NAFTA–TAA–01624; Corning, Inc., Greenville, OH

NAFTA–TAA–01599; Rayovac Corp., Kinston, NC

NAFTA–TAA–01620; Damrow Co., Inc., GEA Group, Fond Du Lac, WI

NAFTA–TAA–01553; Associated Milk Producers, Inc., El Paso, TX

NAFTA–TAA–01634; Pine Hill Plastics, Inc., McMinnville, TN

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–01584; M & W Sewing, Inc., Brooklyn, NY: March 19, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–01641; Champion Products, Inc., Perry, NY: April 14, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–01644; Rockwood Sportswear, Inc., Rockwood, TN: April 30, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–01637; Mundet-Hermetite, Inc., Lexington, VA: April 16, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–01667; Special Plastic Products, L.L.C., Fair Haven, MI: April 16, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–01588; Collins & Aikman, U.S. Automotive Carpet Div., Port Huron, MI: March 25, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–01590; Lacy Diversified Industries, Jessup Door Co. Div., Dowagiac, MI: March 19, 1996.

NAFTA–TAA–01659; CNI, Inc., Port Huron Plant No. 1, Port Huron, MI: May 9, 1996

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of May 1997. 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: May 30, 1997.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97–16924 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–32,949; TA–W–32,950]

Barclay Home Products, Cherokee, NC and Robbinsville, NC; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By letter of April 9, 1997, a former employee of the subject firm requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to petition numbers TA–W–32,949 and TA–W–32,950. The denial notice was signed on February 7, 1997 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 12, 1997 (62 FR 11472).

The petitioner presents new evidence that the Department's survey of the subject firm's customers was incomplete.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed at Washington, DC this 13th day of June 1997.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97–16925 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–33,552]

Cascade Woolen Mill, Inc. Oakland, ME; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on June 2, 1997 in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at Cascade Woolen Mill, Inc., Oakland, Maine.

The petitioning group of workers are subject to an ongoing investigation for which a determination has not yet been issued (TA–W–33,527). Consequently further investigation in this case would serve no purpose; and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 9th day of June, 1997.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97–16922 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–2–33,015]

Sunbeam Corporation Cookeville, TN; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated April 12, 1997, the company requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding worker eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance. The denial notice applicable to workers of the subject firm located in Cookeville, Tennessee, was signed on April 8, 1997 and published in the **Federal Register** on May 2, 1997 (62 FR 24134).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

Findings of the initial investigation showed that workers of Sunbeam Corporation in Cookeville produced armatures and fields for electric motors used in small kitchen appliances. The Department's denial of TAA for workers of the subject firm was based on the fact that the ''contributed importantly'' test of the Group Eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The articles produced by Sunbeam at the Cookeville plant were shipped to other Sunbeam facilities for assembly into small kitchen appliances. Sunbeam did not import component parts.

The company claims that the majority of the production at the Cookeville facility was shifted to a foreign facility. The components are being assembled into small kitchen appliances and are reentering the Untied States. Therefore,

the company believes that the workers should be certified eligible to apply for TAA.

The Department must examine the impact of imports of products like and directly competitive with articles produced at the subject firm. In this case, the workers at the Cookeville plant produced components. Small kitchen appliances cannot be considered like or directly competitive with armatures and fields for electric motors.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 12th day of June 1997.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97–16928 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–33,107]

Systems & Electronics, Incorporated West Plains, MO; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application dated March 26, 1997, the IAMAW Local #2782 requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding worker eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance. The denial notice applicable to workers of the subject firm located in West Plains, Missouri was signed on March 14, 1997 and published in the **Federal Register** on March 31, 1997 (62 FR 15199).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

Findings of the initial investigation showed that workers of Systems & Electronics, Incorporated, located in West Plains, Missouri produced electronic sub-assemblies (Integrated Mail Handling System, Dual Pass Rough Cull, M1000 Tank Transporter, Patriot Canisters and M860A1 Semitrailers) primarily for the U.S. Army and the U.S. Postal Service. The Department's denial of TAA for workers of the subject firm was based on the fact ''that the contributed importantly'' test of the Group Eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 was not met.

On reconsideration the Department of Labor surveyed the major declining customers of the subject firm regarding their purchases of Integrated Mail Handling System, Dual Pass Rough Cull, M1000 Tank Transporter, Patriot Canisters and M860A1 Semitrailers. The respondents reported no imports in the relevant period.

The investigation also revealed that the separation of the workers was because the company does not have a continuous product line but performs work on contracts as received and workers are separated as contracts are done.

In order to determine worker eligibility, the Department must examine imports of products like or directly competitive with those articles produced at the West Plains, Missouri location.

The request for reconsideration claims that the Department did not consider the contracts awarded to Mexico and Israeli Countries. Under reconsideration we learned that the contracts that was awarded to Mexico and Israel were done as a contract basis and those product were not imported back to the United States either by the company or by their customers.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC this 12th day of June, 1997.

Russell T. Kile,

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

[FR Doc. 97–16926 Filed 6–26–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Employment and Training Administration is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension of the collection of the ETA 9048, Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Activity, and the ETA 9049, Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Outcomes. A copy of the proposed information collection request (ICR) can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the addressee section of this notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addressee section below on or before August 26, 1997.

The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;
- Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology,