Issued in East Point, Georgia, on June 26, 1980.

George R. LaCaille,

Acting Director, Southern Region

[FR Doc. 80-20135 Filed 7-3-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

14 CFR Part 159

[Docket No. 20200; Amdt. 159-18]

Solicitation and Leafletting Procedures at National and Dulles International Airports

Correction

In FR Doc. 80-15968 appearing at page 35314 in the issue of Tuesday, May 27, 1980, on page 35320 in the second column in the fourth line in § 159.93(a)(3) "paragraph (c)(2)(e)(i)" should read "paragraph (c)(2)(v)(A)".

BILLING CODE 1505-01-M

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

16 CFR Part 3

Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Procedures

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Federal Trade Commission, pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended by Pub. L. 96-252, is revising rule 3.40(a) of its rules of practice to insert a reference to new section 20 of the FTC Act. This change supplements rules changes published on May 29, 1980, 45 Fed. Reg. 36338.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This rule change is effective July 7, 1980.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Barry R. Rubin, Assistant General Counsel, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C. 20580 (202) 523-3520.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission hereby revises rule 3.40(a) to read as follows:

§ 3.40 Admissibility of evidence in advertising substantiation cases.

(a) If a person, partnership, or corporation is required through compulsory process under Section 6, 9 or 20 of the Act issued after October 26, 1977 to submit to the Commission substantiation in support of an express or an implied representation contained in an advertisement, such person, partnership or corporation shall not thereafter be allowed, in any adjudicative proceeding in which it is alleged that the person, partnership, or corporation lacked a reasonable basis for the representation, and for any purpose relating to the defense of such allegation, to introduce into the record, whether directly or indirectly through references contained in documents or oral testimony, any material of any type whatsoever that was required to be but was not timely submitted in response to said compulsory process. *Provided, however,* that a person, partnership, or corporation is not, within the meaning of this section, required through compulsory process to submit substantiation with respect to those portions of said compulsory process to which such person, partnership, or corporation has raised good faith legal objections in a timely motion pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, until the Commission denies such motion; or if the person, partnership, or corporation thereafter continues to refuse to comply, until such process has been judicially enforced.

* * * * *

(Sec. 6(g), 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46; 80 Stat. 383, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 552)

By direction of the Commission.

Carol M. Thomas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 80-20284 Filed 7-3-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

19 CFR Part 101

[T.D. 80-180]

Clarification of Port Limits of Denver, Colo., Port of Entry

AGENCY: U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Unlike for many ports of entry, there is no reference in the Customs Regulations to an official description of the geographical boundaries of the existing Customs port of entry of Denver, Colorado. Customs has been requested by the State of Colorado to publish the boundaries of the port as they are generally recognized. This document amends the Customs Regulations to clarify that the port limits include all the territory within the corporate limits of the City of Denver, Colorado, and part of Adams County, Colorado, lying immediately north of the corporate limits of Denver.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 7, 1980.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard C. Coleman, Office of Inspection, U.S. Customs Service, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20229 (202-566-5354).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The President's Message to Congress of March 3, 1913 (note following 19 U.S.C. 1), which transmitted a plan of reorganization of the Customs Service, provided that in place of all existing Customs-collection districts and ports, there would be 49 specified Customs-collection districts and ports. The district of Colorado, to include all of the State of Colorado, with district headquarters at Denver, in which Denver is the port of entry, is shown as the 47th Customs-collection district. However, no geographical description of the port is included in the document. Furthermore, Customs is unable to find any other reference to an official description of the geographical boundaries of the port.

The State of Colorado is considering establishing a foreign-trade zone within the State. The zone is required by section 2, Foreign Trade Zones Act of 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81b), to be located in or adjacent to a Customs port of entry. In order that the State of Colorado may comply with the statute, it has requested Customs to make an official determination of the actual boundaries of the Denver, Colorado, port of entry (Region VI).

Customs determined that the port boundaries should be those generally recognized by Customs personnel in Denver and at the Regional Headquarters in Houston, Texas. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** on September 19, 1979 (44 FR 54311) proposing the geographical boundaries of the Denver port of entry to include:

> The territory within the corporate limits of the city of Denver, Colorado, and that part of Adams County, Colorado, lying immediately north of the corporate limits of Denver, bounded on the west by Pecos Street, on the north by 64th Avenue, and on the east by Quebec Street.

Interested parties were given until November 19, 1979, to submit comments concerning the proposal. No comments were received in response to the notice.

Inapplicability of Delayed Effective Date Provision

This amendment clarifies that the geographical boundaries of the existing Customs port of entry of Denver, Colorado, are those generally recognized by Customs personnel. The amendment is merely technical and is a matter in which the public is not particularly interested. Accordingly,