and Regulations Division, (202) 663–1203.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On September 30, 1996 the President signed into law Division ''C'' of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, (IIRIRA), Public Law 104–208, 110 stat. 3009. Section 631(a) amends INA 221(c) by altering the maximum period of validity of an immigrant visa from four months to six months. The Department is amending the corresponding regulation at 22 CFR 42.72(a) to extend the validity period of an immigrant visa to six months. The Department is also amending 22 CFR 42.72(e) regarding the scheduling of the immigrant visa appointment to comply.

Benefit to State Department and Visa Applicants

The Department has found that the four-month validity period of the immigrant visa does not always provide sufficient time for visa recipients to finalize their plans and complete necessary preparations for their permanent move to the United States. It sometimes takes longer than four months to sell homes and businesses, as well as coordinate school schedules for family members. Other unforeseen events such as medical emergencies may arise. Such unforeseen events often result in the necessity of issuing a new visa. The amendment of the regulations to extend the validity period to six months will greatly reduce the necessity of issuing new visas to visa recipients who could not gain admission to the United States during that four-month period for reasons beyond their control. It also will provide visa recipients greater flexibility in preparing for the transfer of their permanent residence.

Final Rule

The implementation of this rule as a final rule is based upon the ''good cause'' exceptions established by 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B) and 553(d)(3). This rule grants or recognizes an exemption or relieves a restriction under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1) and is considered beneficial to the United States Government.

This rule is not expected to have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)). This rule imposes no reporting or record-keeping action from the public requiring the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act requirements. This rule has been reviewed as required by E.O. 12988 and certified to be in compliance therewith. This rule is exempted from E.O. 12866 but has been reviewed to ensure consistency therewith.

List of Subjects in 22 CFR Part 42

Aliens, Immigrants, Passports and visas, Visa validity.

In view of the foregoing, 22 CFR is amended as follows:

PART 42—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 42 continues to read:

Authority: 8 U.S.C. 1104.

2. Section 42.72 is amended by revising the first sentence in paragraph (a), paragraph (e)(1), and the first two sentences of paragraph (e)(4) to read as follows:

§ 42.72 Validity of visas.

(a) Period of validity. With the exception indicated herein, the period of validity of an immigrant visa shall not exceed six months, beginning with the date of issuance. * * *

* * * * *

(e) Aliens entitled to the benefits of sections 154 (a) and (b) of Pub. L. 101–649. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (a) through (d) of this section, the period of validity of an immigrant visa issued to an immigrant described in paragraph (e)(2) of this section may, at the request of the applicant, be extended until January 1, 2002, if the applicant so requests either at the time of issuance of the visa or within six months thereafter. If an applicant entitled to issuance of an immigrant visa having an extended period of validity fails to request extended validity at the time of issuance but subsequently, within six months thereafter, requests that the validity be extended pursuant to this paragraph, the consular officer shall issue a replacement visa to the alien in accordance with the provisions of § 42.74(b).

* * * * *

(4) An alien who has elected to have the period of validity of his or her visa extended pursuant to paragraph (e)(1) of this section shall, if his or her contemplated date of application for admission into the United States is no later than six months following the date of visa issuance, notify the appropriate consular officer of his or her intention to travel to the United States for this purpose. The consular officer shall thereupon schedule an appointment with such alien for the purpose of determining whether or not the alien remains admissible into the United States as an immigrant. Such appointment shall be scheduled not sooner than six months preceding the alien's contemplated date of application for admission for permanent residence. * * *

* * * * *

Dated: April 30, 1997.

Mary A. Ryan,

Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97–13332 Filed 5–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710–06–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 721

[OPPTS–50623A; FRL–5715–7]

RIN 2070–AB27

Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances; Correction

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: EPA issued a document (FR Doc. 96-30474) in the **Federal Register** of December 2, 1996 (61 FR 63726), promulgating significant new use rules in § 721.4484. Two cross-references were inadvertently incorrect. This document corrects those cross-references.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of this rule is January 31, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Toxic Substances, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E–543B, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460; telephone: (202) 554–1404; TDD: (202) 554–0551; e-mail: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA issued a document (FR Doc. 96-30474) in the **Federal Register** of December 2, 1996 (61 FR 63726) (FRL–4964–3), adding § 721.4484. In § 721.4484, two cross-references were inadvertently incorrect. This document corrects the cross-references appearing in § 721.4484 (a)(2)(i) and (a)(2)(ii).

On page 63737, in the second column, in § 721.4484, in paragraph (a)(2)(i), in the third line, ''§ 721.72'' should read ''§ 721.63'' and in paragraph (a)(2)(ii), in the third line, ''§ 721.63'' should read ''§ 721.72''.

Dated: May 13, 1997.

Charles M. Auer,

Director, Chemical Control Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics.

