and increase the likelihood that Praxair would unilaterally raise prices to consumers.

Under the proposed Consent Order, Praxair is required to divest four of CBI's atmospheric gases production facilities, either individually or in some combination. These facilities are located in: (1) Vacaville, California; (2) Irwindale, California; (3) Bozrah, Connecticut; and (4) Madison, Wisconsin. The proposed Consent states that this divestiture shall take place within twelve (12) months of the date the proposed Order becomes final, and shall be to an acquirer or acquirers approved by the Commission. If Praxair fails to divest the assets within 12 months, a trustee may be appointed to divest the four plants.

The proposed Order also requires Praxair to take all steps necessary to ensure that the plants to be divested continue as ongoing, viable and competitive operations. To this end, an Agreement to Hold Separate is incorporated into the proposed Order to preserve the four plants to be divested and to remedy any anticompetitive effects of the acquisition. Under the Hold Separate, Praxair commits to assure the complete independence and viability of the four plants to be divested. Furthermore, to assure that no confidential information is exchanged between Praxair and the businesses that will be divested, Praxair will hold those businesses separate and apart from all of its other operations.

The Order also requires Praxair to provide the Commission a report of compliance with the divestiture provisions of the Order within sixty (60) days following the date the Order becomes final, and every sixty (60) days thereafter until Praxair has completed the required divestiture.

Finally, with the exception of the Eastern Connecticut and Western Wisconsin/Southeastern Minnesota areas, where Praxair and CBI are each other's closest geographic competitor, the Complaint accompanying the Consent Order does not allege a violation with respect to merchant argon. Because merchant argon can be economically shipped significantly greater distances than nitrogen and oxygen, the geographic market for merchant argon most likely consists of the contiguous United States. CBI's share of the argon market is extremely small, seven other competitors would remain in the market after the acquisition, and anticompetitive effects on a national scale appear unlikely. However, localized unilateral anticompetitive effects are likely in the Eastern Connecticut and Western Wisconsin/Southeastern Minnesota areas, where Praxair and CBI are each other's closest competitors. The divestitures that the proposed Consent Order requires in Eastern Connecticut and Western Wisconsin/Southeastern Minnesota eliminate the likelihood of unilateral anticompetitive effects in merchant argon in those areas.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed Order, and it is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed Order or to modify in any way their terms.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–788 Filed 1–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Administration for Children and Families

Proposed Information Collection Activity; Comment Request

Proposed Project(s):

Title: Refugee Unaccompanied Minor Placement Report, Refugee Unaccompanied Minor Progress Report.

OMB No.: 0970–0034.

Description: The two reports collect information necessary to administer the refugee unaccompanied minor program. The ORR–3 (Placement Report) is submitted to ORR by the service provider agency at initial placement and whenever there is a change in the child's status, including termination from the program. The ORR–4 is submitted annually and records the child's progress toward the goals listed in the child's case plan.

Respondents: State governments.

ANNUAL BURDEN ESTIMATES

Instrument	No. of respondents	No. of responses per respondent	Average burden hours per response	Total burden hours
ORR–3	20	50	.417	417
ORR–4	20	55	.250	275

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 692.

In compliance with the requirements of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Administration for Children and Families is soliciting public comment on the specific aspects of the information collection described below. Copies of the proposed collection of information can be obtained and comments may be forwarded by writing to the Administration for Children and Families, Office of Information Services, Division of Information Resource Management Services, 370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW., Washington, DC 20447, Attn: ACF Reports Clearance Officer. All requests should be identified by title. Electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file without special characters or encryption.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Consideration will be given to comments and suggestions submitted within 60 days of this publication.

Dated: January 16, 1996.

Roberta Katson,

Director, Division of Information, Resource Management Services.

[FR Doc. 96–719 Filed 1–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4184–01–M

Administration on Aging

White House Conference on Aging; Compilation of Comments From the Governors on the Proposed Report

AGENCY: White House Conference on Aging, AoA, HHS.

ACTION: Compilation of Governors' Comments (Initial Report).

SUMMARY: The Policy Committee of the White House Conference on Aging is publishing a compilation of the comments received from Governors, as stipulated in the Older American Act, in response to the proposed report of the Conference sent August 1, 1995. The Governors had 90 days in which to review the proposed report and respond with comments. Comments were due November 1, 1995. This notice is an overview of the comments received on the proposed report and a listing of the Governors who responded.

Copies of the full text of the Governors' Comments may be obtained from the White House Conference on Aging. An image file (TIFF) will also be available electronically by accessing the Federal Bulletin Board. This is a secured FTP site. All users must access TELNET to obtain a User-ID and a password. The full text of the Governors' comments will also be published in the White House Conference on Aging final report. Contact information is listed below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: White House Conference on Aging, 501 School Street SW., 8th Floor, Washington, DC 20024–2755. The main telephone number for the Conference is (202) 245–7116 and the FAX number is (202) 245–7857. The INTERNET address (CONFERENCE@BAN-GATE.AOA.DHHS.GOV) may also be used.

