at the hearing. All parties and nonparties desiring to appear at the hearing and make oral presentations should attend a prehearing conference to be held at 9:30 a.m. on December 18, 1996, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building. Oral testimony and written materials to be submitted at the public hearing are governed by sections 201.6(b)(2), 201.13(f), and 207.24 of the Commission's rules. Parties must submit any request to present a portion of their hearing testimony *in camera* no later than 7 days prior to the date of the hearing.

Written Submissions

Each party who is an interested party shall submit a prehearing brief to the Commission. Prehearing briefs must conform with the provisions of section 207.23 of the Commission's rules; the deadline for filing is December 20, 1996. Parties may also file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the hearing, as provided in section 207.24 of the Commission's rules, and posthearing briefs, which must conform with the provisions of section 207.25 of the Commission's rules. The deadline for filing posthearing briefs is January 14, 1997; witness testimony must be filed no later than three days before the hearing. In addition, any person who has not entered an appearance as a party to the investigation may submit a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of the investigations on or before January 14, 1997. On January 28, 1997, the Commission will make available to parties all information on which they have not had an opportunity to comment. Parties may submit final comments on this information on or before January 30, 1997, but such final comments must not contain new factual information and must otherwise comply with section 207.30 of the Commission's rules. All written submissions must conform with the provisions of section 201.8 of the Commission's rules; any submissions that contain BPI must also conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules.

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the Commission's rules, each document filed by a party to the investigation must be served on all other parties to the investigation (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: This investigation is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.21 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: September 20, 1996.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–24597 Filed 9–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[Investigation No. 731–TA–750 (Preliminary)]

Vector Supercomputers From Japan

Determination

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject investigation, the Commission determines, pursuant to section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)), that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury [2] by reason of imports from Japan of vector supercomputers, provided for in heading 8471 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).

Commencement of Final Phase Investigation

Pursuant to section 207.18 of the Commission's rules, as amended in 61 FR 37818 (July 22, 1996), the Commission also gives notice of the commencement of the final phase of its investigation. The Commission will issue a final phase notice of scheduling which will be published in the Federal Register as provided in section 207.21 of the Commission's rules upon notice from the Department of Commerce (Commerce) of an affirmative preliminary determination in the investigation under section 703(b) of the Act, or, if the preliminary determination is negative, upon notice of an affirmative final determination in that investigation under section 705(a) of the Act. Parties that filed entries of appearance in the preliminary phase of the investigation need not enter a separate appearance for the final phase of the investigation. Industrial users, and, if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level, representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to the investigation.

Background

On July 29, 1996, a petition was filed with the Commission and the Department of Commerce by Cray Research, Inc., Eagan, MN, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of LTFV imports of vector supercomputers from Japan. Accordingly, effective July 29, 1996, the Commission instituted antidumping Investigation No. 731–TA–750 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigation and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register of August 7, 1996 (61 FR 41181). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on August 20, 1996, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on September 12, 1996. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 2993 (September 1996), entitled ''Vector Supercomputers from Japan: Investigation No. 731–TA–750 (Preliminary).''

Issued: September 18, 1996.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–24596 Filed 9–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

---

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

[2] Commissioner Nuzum dissenting and Commissioners Watson and Crawford not participating.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of Determinations Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and NAFTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance for workers (TA–W) issued during the period of August and September, 1996.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for

worker adjustment assistance to be issued, each of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Act must be met.

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, have become totally or partially separated,

(2) That sales or production, or both, of the firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely, and

(3) That increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have contributed importantly to the separations, or threat thereof, and to the absolute decline in sales or production.

