The proposed Final Judgment is designed to eliminate the automatic differential clause from defendant's individual contracts for the provision of ocean liner transportation services with shippers or shippers' associations. Under Section IV of the proposed Final Judgment, Lykes is restrained and enjoined from maintaining, adopting, agreeing to, abiding by, or enforcing an automatic rate differential clause in any contract when acting in its capacity as an independent carrier. Section IX of the proposed Final Judgment provides for an initial term of five years, which the United States in its sole discretion may extend up to five additional years. Section V(A) nullifies any automatic rate differential clauses currently in effect in any of Lykes' contracts as an independent ocean carrier.

The proposed Final Judgment does not affect any contracts of any conference in which Lykes is member, and it does not limit Lykes' ability to participate in any conference contracts that contain such a clause. Section V(B)(1–2).

Section VI of the proposed Final Judgment requires Lykes to send a copy of the Final Judgment to each shipper whose contract with Lykes, as an independent carrier, contains an automatic rate differential clause, and to send a copy of the Final Judgment to any other shipper or shippers' association that requests an automatic rate differential clause. Section VI also obligates Lykes to maintain an antitrust compliance program that meets the obligations specified in Section VI(C). The Final Judgment also contains provisions, in Section VII, obligating Lykes to certify its compliance with specified obligations of Sections V and VI of the Final Judgment. In addition, Section VIII of the Final Judgment sets forth a series of measures by which the plaintiff may have access to information needed to determine or secure Lykes' compliance with the Final Judgment.

The relief in the proposed Final Judgment removes the contractual clause that requires Lykes to place in essence a 5% ''tax'' on the shipping costs of Universal's competitors. It restores to Universal's competitors the ability to compete for the lowest shipping prices.

IV.

Alternative to the Proposed Final Judgment

The alternative to the proposed Final Judgment would be a full trial on the merits of the case. In the view of the Department of Justice, such a trial would involve substantial costs to both the United States and Lykes and is not warranted because the proposed Final Judgment provides relief that will fully remedy the violations of the Sherman Act alleged in the United States' Complaint.

V.

Remedies Available to Private Litigants

Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15, provides that any person who has been injured as a result of conduct prohibited by the antitrust laws may bring suit in federal court to recover three times the damage suffered, as well as costs and reasonable attorney's fees. Entry of the proposed Final Judgment will neither impair nor assist in the bringing of such actions. Under the provisions of Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 16(a), the proposed Final Judgment has no *prima facie* effect in any subsequent action that may be brought against the defendant in this matter.

VI.

Procedures Available for Modification of the Proposed Final Judgment

As provided by the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, any person believing that the proposed Judgment should be modified may submit written comments to Roger W. Fones, Chief; Transportation, Energy, and Agriculture Section; Department of Justice; Antitrust Division; Judiciary Center Building, Room 9104; 55 Fourth Street, N.W.; Washington, D.C. 20001, within the 60-day period provided by the Act. Comments received, and the Government's responses to them, will be filed with the Court and published in the Federal Register. All comments will be given due consideration by the Department of Justice, which remains free, pursuant to Paragraph 2 of the Stipulation, to withdraw its consent to the proposed Final Judgment at any time before its entry if the Department should determine that some modification of the Judgment is warranted in the public interests. The proposed Judgment itself provides that the Court will retain jurisdiction over this action, and that the parties may apply to the Court for such orders as may be necessary or appropriate for the modification, interpretation, or enforcement of the Judgment.

VII.

Determinative Documents

No materials and documents of the type described in Section 2(b) of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b), were considered in formulating the proposed Judgment, consequently, none are filed herewith.

Dated: September 26, 1995.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele B. Felasco,

Attorney, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 95–24750 Filed 10–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–29,639]

Gould Shawmut a/k/a Gould Electronics, Inc. Marble Falls, Texas; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Notice of Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on May 26, 1994, applicable to workers of the subject firm. The certification was amended on August 4, 1995 to reflect a corporate name change. The amended notice was published in the Federal Register on August 16, 1995 (60 FR 30618).

At the request of State Agency, the Department is expanding coverage of the certification to include all workers at the Marble Falls location. The workers produce electronic components. New findings show that worker layoffs were not limited to the fuseholder production line.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Gould Shawmut in Marble Falls, Texas who were affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–29,639 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Gould Shawmut, a/k/a Gould Electronics, Inc., Marble Falls, Texas who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 1, 1993, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 22nd day of September 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

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

[FR Doc. 95–24769 Filed 10–4–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M