To obtain the full text of the Governors' comments:

- access the Federal Bulletin Board via modem (setting 8 N 1)—(202) 512–1387;
- access TELNET via INTERNET—fedbbs.access.gpo.gov;
- write to the WHCoA at the above address; or
- after March 31, 1996 contact: National Aging Information Center, 500 E St. SW., Washington, DC 20024–2710. The telephone number is (202) 554–9800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Older Americans Act (Act) Amendments of 1992, Public Law 102–375, requires the Policy Committee (which oversees the 1995 White House Conference on Aging) review the comments received from the Governors in response to the proposed report on the Conference sent to them for review August 3. The Act stipulates that the proposed report is to be submitted to the Governors within 90 days of the end of the Conference (the Conference ended on May 5) and the Governors have 90 days in which to review the report and solicit comments on it.

Just five years short of the next millennium, the fourth White House Conference on Aging took place at a time of significant demographic change highlighted by significant growth in the 85 and over and the minority aged population and the rapidly aging baby boom generation. Delegates to the May 2–5, 1995, Conference were charged with helping to shape the Nation's policies so that they might better meet the diverse needs of older Americans while harnessing the vast talent and resources of older people. Debate on these important issues took place within the context of our Nation's fiscal constraints and competing priorities.

The 1995 White House Conference on Aging (WHCoA) was the first to highlight the relationship between the generations. The Conference theme, ''America Now and Into the 21st Century: Generations Aging Together With Independence, Opportunity and Dignity'' exemplifies this interdependence.

A unique feature of this WHCoA has been the involvement of individuals from the grassroots. Over 800 pre-Conference events were held in the fifty States and three of the territories. The recommendations which emerged from these events played a major role in determining the agenda and theme of the Conference as well as the resolutions drafted for the delegates to vote on. Other major sources of grassroots input included more than 900 public comments received on the proposed agenda published in the Federal Register and the numerous letters received from States, individuals, and public and private organizations. This grassroots process has continued with more than 250 post Conference events around the country looking at implementation strategies for the resolutions of greatest importance to the participants in the event.

The proposed report included a comprehensive policy statement on aging, an overview of the resolution process and the 45 resolutions (synthesized from the 50 adopted at the Conference) and brief information about implementation of each resolution. Governors were asked to look particularly at the policy statement and implementation of the resolutions. They were encouraged to look at the resolutions from the context of what their States were doing as well as what impact a resolution would have on their States if implemented.

The national policy on aging statement reiterated that the 1995 WHCoA defined aging as a lifelong process which encompasses all generations. It further stated that the aging of society presents an opportunity but also an obligation for our Nation with every State experiencing an increase in the population of persons age 65 and over during this decade. This trend is expected to continue into the 21st century with especially dramatic growth in minority elderly populations.

The Statement addressed the concern that national aging policy for the present and the future not be developed in a vacuum. Political and fiscal choices must be made. Priorities must be established within these basic principles which provide the framework for a national policy on aging:

- Affirm support for programs and policies which have been extraordinary successes of aging policy in the United States;
- Strengthen independence;
- Promote personal security;
- Encourage and empower people to share responsibility for their own aging while ensuring that the needs of the most vulnerable are met;
- Recognize older persons as resources, utilize their experience, knowledge and skills;
- Value the interdependence of generations; and
- Ensure the quality of life of all Americans as they age.

The other main component of the proposed report was the resolutions: how they were developed, the text of each resolution and how they might be implemented. The resolutions are a major product of the Conference as defined in the authorizing legislation. The Policy Committee had decided while planning the Conference to concentrate the delegates' attention on a limited set of focused resolutions for action.

Recommendations from pre-Conference events were sorted based on the framework outlined in the final agenda and then used to draft the resolutions to be debated by the delegates at the Conference. Delegates also sought the necessary support (signatures of at least 10% of the delegates) to place their own resolutions on the ballot. On the final day of the Conference, delegates voted on resolutions. The 53 resolutions from the Conference were later synthesized to produce a final set of 45 resolutions.

Following the Conference, three basic elements necessary for implementation of the resolutions were identified and suggested implementation plans were prepared. The proposed report covered these three elements as a means to focus and guide further discussion regarding resolution implementation:

• Who has the responsibility to lead and take action:

Federal, state, tribal, and local government
Business
Organized labor
Foundations
Non-profits
Aging network
Delegates
Individuals

• Specific action to be taken:

Legislative (new legislation, amendments to existing laws, and resolutions at the federal, state and local levels)
Regulatory (new Regulations, modifications of existing regulations)
Programmatic (grants, initiatives, cooperative ventures)
Administrative (waivers, orders)
Advocacy
Marketing
Education (dissemination of public information, classes/meetings)
Other

• Timing of actions within the WHCoA's then-year perspective of national aging policies:

Immediate—by October 1996
Short term (ST)—within 5 years
Long term (LT)—within 10 years

The main goal of the 1995 WHCoA is to provide resolutions to influence national aging policy and to develop a blueprint for action to implement these resolutions. The plan for implementation of the resolutions, which will have a major impact on aging concerns into the 21st century, will be included with the recommendations for administrative and legislative action in the final report to be published in January 1996.

Overview of the Governors' Comments

Forty-five Governors responded to the proposed report. Their letters focused primarily on the Conference resolutions and their suggested implementation strategies.

The letters represented a cross section of States in terms of size, region of the country, size of the aging population and condition of the economy. Despite the differences, there were common themes among many of the letters. These included:

1. Importance of quality health care for all generations; including home and community-based care/services;

2. Importance of the Older Americans Act;

3. Intergenerational policies and programs;

4. Social Security; and

5. Importance of the WHCoA.

Specific issues addressed within the common themes are:

1. Importance of Quality Health Care for All Generations, Including Home and Community-Based Care/Services—Governors recognized the need for high-quality health care programs (particularly Medicare and Medicaid) for elders, persons with disabilities and children. While individual responsibility for one's own health was emphasized, it was also recognized that the state and federal governments have a responsibility, particularly to those most frail and vulnerable. Many Governors stressed the importance of preventive care and the need to educate their citizens on healthy practices. Eighteen of the 45 Governors suggested that the states should be given greater flexibility for implementing federal programs such as Medicaid. Many Governors emphasized cost-savings realized in utilizing home and community-based care and services, rather than institutional care. The need for eliminating fraud and abuse as a means of controlling health care costs was also a recurring theme.

2. Older Americans Act—Most Governors expressed support for the Older Americans Act programs. However, ''flexibility'' is the overriding theme of the Governors' comments—to allow states more autonomy in the design and implementation of programs, and in the delivery of services.

3. Intergenerational Policies and Programs—There was general support for transfers among generations, such as the fiscal transfers in the Social Security program and those among individuals in mentoring programs. The Governors appreciated the intergenerational theme of the Conference and the support the delegates gave to programs for children (nutrition programs, other ''safety net'' programs and grandparents raising grandchildren). They agreed with the delegates that investments in these programs now will benefit both today's older and younger people. There was concern, nonetheless, about balancing our obligation to future generations with the fiscal impact of continuing to provide services, benefits, and entitlements.

4. Social Security—Several Governors noted that although Social Security was intergenerational issue requiring sensitivity to the needs of current recipients while ensuring that there will be benefits for future retirees. As with health care, Governors stressed the need for tighter controls to eliminate fraud and abuse.

5. Importance of the WHCOA—Governors who commented on the WHCOA expressed appreciation for the Conference's solicitation of grass roots involvement in developing the resolutions. Every state conducted either a pre or post White House Conference on Aging (some states have done both). Many Governors indicated that their state's delegates to the WHCOA had assisted in the preparation of their report and would be called upon to assist with the development of state aging programs and policies.

In general the Governors expressed the need to be flexible, innovative and cost conscious. They emphasized the need to promote individual, family and community responsibility while at the same time recognizing the importance of the state and federal role in maintaining and enhancing programs and services for those citizens who are frail, poor and most vulnerable.

A full listing of the 45 Governors who provided comments on the proposed report as well as a compilation of the programs and policies they raised in their comments is included in this report. The Policy Committee feels it is important to make the full text of the Governors letters available to the public and will do so including at the time the Final Report of the White House Conference on Aging is published early in 1996.

Governors letters available to the public and will do so including at the time the Final Report of the White House Conference on Aging is published early in 1996.

Comments are welcome.

List of Governors Who Submitted Comments

Governor Fob James (R–AL)*
Governor Tony Knowles (D–AK)
Governor Jim Guy Tucker (D–AR)
Governor Pete Wilson (R–CA)
Governor Roy Romer (D–CO)
Governor John G. Rowland (R–CT)
Governor Lawton Chiles (D–FL)
Governor Zell Miller (D–GA)
Governor Benjamin J. Cayetano (D–HI)
Governor Philip E. Batt (R–ID)
Governor Jim Edgar (R–IL)
Governor Evan Bayh (D–IN)
Governor Terry E. Branstad (R–IA)
Governor Bill Graves (R–KS)
Governor Brereton C. Jones (D–KY)
Governor Edwin W. Edwards (D–LA)
Governor Angus S. King, Jr. (I–ME)
Governor Parris N. Glendening (D–MD)
Governor William F. Weld (R–MA)*
Governor John Engler (R–MI)
Governor Arne H. Carlson (R–MN)