Negative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met. A survey of customers indicated that increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA–W–32,588 & A,B,C,D,E; Burlington Industries, Inc., Knitted Fabric Div., Greensboro, NC, Wake Forest, NC, Denton, NC, Rocky Mount, NC, Cramerton, NC, New York, NY

TA–W–32,504; H.S. Novelty, Fultonville, NY

TA–W–32,514; Weyerhauser Containerboard Packaging Co., Buffalo, NY

TA–W–32,482; Team 95, Jamestown, TN

TA–W–32,591; Island Falls Cedar Products, Island Falls, ME

TA–W–32,576; Bethlehem Steel Corp., Including the Following Divisions; Bethlehem Structural Products Corp., Bethforge, Inc., Bethlehem Roll Corp., PB & NE Subsidiary Railroad Co., Bethlehem, PA

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

TA–W–32,409; Faberware, Inc., Bronx, NY

Increased imports did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the firm.

TA–W–32,619; Ontario Enterprises, Inc., Ontario, CA

TA–W–32,537; Cape Cod/Cricket Lane, Pleasant Shade, TN

TA–W–32,616; U.S. Bureau of Mines, Mineral Availability Field Office, Lakewood, CO

The workers firm does not produce an article as required for certification under Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

TA–W–32,672; Oxford International Ltd, Oxford Speaker Co., Chicago, IL

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) has not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification.

TA–W–32,505; St. Marys Carbon Co., St. Marys, PA

The investigation revealed that criterion (2) and Criterion (3) have not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification. Increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm or appropriate subdivision have not contributed importantly to the separations or threat thereof, and the absolute decline in sales or production.

Affirmative Determinations for Worker Adjustment Assistance

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name & location for each determination references the impact date for all workers for such determination.

TA–W–32,550; J & M Apparel, Inc., Finger, TN: June 21, 1995

TA–W–32,587; Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Green, OH

All workers totally or partially separated from employment on or after July 15, 1995 are certified.

All workers engaged in the production of air springs are denied.

TA–W–32,639; Magnetek Manufacturing, Mendenhall, MS: July 30, 1995.

TA–W–32,661; Jo-Nez Apparel, Inc., Tompkinsville, KY: August 6, 1995.

TA–W–32,627; ABS Global, Inc., Deforest, WI: July 27, 1995.

TA–W–32,598; Strick Corp., Casa Grande, AZ: July 18, 1996.

TA–W–32,556; Lodestar Industrial Contractors, Limited, Colville, WA: July 3, 1995.

TA–W–32,538; Ithaca Industries, Inc., Sylvania, GA: June 17, 1995.

TA–W–32,486; Ambrose Uniform Div. of Best Manufacturing Co., Cordele, GA: May 15, 1995

TA–W–32,531; Norco Windows, Inc., (Formerly a Div. of Trust Joist International), Hawkins, WI: June 19, 1995.

TA–W–32,454; Gartal Belt DBA General Belt, New York, NY

TA–W–32,578; Seagrave Leather Corp., East Wilton, ME: June 25, 1995.

TA–W–32,529; Magnetic Engineering, Inc., Manitou Springs, CO: June 20, 1995.

TA–W–32,544; Suburban Apparel AKA Central Fashions, Orange, NJ: June 26, 1995.

TA–W–32,545; Remington Arms Co., Inc., Ilion, NY: June 21, 1995.

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Pub. L. 103–182) concerning transitional adjustment assistance hereinafter called (NAFTA–TAA) and in accordance with Section 250(a) Subchapter D, Chapter 2, Title II, of the Trade Act as amended, the Department of Labor presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA issued during the month of August and September, 1996.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for NAFTA–TAA the following group eligibility requirements of Section 250 of the Trade Act must be met:

(1) That a significant number or proportion of the workers in the workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision thereof, (including workers in any agricultural firm or appropriate subdivision thereof) have become totally or partially separated from employment and either—

(2) That sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely,

(3) That imports from Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have increased, and that the increases in imports contributed importantly to such workers' separations or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

(4) That there has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to Mexico or Canada of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by the firm or subdivision.

Negative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

In each of the following cases the investigation revealed that criteria (3) and (4) were not met. Imports from Canada or Mexico did not contribute importantly to workers' separations. There was no shift in production from the subject firm to Canada or Mexico during the relevant period.

