of this section, must be filed by November 1, 1997. Disposition of
peanuts imported in excess of the 1997
peanut import quotas must be filed
within 120 days of the peanuts’ entry by
the Customs Service. Extension of these
reporting periods must be granted by the
AMS on a case by case basis upon a
showing that such extension would be
justified. Requests for extension must be
submitted in writing to the Marketing
Order Administration Branch, Fruit and
Vegetable Division, AMS, USDA, P.O.
Box 96456, room 2525–S, Washington,
DC 20090–6456, Attn: Peanut Imports or
faxing the request to (202) 720–5698.
An extension request must include the
Customs Service entry number, relevant
grade and aflatoxin certificates (if any)
issued on the outstanding peanuts, and
the reasons for delay in obtaining final
disposition of the peanuts.

(4) Failure to fully comply with
quality and handling requirements or
failure to notify the Secretary of
disposition of all foreign produced
peanuts, as required under this section,
may result in a compliance investigation
by the Secretary. Falsification of reports
submitted to the Secretary is a violation
by the Secretary. Falsification of reports
submitted to the Secretary is a violation
of Federal law punishable by fine or
imprisonment, or both.

Robert C. Keeney,
Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division.
[FR Doc. 97–25411 Filed 9–24–97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Marketing Service
7 CFR Part 1205
1997 Amendment to Cotton Board Rules and Regulations Adjusting
Supplemental Assessment on Imports

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Correction to final rule.

SUMMARY: This document corrects the
final rule published September 2, 1997
(62 FR 46412) which amended the
Cotton Board Rules and Regulations by
lowering the value assigned to imported
cotton for the purpose of calculating
supplemental assessments collected for
use by the Cotton Research and
Promotion Program.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 2, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Craig Shackelford, (202) 720–2259.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
The Agricultural Marketing Service
(AMS) amended the Cotton Board Rules
and Regulations by lowering the value
assigned to imported cotton for the
purpose of calculating supplemental
assessments collected for use by the
Cotton Research and Promotion
Program. This action is required by this
rule on an annual basis to ensure
that the assessments collected on
imported cotton and the cotton content
of imported products remain similar to
those paid on domestically produced
cotton. As a result of changes in the
1997 Harmonized Tariff Schedule
(HTS), numbering changes in the import
assessment table are amended. Eleven
HTS numbers were to be eliminated
from the assessment table because
negligible assessments have been
collected on these numbers and their
elimination would contribute to
reducing the overall burden to
importers.

Need for Correction
In rule FR Doc. 97–23218 published
on September 2, 1997 (62 FR 46412),
make the following correction. On page
46415, in the third column, immediately
below the HTS number 5212216090
remove the entries for HTS numbers
5309214010, 5309214090, 530924010,
5311004020, 5407810010, 5407810030,
5407912020, 5408312020, 5408329020,
5408349020, and 5408349095.

Dated: September 18, 1997.
Norma McDill,
Acting Director, Cotton Division.
[FR Doc. 97–25278 Filed 9–24–97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
9 CFR Parts 1 and 3

[DOCKET No. 95–078–4]

RIN 0579–AA74

Humane Treatment of Dogs; Tethering;
Clarification

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health
Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule; clarification.

SUMMARY: On August 13, 1997, we published in the Federal Register (62
FR 43272–43275, Docket No. 95–078–2) a final rule that removed the option for
facilities regulated under the Animal Welfare Act to use tethering as a means
of primary enclosure. We also added a provision to the regulations to permit
facilities to temporarily tether a dog if they obtain approval from the
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. The purpose of this notice is to
clarify what kinds of facilities are regulated under the Animal Welfare Act
and, subsequently, what kinds of facilities must comply with the final
rule on tethering.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Stephen Smith, Staff Animal Health
Technician, Animal Care, APHIS, suite
6D02, 4700 River Road Unit 84,
Riverdale, MD 20737–1234, (301) 734–
4972, or e-mail: snsmith@aphis.usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
On August 13, 1997, we published in
the Federal Register (62 FR 43272–
43275, Docket No. 95–078–2) a final
rule that amended the regulations by
removing the option for facilities
regulated under the Animal Welfare Act
to use tethering as a means of primary
enclosure. We also added a provision to
the regulations to state that regulated
facilities may temporarily tether a dog if
they obtain approval from the Animal
and Plant Health Inspection Service
(APHIS).