Governor Kirk Fordice (R–MS)
Governor Mel Carnahan (D–MO)
Governor E. Benjamin Nelson (D–NE)
Governor Bob Miller (D–NV)
Governor Christine Todd Whitman (R–NJ)*
Governor Gary Johnson (R–NM)
Governor George E. Pataki (R–NY)
Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. (D–NC)
Governor Edward T. Schafer (R–ND)
Governor George V. Voinovich (R–OH)
Governor John A. Kitzhaber (D–OR)
Governor Tom Ridge (R–PA)
Governor Pedro Rossello (I–PR)
Governor Lincoln Almond (R–RI)
Governor David Beasley (R–SC)
Governor William J. Janklow (R–SD)
Governor Don Sundquist (R–TN)
Governor George W. Bush, Jr. (R–TX)
Governor Michael O. Leavitt (R–UT)
Governor Howard Dean (D–VT)
Governor George Allen (R–VA)*
Governor Mike Lowry (D–WA)
Governor Gaston Caperton (D–WV)
Governor Tommy Thompson (R–WI)
*Governors' designee submitted response

Programs and Policies Addressed in Governors' Comments

Housing and Transportation—7 States (AK, GA, ME, MI, NM, NY, WV)
Social Security—19 States (CT, FL, GA, HI, ID, LA, MD, MI, NV, NJ, NM, NY, OR, RI, SD, TN, VT, VA, WV)
Elders as resources—14 States (CA, FL, ID, IL, KY, LA, MD, MA, MI, NM, SD, TX, WV, WI)
Intergenerational—23 States (CA, CO, FL, HI, IL, KY, LA, MD, MA, MI, MS, NJ, NM, OH, OR, PA, SD, TN, UT, VT, WA, WV, WI)
Older Americans Act—24 States (AR, FL, GA, HI, ID, KY, LA, MD, MA, MI, MS, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NC, OR, PA, RI, TN, VT, WA, WV, WI)
Medicare and Medicaid—34 States (AK, AR, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, HI, ID, IA, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, NE, NV, NJ, NM, NC, NY, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, UT, VT, WA, WV, WI)
Health Care Reform—16 States (KY, LA, ME, MD, MI, NJ, ND, NY, RI, SC, TN, UT, VT, VA, WV, WI)

Dated: January 11, 1996.

Fernando M. Torres-Gil,

Assistant Secretary for Aging.

[FR Doc. 96–645 Filed 1–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4130–02–M

Food and Drug Administration

Public Information; List of All Memoranda of Understanding and Agreements Between FDA and State or Local Government Agencies; Availability; Update

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice; update.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is publishing an update of the September 1993 list of all memoranda of understanding (MOU's) that are cooperative work-sharing agreements currently in effect between FDA and State or local government agencies. FDA publishes this list to provide information to the public on these agreements. The full text of any of the listed MOU's is available from FDA on request.

ADDRESSES: Submit written requests for single copies of any of the listed MOU's to the Division of Federal-State Relations (HFC–150), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, rm. 12–07, Rockville, MD 20857. Requests should be identified with the Compliance Policy Guide (CPG) number and title of the document. The listed MOU's are also available for public examination in the office of the Freedom of Information Staff, Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, rm. 12A–16, Rockville, MD 20857, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Glenn Johnson, Division of Federal-State Relations (HFC–152), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301–443–3360.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Federal Register of September 20, 1993 (58 FR 48794), FDA published a final rule exempting from publication in the Federal Register the full text of those MOU's that are cooperative work-sharing agreements between FDA and State or local government agencies. The same rule required FDA to publish periodically, but not less than once every 2 years, a notice listing all such agreements and MOU's currently in effect. The first periodic list was published in the Federal Register of September 20, 1993 (58 FR 48889), and updated in the Federal Register of November 8, 1993 (58 FR 59269). FDA is now updating the list by publishing a complete list of all MOU's that are cooperative work-sharing agreements currently in effect between FDA and State or local government agencies.

CPG Number	Title	Date
7157.01	MOU with the *New Mexico Department of Health and Environment* and *New Mexico Department of Agriculture* regarding coordination of information and work-sharing in monitoring pesticide residues and mycotoxins in food and animal feed commodities produced in or shipped into the State of New Mexico. Revised Apr. 12, 1994. (FDA–225–88–4002)	Aug. 5, 1988
7157.03	MOU with the *Washington State Department of Agriculture* regarding inspection and grading of grain, rice, and pulses. (FDA–225–81–4000)	Sept. 10, 1981
7157.04	MOU with the *State of Illinois Attorney* General regarding development and implementation of appropriate sanctions concerning fraud and deception involving foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics. (FDA–225–83–4000)	Dec. 13, 1982