NAFTA–TAA–01165; Devro-Teepak, Inc., Danville, IL

NAFTA–TAA–01142; Bethlehem Steel Corp: Bethlehem Structural Products Corp., Beth Forge, Inc., Bethlehem Roll Corp., PB & NE Subsidiary Railroad Co

NAFTA–TAA–01188; Apex Mold and Engineering, Inc., Sterling Heights, MI

NAFTA–TAA–01130; American Coastal Tes Marine, Inc., Everson, WA

NAFTA–TAA–01167; Remington Arms Co., Inc., Firearms Manufacturing, Ilion, NY

NAFTA–TAA–01157; Disk maintenance d/b/a Circuit Test, Inc., Haverhill, MA

NAFTA–TAA–01159; Runnymede Mills, Inc., Tarboro, NC

In the following cases, the investigation revealed that the criteria for eligibility have not been met for the reasons specified.

None.

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

The following certifications have been issued; the date following the company name & location for each determination references the impact date for all workers for such determination.

NAFTA–TAA–01136; The Safety Stitch, Inc., Harrisville, WV: June 14, 1995.

NAFTA–TAA–01146; Technical Ceramics Laboratories, Inc., A Div. of Carpenter Technology Corp., Alpharetta, GA: July 5, 1995.

NAFTA–TAA–01179; V.R. Fashions, Inc., Waco, TX: August 12, 1995.

NAFTA–TAA–01177: J.E. Morgan Knitting Mills, Inc. Div. of Dawson International—PLC, Tamaqua, PA: August 8, 1995.

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of August & September, 1996. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–4318, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210 during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: September 10, 1996.

Curtis K. Kooser,

Acting Program Manager, Policy & Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 96–24541 Filed 9–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

[TA–W–32,486]

Ambrose Uniform, Division of Best Manufacturing Company, Ambrose, Georgia; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on August 28, 1996, applicable to all workers of Ambrose Uniform, Division of Best Manufacturing Company, Cordele, Georgia. The notice will soon be published in the Federal Register.

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that the Department's worker certification incorrectly identified the affected workers as being located in Cordele, Georgia. The worker separations took place at the subject firm's Ambrose Plant in Ambrose, Georgia. The workers were engaged in the production of lab coats and shirts. The company reports that no worker layoffs have occurred in Cordele, Georgia.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include those workers of Ambrose Uniform, Division of Best Manufacturing Company, Ambrose, Georgia, adversely affected by imports. Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to exclude workers at the subject firms' division in Cordele, Georgia and include the workers at the Ambrose, Georgia location.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–32,486 is hereby issued as follows:

''All workers of Ambrose Uniform, Division of Best Manufacturing Company, Ambrose, Georgia, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after May 15, 1995 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.''

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 12th day of September 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 96–24536 Filed 9–24–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

Petitions have been filed with the Secretary of Labor under Section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (''the Act'') and are identified in the Appendix to this notice. Upon receipt of these petitions, the Program Manager of the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, has instituted investigations pursuant to Section 221(a) of the Act.

The purpose of each of the investigations is to determine whether the workers are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act. The investigations will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved.

The petitioners or any other persons showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigations may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than October 7, 1996.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of the investigations to the Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than October 7, 1996.

The petitions filed in this case are available for inspection at the Office of the Program Manager, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 3rd day of September, 1996.

Curtis K. Kooser,

Acting Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

APPENDIX—PETITIONS INSTITUTED ON 09/03/96

TA–W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of petition	Product(s)
32,690	Bruckner Manufacturing (Co.)	Bronx, NY	07/29/96	Stainless Steel Cookware.
32,691	Smith Corona Corp. (Co.)	Cortland, NY	08/20/96	Typewriters, Word Processors.
32,692	Tuboscope Vetco (Wkrs)	Corpus Christi, TX	08/25/96	Inspection Services to Oil & Gas Co.
32,693	Decotech Innovations (Wkrs)	Marion, NC	08/20/96	Cloth and Yarn.