This rulemaking was based on our
experience in enforcing the Animal
Welfare Act, which has shown that
tethering can be an inhumane practice
when used as a means of primary
enclosure in facilities regulated under
the Animal Welfare Act. Typically, this
inhumane use of tethering involves
dogs that are permanently tethered
without opportunity for regular
exercise. This was the basis for our
position that tethering is inhumane.
However, we recognize that under other
circumstances (intermittent use, dogs
are vigorously exercised, pets are on
running tethers, dogs have close
oversight, etc.) the use of tethering may
be entirely appropriate and humane. We
did not intend to imply that tethering of
dogs under all circumstances is
inhumane, nor that tethering under any
circumstances must be prohibited.
Since publication of the final rule, we
have been made aware that some
members of the public are confused as
to who must comply with this final rule.
We have received numerous inquiries
from various kinds of dog owners who
tether their dogs. These dog owners are
concerned that, pursuant to the final
rule, they will no longer be able to
tether their dogs. We are publishing this
notice in order to make it clear who
must comply with the final rule, and
who is not subject to the provisions of the final rule.

The final rule regarding tethering of dogs was issued under the authority of the Animal Welfare Act. The Animal Welfare Act authorizes APHIS to license, register, and regulate animal dealers, animal transporters, animal exhibitors, and research facilities that sell, transport, exhibit, or use certain kinds of animals, including dogs. Regulations established under the Act are contained in 9 CFR parts 1, 2, and 3. Subpart A of 9 CFR part 3 contains requirements concerning dogs and cats.

With regard to dogs sold, transported, exhibited, or used in research by persons subject to the Animal Welfare Act, APHIS' regulations are intended to ensure that the dogs are given proper and humane care. Persons subject to the Animal Welfare Act include persons who sell dogs wholesale or breed dogs to sell wholesale, sell dogs to laboratories for research purposes or breed dogs for research purposes. Most dog breeder and wholesale industry organizations agree that tethering is not a humane means of primary enclosure for dogs when used under the circumstances typical to breeding and wholesale facilities. Many of these organizations already prohibit member facilities from using tethering as a means of primary enclosure. For this reason, using tethering as a means of primary enclosure is rare among licensed Class A and Class B dog dealers. We recognize that many persons not subject to the Animal Welfare Act do tether their dogs.

Persons not regulated under the Animal Welfare Act who tether their dogs are likely to be using this means of restraint under circumstances different than those typical to breeding and wholesale facilities. In these cases, tethering may be a humane method of restraint. Regardless, APHIS does not have the authority to regulate the activities of dog owners who are not subject to the Animal Welfare Act.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2131-2159; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(g).

Done in Washington, DC, this 22nd day of September 1997.

Terry L. Medley,
Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 97-25482 Filed 9-24-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-34-P

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

12 CFR Chapter VII

Interpretive Rulings and Policy Statements

AGENCY: National Credit Union Administration (NCUA).

ACTION: Withdrawal of outdated and unnecessary Interpretive Rulings and Policy Statements (IRPS).

SUMMARY: NCUA is withdrawing several of its Interpretive Rulings and Policy Statements (IRPS) that have become outdated or unnecessary or have been superseded by other IRPS or NCUA regulations. This is the first step in NCUA's ongoing project to update and streamline its IRPS. The intended purpose of withdrawing these IRPS is to ease the compliance burden on federally chartered and federally insured credit unions and provide more valuable guidance by eliminating IRPS that no longer effectively advance NCUA's regulatory goals or statutory responsibilities.