healthy animals. Generally, we consider 30 days to be a sufficient amount of time for the elimination of any pseudorabies virus that might remain on the premises after cleaning and disinfection. However, a premises that has been adequately cleaned and disinfected may, in some cases, not need a 30-day waiting period to ensure that the virus has been eliminated. Conversely, it is possible that it might not be entirely safe to restock a premises until more than 30 days have elapsed following cleaning and disinfection.

It was our intent to allow an official pseudorabies epidemiologist familiar with the individual premises and the cleaning and disinfection done on that premises to determine whether any reduction or addition to the 30-day waiting period was warranted or advisable for that premises. Therefore, we are adding language to § 52.4 to clarify that intent.

This technical amendment is consistent with procedures outlined in our ''State-Federal-Industry Program Standards for Pseudorabies Eradication.'' (A copy of the standards can be obtained by contacting the person listed above under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.) At the onset of our accelerated pseudorabies eradication program, we advised States participating in the eradication program that we would proceed in accordance with our existing program standards. The language we are adding to the regulations is consistent with the existing standards.

Comments sent to us on our January 15, 1999, interim rule (Docket No. 98–123–2) were required to be received on or before March 16, 1999. To allow the public enough time to comment on this technical amendment as it relates to the interim rule, we are extending the period during which we will accept comments on Docket No. 98–123–2.

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 52

Animal diseases, Pseudorabies, Swine, Indemnity payments, Transportation.

Accordingly, we are amending 9 CFR part 52 as follows:

PART 52—SWINE DESTROYED BECAUSE OF PSEUDORABIES

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 111–113, 114, 114a, 114a-1, 120, 121, 125, and 134b; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.2(d).

2. Section § 52.4 is revised to read as follows:

§ 52.4 Disinfection of premises, conveyances, and materials.

All premises, including barns, stockyards and pens, and all cars and other conveyances, and the materials on any premises or conveyances used to house or transport swine for which indemnity is paid under this part must be cleaned and disinfected under the supervision of an APHIS employee after removal of the swine from the known infected herd. Premises may be restocked with swine 30 days following an approved cleaning and disinfection, unless an official pseudorabies epidemiologist determines that a shorter or longer period of time is adequate or necessary to protect new animals against infection. The owner to whom the indemnity is paid will be responsible for expenses incurred in connection with the cleaning and disinfection, except for cleaning and disinfection of the conveyances used to transport the swine to the location of disposal.

Done in Washington, DC, this 11th day of March 1999.

Craig A. Reed,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 99–6491 Filed 3–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

17 CFR Parts 202, 240, 242 and 249

[Release No. 34–40760A; File No. S7–12–98]

RIN 3235–AH41

Regulation of Exchanges and Alternative Trading Systems; Correction

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission.

ACTION: Correction to final regulations.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to the final regulations which were published Tuesday, December 22, 1998, (63 FR 70844). The regulations related to regulation of exchanges and alternative trading systems.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 21, 1999, except §§ 242.301(b)(5)(i)(D) and (E) and §§ 242.301(b)(6)(i)(D) and (E), which shall become effective on April 1, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kevin Ehrlich, Attorney, at (202) 942–0778, Division of Market Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20549–1001.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The final regulations that are the subject of these corrections relate to the regulation of exchanges and alternative trading systems.

Need for Correction

As published, the final regulations contain a rule designation which was previously designated by another final rule. In the final rules for OTC derivatives dealers, published on Tuesday, November 3, 1998, new Rule 17a–4(b)(10) was adopted and became effective on January 4, 1999. The final rules for the regulation of exchanges and alternative trading systems erroneously also designated a new Rule 17a–4(b)(10). This correction redesignates the Rule 17a–4(b)(10) contained in the regulation of exchanges and alternative trading systems release as Rule 17a–4(b)(11) and makes the necessary changes throughout the release text and final rules.

Under section 553(b), notice of proposed rulemaking is not required when the agency for good cause finds that notice and public procedure thereon are ''impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest.'' Because the amendments adopted today are technical corrections to clarify the rule designations, the Commission finds that publishing the amendments for comment would be unnecessary. The rule being amended was adopted after notice and the opportunity for public comment.

Under section 553(d), publication of a substantive rule not less than 30 days before its effective date is required except as otherwise provided by the agency for good cause. For the same reasons as described above with respect to notice and opportunity for comment, the Commission finds that there is good cause for having the rule become effective on April 21, 1999.

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 [1] does not apply to this rulemaking since these correcting amendments do not require any ''collection of information.''

Section 23(a)(2) of the Exchange Act [2] requires the Commission to consider the anti-competitive effects of any rules it adopts thereunder, and to balance them against the benefits that further the purposes of the Act. Furthermore, section 2 of the Securities Act [3] and section 3 of the Exchange Act,[4] as

[1] 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

[2] 15 U.S.C. 78w(a)(2).

[3] 15 U.S.C. 77b.

