

**Federal Register** on June 6, 2002 (67 FR 38841–38844, Docket No. 02–021–1); in a document published in the **Federal Register** on December 31, 2002, the compliance date for certain provisions of § 77.10 was extended from January 1, 2003, to September 30, 2003 (67 FR 79836–79837, Docket No. 02–021–3). The interim rule that amended the classification of California was effective and published in the **Federal Register** on April 25, 2003 (68 FR 20333–20336, Docket No. 03–005–1). The interim rule that amended the classification of New Mexico was effective and published in the **Federal Register** on July 24, 2003 (68 FR 43618–43621, Docket No. 03–044–1). Finally, in a document published in the **Federal Register** on August 8, 2003 (68 FR 47201–47202, Docket No. 03–072–1), we extended the delay in the date for compliance until March 30, 2004.

The specific provisions of § 77.10 that have a delayed compliance date are:

- The identification of sexually intact heifers moving to approved feedlots and steers and spayed heifers moving to any destination (§ 77.10(b));
- The identification requirements for sexually intact heifers moving to feedlots that are not approved feedlots (§ 77.10(d)); and
- Because identification is required for certification, the certification requirements for sexually intact heifers moving to unapproved feedlots (§ 77.10(d)).

Initially, we delayed the compliance with these requirements for the State of Texas for two reasons. First, the size of the cattle industry in Texas necessitated additional time to implement the identification requirements of the regulations. Second, some cattle that had begun moving through channels prior to the change in Texas' tuberculosis status would not have been identified at their premises of origin. In addition, we subsequently delayed the compliance date in response to comments received on the interim rule that classified Texas as modified accredited advanced and that also solicited comments on the current regulatory provisions of the domestic bovine tuberculosis eradication program. The compliance date was delayed for California and New Mexico to provide equitable treatment for producers in California and New Mexico.

Based on the comments that we received on the interim rule for Texas, it appears that the tuberculosis risk associated with the movement of nonbreeding cattle from modified accredited advanced States or zones

through feeder channels to slaughter is low and that identification requirements for certain cattle destined for slaughter may be unnecessary. We are developing a proposed rule to amend the regulations as a result of those comments; in order to provide time for that rulemaking to proceed, we are further delaying the date for compliance with the identification and certification requirements of § 77.10(b) and (d) for nonbreeding cattle from the States of Texas, California, and New Mexico, until further notice. As stated in the interim rule for Texas, this delay in compliance does not apply to the movement of cattle from the former modified accredited advanced zone in El Paso and Hudspeth Counties, TX.

**Authority:** 7 U.S.C. 8301–8317; 7 CFR 2.22, 2.80, and 371.4.

Done in Washington, DC, this 16th day of March, 2004.

**Kevin Shea,**

*Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.*

[FR Doc. 04–6326 Filed 3–19–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410–34–P**

## SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

### 17 CFR Part 240

#### General Rules and Regulations, Securities Exchange Act of 1934

##### *CFR Correction*

In Title 17 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 240 to End, revised as of April, 1, 2003, § 240.17Ad–17 is corrected by revising paragraph (a)(3)(ii) to read as follows:

##### **§ 240.17Ad–17 Transfer agents' obligation to search for lost securityholders.**

(a) \* \* \*

(3) \* \* \*

(ii) The aggregate value of assets listed in the lost securityholder's account, including all dividend, interest, and other payments due to the lost securityholder and all securities owned by the lost securityholder as recorded in the transfer agent's master securityholder files, is less than \$25; or

\* \* \* \* \*

[FR Doc. 04–55503 Filed 3–19–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1505–01–D**

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### Food and Drug Administration

#### 21 CFR Part 520

#### Oral Dosage Form New Animal Drugs; Omeprazole Paste

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to reflect approval of a new animal drug application (NADA) filed by Merial Ltd. The NADA provides for oral administration of omeprazole paste to horses for the prevention of gastric ulcers.

**DATES:** This rule is effective March 22, 2004.

##### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Melanie R. Berson, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV–110), Food and Drug Administration, 7500 Standish Pl., Rockville, MD 20855, 301–827–7540, e-mail: [mberson@cvm.fda.gov](mailto:mberson@cvm.fda.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Merial Ltd., 3239 Satellite Blvd., Bldg. 500, Duluth, GA 30096–4640, filed NADA 141–227 for ULCERGARD (omeprazole) Paste. The application provides for oral use of omeprazole paste in horses for the prevention of gastric ulcers. The NADA is approved as of February 18, 2004, and the regulations are amended in 21 CFR 520.1615 to reflect the approval. The basis of approval is discussed in the freedom of information summary.

In accordance with the freedom of information provisions of 21 CFR part 20 and 21 CFR 514.11(e)(2)(ii), a summary of safety and effectiveness data and information submitted to support approval of this application may be seen in the Division of Dockets Management (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852, between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Under section 512(c)(2)(F)(ii) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(c)(2)(F)(ii)), this approval qualifies for 3 years of marketing exclusivity beginning February 18, 2004.

The agency has determined under 21 CFR 25.33(d)(1) that this action is of a type that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, neither an environmental assessment