[FR Doc. 97–13328 Filed 5–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

45 CFR Part 1610

Use of Non-LSC Funds, Transfers of LSC Funds, Program Integrity

AGENCY: Legal Services Corporation.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule revises the Legal Services Corporation's (''Corporation'' or ''LSC'') interim rule concerning the use of non-LSC funds by LSC recipients. The revisions are intended to address constitutional challenges while ensuring that no LSC-funded entity engages in restricted activities. This final rule continues the interim rule's deletion of the provisions on transfers of non-LSC funds and revises the interim rule's new section that sets out standards for the integrity of recipient programs. The final rule also makes several conforming revisions, including changes to definitions and section titles.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This final rule is effective June 20, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Office of the General Counsel, (202) 336–8817.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 2, 1996, the Corporation published a completely revised final rule to implement Section 504 in the Corporation's FY 1996 appropriations act, Public Law 104–134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996), as incorporated by the Corporation's FY 1997 appropriations act, Public Law 104–208, 110 Stat. 3009. Section 504 applies certain restrictions to any person or entity receiving LSC funds, effectively restricting the use of virtually all of a recipient's funds to the same degree that it restricts LSC funds. Although not required to by law, the Corporation extended the restrictions on a recipient's funds to a transfer of a recipient's non-LSC funds. Thus, the rule required that when a recipient transferred its non-LSC funds to an entity that had no LSC funds, the conditions would remain attached to the transferred funds. However, the other funds of the entity would not be affected.

In January 1997, five legal services recipients in Hawaii, Alaska, and California, together with two of their program lawyers, two non-federal funders and a client organization, filed suit in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii challenging a number of the Section 504 restrictions as unconstitutional conditions on their use of non-LSC funds. *Legal Aid Society of Hawaii et al.* v. *Legal Services Corporation*, Civil Action No. 97–00032 ACK, (hereinafter referred to as *LASH*). The Court entered an order on February 14, 1997, which preliminarily enjoined the Corporation from enforcing restrictions on the recipients' use of non-LSC funds for certain restrictions as to which the Court determined that the plaintiffs had a fair likelihood of demonstrating an infringement of First Amendment rights. (The Court denied the preliminary injunction request with respect to certain other restrictions, including those relating to class actions and representation of ineligible aliens.) The Court's preliminary ruling was grounded in pertinent part on its understanding of the Corporation's interrelated organization policy, but also implicated the expansive reach of the Corporation's restrictions on non-LSC funds. The effect of the preliminary order was to allow those recipients who are plaintiffs in the case to use their non-LSC funds to engage in certain prohibited activities within their recipient programs during the interim period before a trial on the merits and a final ruling by the judge.

A similar suit to *LASH* was also filed in January 1997, as a class action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, which sought, *inter alia,* to have the court declare certain restrictions unconstitutional and grant preliminary and final injunctive relief. *Velazquez et al.* v. *Legal Services Corporation,* 97 Civ. 00182 (FB) (E.D.N.Y.). There has been no ruling or order issued to date.

Because the Court's order in *LASH* created a situation clearly at odds with Congressional intent, the Operations and Regulations Committee (''Committee'') of the Corporation's Board of Directors (''Board'') held public hearings and considered a draft interim rule on March 7, 1997. The Committee recommended and the Board agreed on March 8, 1997, on an interim rule, which was published in the **Federal Register** on March 14, 1997, with a request for comments.

The interim rule revised the final rule with the intent of addressing the constitutional concerns raised in *LASH* while preserving the statutory system created by Congress that forbids recipients from engaging in prohibited activities and subsidizing prohibited activities with LSC funds. Generally, the interim rule deleted provisions in § 1610.7 on the transfer of non-LSC funds and added a new § 1610.8 dealing with the integrity of recipient programs. Section 1610.8 replaced and nullified Section 1–7 of the Corporation's 1986 Audit and Accounting Guide, which set out the Corporation's policy on interrelated organizations.

The Corporation received three timely comments and several other comments thereafter, each of which was given careful consideration. Based on the comments and its own internal research and review, the Corporation has made several revisions to the interim rule. A section-by-section analysis of this final rule is provided below. The analysis includes explanations of provisions in the December 1996 final rule that remain unchanged by the interim or this final rule.

Section 1610.1 Purpose

The purpose section is intended to reflect Congressional intent that no LSC-funded organization engage in any restricted activities. This final rule adds language clarifying that the purpose of the rule is to ensure that recipients maintain objective integrity and independence from organizations that engage in restricted activities. The term ''restricted activities'' is used in the preamble and text of this rule as an umbrella term to refer to the restrictions included in the definitions of ''purpose prohibited by the LSC Act'' and ''activity prohibited by or inconsistent with Section 504.''

Section 1610.1 Definitions

This section provides definitions for terms used in this part. Paragraph (a) defines ''purpose prohibited by the LSC Act.'' The December 1996 final rule revised the Corporation's longstanding definition in several ways. This rule deleted reference to a prohibition on the representation of juveniles, because the prohibition is no longer in the LSC Act. This rule also deleted reference to those restrictions on activities in the LSC Act that are now included in the broader restrictions in the Corporation's appropriations act. Numbering changes were also made to conform to 1977 amendments to the LSC Act. These changes have been retained in this rule.

Paragraph (b) defines ''activity prohibited by or inconsistent with Section 504'' by listing the prohibitions and requirements in Section 504 of the Corporation's FY 1996 appropriations which have been incorporated by reference in the Corporation's FY 1997 appropriations act. These prohibitions and requirements apply to a recipient's activities, regardless of the source of