342/642 to 166,813 dozen [1] for the period January 1, 1998 through May 30, 1998, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC).

The Guaranteed Access Level for Categories 342/642 remains unchanged.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that this action falls within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 98–2738 Filed 2–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–F

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Announcement of an Import Restraint Limit for Certain Cotton and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Laos

January 29, 1998.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs establishing a limit.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 4, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Helen L. LeGrande, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212. For information on the quota status of this limit, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port or call (202) 927–5850. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482–3715.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended.

The Governments of the United States and the Lao People's Democratic Republic have agreed to amend and extend the Bilateral Textile Agreement of September 15, 1994 for three consecutive one-year periods, beginning on January 1, 1998 and extending through December 31, 2000.

In the letter published below, the Chairman of CITA directs the Commissioner of Customs to establish the 1998 limit for Categories 340/640.

This limit may be revised if Laos becomes a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United States applies the WTO agreement to Laos.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see **Federal Register** notice 62 FR 66057, published on December 17, 1997).

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

January 29, 1998.

Commissioner of Customs,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: Pursuant to section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; and the Bilateral Textile Agreement of September 15, 1994, as amended and extended, between the Governments of the United States and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, you are directed to prohibit, effective on February 4, 1998, entry into the United States for consumption and withdrawal from warehouse for consumption of cotton and man-made fiber textile products in Categories 340/640, produced or manufactured in Laos and exported during the twelve-month period beginning on January 1, 1998 and extending through December 31, 1998, in excess of 159,536 dozen [1].

The limit set forth above is subject to adjustment pursuant to the current bilateral agreement between the Governments of the United States and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Products in the above categories exported during 1997 shall be charged to the applicable category limit for that year (see directive dated November 4, 1996) to the extent of any unfilled balance. In the event the limit established for that period has been exhausted by previous entries, such products shall be charged to the limit set forth in this directive.

This limit may be revised if Laos becomes a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United States applies the WTO agreement to Laos.

In carrying out the above directions, the Commissioner of Customs should construe entry into the United States for consumption to include entry for consumption into the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that this action falls within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 98–2735 Filed 2–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–F

[1] The limit has not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1997.

[1] The limit has not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1997.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

[CPSC Docket No. 98–C0005]

TJX Companies, Inc., a Corporation; Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement and Order

AGENCY: Consumer Product Safety Commission.

ACTION: Provisional Acceptance of a Settlement Agreement under the Consumer Product Safety Act.

SUMMARY: It is the policy of the Commission to publish settlements which it provisionally accepts under the Consumer Product Safety Act in the **Federal Register** in accordance with the terms of 16 CFR 1605.13(d). Published below is a provisionally-accepted Settlement Agreement with The TJX Companies, Inc., a corporation, containing a civil penalty of $150,000.

DATES: Any interested person may ask the Commission not to accept this agreement or otherwise comment on its contents by filing a written request with the Office of the Secretary by February 19, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to comment on this Settlement Agreement should send written comments to the Comment 98–C0005, Office of the Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dennis C. Kacoyanis, Trail Attorney, Office of Compliance and Enforcement, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC 20207; telephone (301) 504–0626.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The text of the Agreement and Order appears below.

Dated: January 29, 1998.

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary.

Consumer Product Safety Commission

[CPSC Docket No. 98–C0005]

In the Matter of The TJX Companies, Inc., a Corporation

Settlement Agreement and Order

1. The TJX Companies, Inc., (hereinafter, ''Respondent''), a corporation, enters into this Settlement Agreement (hereinafter, ''Agreement'') with the staff of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and agrees to the

entry of the Order incorporated herein. The purpose of this Agreement and Order is to settle the staff's allegations that Respondent knowingly sold and offered for sale, in commerce, certain women's 100% rayon sheer chiffon skirts and scarves that failed to comply with the Clothing Standard for the Flammability of Clothing Textiles (hereinafter, ''Clothing Standard''), 16 CFR part 1610, in violation of section 3 of the Flammable Fabrics Act (FFA), 15 U.S.C. 1192.

I. The Parties

2. The ''staff'' is the staff of the Consumer Product Safety Commission (hereinafter, ''Commission''), an independent regulatory commission of the United States government established pursuant to section 4 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA), 15 U.S.C. 2053.

3. Respondent is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with principal corporate offices at 770 Cochituate Road, Framingham, MA 01701. Respondent is an off-price retailer of wearing apparel and accessories, and is comprised of various chain stores including, but not limited to T. J. Maxx, and prior to September 30, 1995 included Hit or Miss.

II. Allegations of the Staff

4. In 1994 and 1995, Respondent sold, or offered for sale, in commerce, 17,571 women's 100% sheer chiffon rayon skirts and 17,247 women's 100% sheer chiffon rayon scarves.

5. The skirts and scarves identified in paragraph 4 above are subject to the Clothing Standard, 16 CFR 1610, issued under section 4 of the FFA, 15 U.S.C. 1193.

6. The staff tested the skirts and scarves identified in paragraph 4 above for compliance with the requirements of the Clothing Standard. See 16 CFR 1610.3 and .4. The test results showed that the skirts and the scarves violated the requirements of the Clothing Standard and, therefore, are dangerously flammable and unsuitable for clothing because they are susceptible to rapid and intense burning when exposed to an ignition source.

7. On August 5, 1994, the staff informed Respondent that the skirts identified in paragraph 4 above failed to comply with the Clothing Standard and requested that it review its entire product line for other potential violations. The staff urged Respondent to examine particularly other 100% rayon and rayon/cotton blends featuring a sheer chiffon layer.

8. On July 19, 1995 and July 24, 1995, the staff informed Respondent that the scarves identified in paragraph 4 above failed to comply with the Clothing Standard.

9. Respondent knowingly sold, or offered for sale in commerce, the skirts and scarves identified in paragraph 4 above, as the term ''knowingly is defined in section 5(e)(4) of the FFA, 15 U.S.C. 1194(e)(4), in violation of section 3 of the FFA, 15 U.S.C. 1192, for which a civil penalty may be imposed pursuant to section 5(e)(1) of the FFA, 15 U.S.C. 1194(e)(1).

III. Response of Respondent

10. Respondent specifically denies that it sold or offered for sale garments identified in paragraph 4 above that violated the flammability requirements of the general wearing apparel standard or failed to meet any other applicable federal standard.

11. The garments identified in paragraph 4 above were purchased from vendors pursuant to written and binding warranties that the garments met all applicable federal standards. Respondent's vendors have represented that independent laboratory testing of the garments at issue confirmed that they met all applicable federal standards.

12. Respondent promptly and diligently assisted the Commission staff in its efforts to implement the voluntary recalls of allegedly violative skirts in 1994 and filed a written report with the Commission which set forth the steps it had undertaken and in which it committed to monitor its purchase of similar skirts. At no time after the submission of this report, did the staff provide TJX with any indication that the actions undertaken by TJX with regard to the recall or monitoring of skirts were inadequate to satisfy either TJX's legal obligations or the Commission's express wishes.

13. Respondent also promptly and diligently assisted the Commission in its efforts to implement the voluntary recall of allegedly violative scarves in 1995.

14. Respondent has received no reports of injuries from the use of any products enumerated in paragraph 4 of this Agreement and has been informed of the existence of no such injuries from such products identified in paragraph 4 above by the staff.

IV. Agreement of the Parties

15. For purposes of this Settlement Agreement and Order, the Commission has jurisdiction over Respondent and the subject matter of this Settlement Agreement and Order under the Consumer Product Safety Act, 15 U.S.C. 2051 *et seq.*; the Flammable Fabrics Act (FFA), 15 U.S.C. 1191 *et seq.*; and the Federal Trade Commission Act (FTCA), 15 U.S.C. 41 *et seq.*

16. This Settlement Agreement and Order is entered into for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by Respondent that it violated any law or is in any way at fault. Nor does this Agreement constitute an admission by Respondent that it is paying a civil penalty. Respondent enters into this Agreement solely to settle the allegations of the staff that a civil penalty is appropriate. Nothing in this Agreement precludes TJX from raising any defenses in any future litigation not arising out of the terms of this Agreement and Order.

17. This Agreement does not constitute a determination by the Commission that Respondent knowingly violated the FFA and the Clothing Standard. This Agreement becomes effective only upon its final acceptance by the Commission and service of the incorporated Order upon Respondent.

18. Upon provisional acceptance of this Settlement Agreement and Order by the Commission, this Settlement Agreement and Order shall be placed on the public record and shall be published in the **Federal Register** in accordance with the procedures set forth in 16 CFR 1605.13(d). If the Commission does not receive any written request not to accept the Settlement Agreement and Order within 15 days, the Settlement Agreement and Order will be deemed to be finally accepted on the 20th day after the date it is published in the **Federal Register.**

19. Upon final acceptance of this Settlement Agreement by the Commission and issuance of the Final Order, Respondent waives any rights to a formal hearing as to any findings of fact and conclusions of law relating to the staff's allegations in this matter.

20. Upon final acceptance of this Settlement Agreement by the Commission and issuance of the Final Order, the Commission specifically waives its right to initiate either by referring to the Department of Justice or bringing in its own name any civil, administrative, or criminal action relating to any of the events giving rise to the allegations of the staff enumerated in paragraphs 4 through 9 above against: (i) Respondent, (ii) any of Respondent's former or current affiliated entities; (iii) any shareholder, officer, director, employee, or agent of any entity referenced in (i) or (ii); and (iv) any successor, heir, or assign of the persons described in (i), (ii), or (iii).

21. Upon final acceptance by the Commission of this Settlement Agreement and Order, the Commission shall issue the attached Order incorporated herein by reference.

22. A violation of the attached Order shall subject Respondent to appropriate legal action.

23. The Commission may disclose the terms of this Settlement Agreement and Order to the public consistent with section 6(b) of the CPSA, 15 U.S.C. 2055(b).

