Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482–4212.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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

The United States Government has decided to rescind the request made on March 27, 1995 to consult on imports of cotton and man-made fiber nightwear and pajamas in Categories 351/651 from Honduras.

In the letter published below, the Chairman of CITA directs the Commissioner of Customs to cancel the limit established for Categories 351/651 for the period March 27, 1995 through March 26, 1996.

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 59 FR 65531, published on December 20, 1994). Also see 60 FR 32655, published on June 23, 1995.

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

September 27, 1995.

Commissioner of Customs,

Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive cancels and supersedes the directive issued to you on June 16, 1995, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of cotton and man-made fiber textile products in Categories 351/651, produced or manufactured in Honduras and exported during the period which began on March 27, 1995 and extends through March 26, 1996.

Effective on September 29, 1995, you are directed to cancel the limit established for Categories 351/651 for the period March 27, 1995 through March 26, 1996.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that this action falls within the foreign affairs exception to 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.95–24417 Filed 9–28–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DR–F

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Addition

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Addition to the Procurement List.

SUMMARY: This action adds to the Procurement List a finger bleeding lancet to be furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, Crystal Square 3, Suite 403, 1735 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202–3461.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beverly Milkman (703) 603–7740.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 14, 1995, the Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled published notice (60 F.R. 36266) of proposed addition to the Procurement List. The Committee received comments from the current contractor in response to its 1995 and 1994 proposals to add the lancets to the Procurement List. The contractor indicated that it is a considerably smaller entity than the Committee deemed it to be, and addition of the lancet to the Procurement List would have a severe impact on that entity, including loss of jobs and of the opportunity to recoup the entity's investment in equipment, possibly resulting in the entity going out of business.

The contractor also questioned whether people with severe disabilities are capable of producing the lancets, and whether the nonprofit agency which will produce them is in compliance with Food and Drug Administration (FDA) requirements for the production of medical instruments. The contractor was particularly concerned about the nonprofit agency's ability to avoid certain critical defects identified by the FDA in the production of lancets. The contractor also questioned the nonprofit agency's compliance with the statutory direct labor ratio requirement as it applies to lancet production, and indicated that the Committee's pricing mechanism is not in accordance with law.

As the result of a 1986 merger, the contractor's Medical Supply Division, which provides the lancets to the Government and other customers, is part of the same corporate entity as the administrative holding company for the contractor's various business ventures. This corporate entity reports its sales and income for tax purposes separately from its subsidiary corporations.

In situations like this, it has long been the Committee's policy to look at impact on the total business of the contractor affected by a decision to add a commodity or service to the Procurement List. This policy was specifically incorporated in the Committee's regulations as part of a regulatory revision which became effective December 16, 1994 (59 F.R. 59338, Nov. 16, 1994). In this case, the Committee's policy is especially appropriate. A review of the various documents submitted by the contractor, including its Form 10-K report for 1993 filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, revealed a large interlocking financial enterprise controlled by the contractor, with substantial identity of officers, board members, and ownership for the various corporations in the enterprise. The lancets are even made for the contractor by one of its subsidiaries, in a building near the contractor's headquarters which the contractor bought from the same subsidiary and leases back to the subsidiary.

The contractor's sales of the lancets to the Government are only a very small percentage of the sales of the total enterprise. The Committee does not consider loss of such a small percentage to constitute severe adverse impact on the contractor. The contractor's ability to transfer assets and employees between various parts of the enterprise should allow it to absorb any employees who may be displaced by the Committee's action and any manufacturing equipment, which it can continue to use in producing lancets for the commercial market. Because no contractor is guaranteed to continue receiving Government contracts for an item under the competitive bidding system, the contractor assumed a risk of losing the use of this equipment when it entered the Government market.

The Committee's conclusion that people with severe disabilities employed by the designated nonprofit agency will be capable of producing the lancets to fill Government orders is based on findings by the Committee's industrial engineer and an assessment by the engineering staff of the authorized central nonprofit agency for this action. The Committee's engineer reviewed production plans with the nonprofit agency and a central nonprofit agency engineer to address each of the contractor's capability contentions in