[4] 15 U.S.C. 78c.

amended by the recently enacted National Securities Markets Improvements Act of 1996,[5] provide that whenever the Commission is engaged in rulemaking and is required to consider or determine whether an action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, the Commission shall also promote efficiency, competition, and capital formation. Because the amendments here do not effect any substantive change in the rules they do not have any anti-competitive effects. Because they correct mistakes or clarify ambiguity present in the Commission's rules, they serve to promote efficiency, competition, and capital formation, and are therefore in the public interest.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication on December 22, 1998 of the final regulations which were the subject of FR Doc. 98–33299 beginning on page 70844 is corrected as follows:

1. On page 70845 in the first column under XII. in the table of contents, ''D. Rule 17a–4(b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''D. Rule 17a–4(b)(11)''.

2. On page 70909 in the second column, line 11 of the last paragraph, ''17a–4(b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''17a–4(b)(11)''.

3. On page 70911 in the third column, 9th line from the bottom in the last paragraph, ''Rule 17a–4(b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''Rule 17a–4(b)(11)''.

4. On page 70913 in the second column, heading ''D. Rule 17a–4(b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''D. Rule 17a–4(b)(11)'' and lines 5 and 11 of the last paragraph, ''Rule 17a–4(b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''Rule 17a–4(b)(11)''.

5. On page 70913 in the third column in the first line, ''Rule 17a–4(b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''Rule 17a–4(b)(11)''.

6. On page 70919 in the third column, the last line of instruction 11, ''paragraph (b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''paragraph (b)(11)''.

7. On page 70920 in the first column at the first line, the designation ''(10)'' is corrected to read ''(11)''.

8. On page 70920 in the first column in the first paragraph, lines 11 and 16, ''(b)(10)'' is corrected to read ''(b)(11)''.

Dated: March 11, 1999.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–6411 Filed 3–16–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–P

[5] Pub. L. 104–290, 106, 110 Stat. 3416 (1996).

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 201

[Docket No. 77N–094W]

Over-the-Counter Drug Products Containing Analgesic/Antipyretic Active Ingredients for Internal Use; Required Alcohol Warning; Final Rule; Compliance Date

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule; compliance date.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is establishing a compliance date of October 22, 1999, for the regulation that published in the **Federal Register** of October 23, 1998 (63 FR 56789). The regulation established warning statements that advise consumers with a history of heavy alcohol use to consult a physician for advice about the use of OTC internal analgesic/antipyretic drug products. The compliance date applies to all affected OTC drug products, whether marketed with or without an approved application. FDA is taking this action in response to correspondence and a citizen petition requesting more time to relabel these products.

DATES: 21 CFR 201.322, published on October 23, 1998 (63 FR 56789), is effective April 23, 1999; but compliance is not required until October 22, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gerald M. Rachanow, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (HFD–560), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301–827–2307.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

In the **Federal Register** of November 14, 1997 (62 FR 61041), FDA published a proposed amendment of part 201 (21 CFR part 201) to establish alcohol warnings for all OTC drug products labeled for adult use containing internal analgesic/antipyretic active ingredients. The agency stated that it may change the wording of the proposed warnings or not require them as a result of comments filed in response to the proposal. Because it wished to encourage the voluntary use of the proposed warning statements, the agency advised that manufacturers would be given ample time after publication of a final rule to use up any labeling printed in conformance with the proposal (62 FR 61041 at 61052).

In the **Federal Register** of October 23, 1998 (63 FR 56789), FDA issued a final rule amending part 201 and establishing in § 201.322 a required alcohol warning for OTC drug products containing internal analgesic/antipyretic active ingredients. The final rule requires manufacturers to add certain new warnings for any OTC drug product, labeled for adult use, containing any internal analgesic/antipyretic active ingredients (including, but not limited to, acetaminophen, aspirin, carbaspirin calcium, choline salicylate, ibuprofen, ketoprofen, magnesium salicylate, naproxen sodium, and sodium salicylate) alone or in combination and marketed with or without an approved application. The wording of the warnings in the final rule was different than the wording in the proposal. The final rule specified an effective date of April 23, 1999, for any OTC drug product subject to this section.

II. Summary of Comments Received

In response to the final rule, the agency received several comments (Ref. 1) and a citizen petition (Ref. 2) requesting more time to implement the new required alcohol warnings and a mechanism by which manufacturers may petition the agency for a variance or extension of time to comply with the regulation's 6-month implementation date. The comments were submitted by several large manufacturers of brand name OTC internal analgesic/antipyretic drug products and a manufacturer of a large number of private label OTC internal analgesic/antipyretic drug products. The comments stated that relabeling procedures generally take longer than the 6 months provided for in the final rule and that the companies simply lack the needed manpower and equipment to comply by April 23, 1999.

The comments added that the implementation period for the new rule must ensure that label integrity is not compromised or done haphazardly. The comments stated that 6 months is an insufficient period of time for a number of companies to accomplish the relabeling, and the short timeframe does not promote emphasis on labeling integrity and good manufacturing practice compliance. All of the comments expressed concern that numerous products could become unavailable and estimated significant loss of inventory if required to implement the labeling change by April 23, 1999.

One comment requested permission to use up all existing supplies of labeling that contain the precise alcohol warning contained in an agency letter dated March 14, 1996 (Ref. 3). Another