Respondent the TJX Companies, Inc.

Dated: December 9, 1997.

Bernard Cammarata,

President and Chief Executive Officer, The TJX Companies, Inc. 770 Cochituate Road, Framingham, MA 01701.

Commission Staff

Eric L. Stone,

Director, Division of Administrative Litigation, Office of Compliance.

Alan H. Schoem,

Assistant Executive Director, Office of Compliance, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, D.C. 20207–0001.

Dated: December 10, 1997.

Dennis C. Kacoyanis,

Trial Attorney Ronald G. Yelenik, Trial Attorney Division of Administrative Litigation, Office of Compliance.

Order

Upon consideration of the Settlement Agreement entered into between Respondent The TJX Companies, Inc., (hereinafter, ''Respondent''), a corporation, and the staff of the Consumer Product Safety Commission (''Commission''); and the Commission having jurisdiction over the subject matter and Respondent; and it appearing that the Settlement Agreement and Order is in the public interest, it is

Ordered, that the Settlement Agreement and Order be and hereby is accepted, as indicated below; and it is

Further ordered, that Respondent pay to the United States Treasury a civil penalty of one hundred fifty thousand dollars ($150,000.00) within twenty (20) days after service upon Respondent of the Final Order.

Provisionally accepted and Provisional Order issued on the 29th day of January 1998.

By order of the Commission,

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 98–2753 Filed 2–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

[OMB Control Number 0704–0332]

Information Collection Requirements; DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Notice and request for comments regarding a proposed extension of an approved information collection requirement.

SUMMARY: In compliance with Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), DoD announces the proposed extension of a public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of DoD, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. This information collection requirement is currently approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for use through July 31, 1998, under OMB Control Number 0704–0332. DoD proposes that OMB extend its approval for use through July 31, 2001.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by April 6, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to: Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Attn: Mrs. Susan L. Schneider, PDUSD(A&T) DP(DAR), IMD 3D139, 3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301–3062. Telefax number (703) 602–0350. E-mail comments submitted over the Internet should be addressed to: dfars@acq.osd.mil. Please cite OMB Control Number 0704–0332 in all correspondence related to this issue. E-mail comments should cite OMB Control Number 0704–0332 in the subject line.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mrs. Susan L. Schnieder, (703) 602–0131. A copy of the information collection requirement is available electronically via the Internet at: http://www.dtic.mil/dfars/. Paper copies of the information collection requirement may be obtained from Mrs. Susan L. Schnieder, PDUSD (A&T) DP(DAR), IMD 3D129, 3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301–3062.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title, Associated Forms, and Associated OMB Control Number: Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) Appendix I, Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program; OMB Control Number 0704–0332.

Needs and Uses: In order to evaluate whether the purposes of the DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program (established under Section 831 of Public Law 101–510, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, as amended) have been attained, Appendix I of the DFARS requires that companies participating in the Program, as mentors, keep records and report on progress in achieving the developmental assistance objectives under each mentor-protégé agreement. Participation in the Program is voluntary and is open to companies with at least one active subcontracting plan negotiated with DoD or another Federal agency. The report is used by the Government to assess whether the purposes of the Program have been attained.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Annual Burden Hours: 496 (Includes 248 recordkeeping hours).

Number of Respondents: 124.

Responses Per Respondent: 2.

Annual Responses: 248.

Average Burden per Response: 1 hour response; 2 hours recordkeeping.

Frequency: Semiannually.

Summary of Information Collection

The information collection includes requirements related to evaluation of the DoD Pilot Mentor-protégé Program. DFARS Appendix I–III, Reporting requirements and program reviews, prescribes how mentor firms shall report on the progress made under active mentor-protégé agreements. It requires mentor firms to report semiannually by attaching to their SF 295, Summary Subcontract Report—

a. A statement that includes the number of active mentor-protégé agreements in effect and the progress in achieving development assistance objectives under each agreement; and

b. A copy of the SF 294, Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts, for each contract where developmental assistance was credited, with a statement identifying the amount of dollars credited to the small disadvantaged business subcontract goal as a result of developmental assistance; an explanation as to the relationship between the developmental assistance provided the protégé firm(s) under the Program and the activities sunder the contract covered by the SF 294(s); and the number and dollar value of subcontracts awarded to the protégé firms(s).

Michele P. Peterson,

Executive Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations Council.

[FR Doc. 98–2648 Filed 2–3–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Disposal and Reuse of the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex, New York City, New York

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations promulgated by the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the Army has prepared a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) pertaining to the Environmental Assessment (EA) for disposal and reuse of the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex, New York City, New York. In the FNSI, the Army states its intention to dispose of excess property resulting from the closure of the Manhattan Beach Stand Along Housing Complex.

In accordance with the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act of October 1988, Pub. L. 100–526, as amended, the Secretary of Defense's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure required the closure of 53 stand alone family housing installations, including the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex.