged?

(b) Are there regulatory alternatives that would reduce any adverse economic impact of Rule 701, yet comply with the mandate of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act?

(c) What are the aggregate costs and benefits of Rule 701? Are there provisions in the Rule that are not necessary to implement the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act or that have imposed costs not outweighed by benefits? Who has benefited and who has borne the cost? Have the costs or benefits of the Rule dissipated over time?

List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 700

Warranties, trade practices.

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 41–58.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–8181 Filed 4–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Parts 71, 170, and 171

[Docket No. 95N–0220]

RIN 0910–AA66

Substances Approved for Use in the Preparation of Meat and Poultry Products; Reopening of Comment Period

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is reopening for 60 days the comment period for a proposed rule that appeared in the Federal Register of December 29, 1995 (60 FR 67490). The document proposed to amend FDA's regulations governing the review of petitions for the approval of food and color additives and substances generally recognized as safe (GRAS) to provide for joint review of such petitions by the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), when meat or poultry product uses are proposed. The closing date for submission of comments was March 14, 1996. This action is being taken in response to a request for additional time to answer comments.

DATES: Written comments by June 3, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 12420 Parklawn Dr., rm. 1–23, Rockville, MD 20857.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George H. Pauli, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–200), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202–418–3090.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Federal Register of December 29, 1995 (60 FR 67490), FDA published a proposal to amend the regulations governing the review of petitions for the approval of food and color additives and GRAS substances to provide for joint review of such petitions by FSIS when meat or poultry product uses are proposed. By agreement between USDA and FDA, such listings would eliminate the need for a separate FSIS rulemaking to allow the use in meat and poultry products of FDA-approved substances. Interested persons were given until March 14, 1996, to submit comments on the proposal. FSIS published a companion document in the same issue of the Federal Register (60 FR 67459) and is extending its comment period for 60 days. In response to a request for additional time to answer comments, as well as for consistency with FSIS, FDA is reopening the comment period on FDA's proposal for 60 days.

Interested persons may, on or before June 3, 1996, submit to the Dockets Management Branch (address above) written comments regarding this proposal. Two copies of any comments are to be submitted, except that individuals may submit one copy. Comments are to be identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document. Received comments may be seen in the office above between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Dated: March 28, 1996.

William K. Hubbard,

Associate Commissioner for Policy Coordination.

[FR Doc. 96–8166 Filed 4–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration

29 CFR Parts 2509, 2520 and 2550

RIN 1210–AA51

Removal of Interpretive Bulletins and Regulations Relating to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974

AGENCY: Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This document contains a notice of a proposal to remove from the Code of Federal Regulations certain interpretive bulletins and regulations (or portions thereof) under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA, 29 U.S.C. 1001, *et. seq.*) that the Department of Labor (the Department) believes are obsolete (collectively, the obsolete regulations). The obsolete regulations generally provided transitional relief for plan sponsors, plan administrators, and others subject to the requirements of title I of ERISA, in coming into compliance with ERISA's requirements in the first several years following ERISA's enactment in 1974. Because the election periods or dates of applicability under these rules have expired, the Department believes that the regulations are no longer