Dated: October 3, 1997.

Gerald R. Bastoni,

Executive Director, Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal NHC Commission.

[FR Doc. 97–26793 Filed 10–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–PE–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Notice of Proposed Information Collection

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is announcing its intention to request renewed approval for the collection of information under 30 CFR part 850 which provides authority for State regulatory authorities to develop a blaster certification program.

DATES: Comments on the proposed information collection must be received by December 8, 1997, to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to John A. Trelease, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, 1951 Constitution Ave, NW, Room 210—SIB, Washington, DC 20240. Comments may also be submitted electronically to jtreleas@osmre.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request a copy of the information collection request, explanatory information and related forms, contact John A. Trelease, at (202) 208–2783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regulations at 5 CFR 1320, which implementing provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13), require that interested members of the public and affected agencies have an opportunity to comment on information collection and recordkeeping activities (see 5 CFR 1320.8 (d). This notice identifies information collections that OSM will be submitting to OMB for extension. These collections are contained in 30 CFR 850, Permanent regulatory program requirements—standards for certifications of blasters.

OSM revised burden estimates, where appropriate, to reflect current reporting levels or adjustments based on reestimates of burden or respondents. OSM will request a 3-year term of approval for each information collection activity.

Comments are invited on: (1) The need for the collection of information for the performance of the functions of the agency; (2) the accuracy of the agency's burden estimates; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information collection; and (4) ways to minimize the information collection burden on respondents, such as use of automated means of collection of the information. A summary of the public comments will accompany OSM's submission of the information collection request to OMB

The following information is provided for the information collection: (1) Title of the information collection; (2) ONB control number; (3) summary of the information collection activity; and (4) frequency of collection, description of the respondents, estimated total annual responses, and the total annual reporting and recordkeeping burden for the collection of information.

Title: Permanent regulatory program requirements—standards for certification of blasters, 30 CFR 850.

OMB Control Number: 1029–0080.

Summary: This part establishes the requirements and procedures applicable to the development of regulatory programs for the training, examination, and certification of persons engaging in or directly responsible for the use of explosives in surface coal mining operations.

Bureau Form Number: None.

Frequency of Collection: Once.

Description of Respondents: State governments.

Total Annual Responses: 1.

Total Annual Burden Hours: 1.

Dated: October 6, 1997.

Richard G. Bryson,

Chief, Division of Regulatory Support.

[FR Doc. 97–26802 Filed 10–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Agency for International Development

Notice of Public Information Collections Submitted to OMB for Review

SUMMARY: U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has submitted the following information collections to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104–13. Comments regarding this information collection are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Comments should be addressed to: Desk Officer for USAID, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Washington, D.C. 20523. Copies of submission may be obtained by calling (202) 712–1765.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

OMB Number: OMB 0412–0012.

Form Number: Form AID 282.

Title: Supplier's Certificate Agreement with the U.S. Agency for International Development—Invoice and Contract Abstract.

Type of Submission: Renew.

Purpose: The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) finances goods and related services under its Commodity Import Program which are contracted for by public and private entities in the countries receiving the USAID Assistance. Since USAID is not a party to these contracts, USAID needs some means to collect information directly from the suppliers of the goods and related services and to enable USAID to take an appropriate action against them in the event they do not comply with the applicable regulations. USAID does this by securing from the suppliers, as a condition for the disbursement of funds a certificate and agreement with USAID which contains appropriate representations by the suppliers.

Annual Reporting Burden:

Respondents: 400,

Total Annual responses: 3,600,

Total annual hours requested: 1,800.

OMB Number: OMB 0412–0510.

Form Number: N/A.

Title: Administrative of Assistance Awards to U.S. Non-Governmental Organizations, 22 CFR 226, and USAID's Automated Directive System, Chapter 303.

Type of Submission: Renew.

Purpose: Section 635(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) authorizes USAID to make grants and cooperative agreements with any organization and within limits of the FAA. Most of the information that USAID requests of its recipients is necessary to fulfill the requirement that USAID, as Federal Agency, ensure prudent management of public funds under all of its assistance instruments. The pre-award information is necessary to assure that funds are provided for programs that further the purposes of the FAA and that the recipients have the capability to manage the program administratively and financially. The administration (post-award) requirements are based on the need to assure that the program is functioning adequately, the funds are managed properly and that statutory

and regulatory requirement are complied with.

Annual Reporting Burden:
Respondents: 400,
Total Annual responses: 37,400,
Total annual hours requested: 1,100.

OMB Number: OMB 0412–0551.
Form Number: N/A.
Title: U.S. Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulations (AIDAR) Clause 752.70.26 Reports.
Type of Submission: Revision of currently approved collection.
Purpose: Section 635(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) authorizes USAID to make contract with any cooperative, international organization, or other body or persons in or out of the United States in furtherance of the purposes and within the limitations of the FAA. To determine how well contractors are performing to meet the requirements of the contract, USAID requires periodic performance reports from contractors. The performance report requirements are contained in the USAID clause new AIDAR reports (October 1996).

Annual Reporting Burden:
Respondents: 350,
Total Annual responses: 2,000,
Total annual hours requested: 8,000.

Dated: October 1, 1997.

Willette L. Smith,

Acting Chief, Information and Records Division, Office of Administrative Services, Bureau of Management.

[FR Doc. 97–26808 Filed 10–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6116–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

[Civil Action No. 1:97CV01515]

Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment United States v. Raytheon Company, et al.

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)(h), the United States of America hereby publishes below the comments received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States* v. *Raytheon Company, et al.*, Civil Action No. 1: 97CV01515, filed in the United States District for the District of Columbia, together with the United States' response to the comments.

Copies of the comments and responses are available for inspection in Room 215 of the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 7th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530, telephone: (202) 514–2481, and at the office of the Clerk of the United States District of Columbia, United States Courthouse, Third Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Copies of any of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street, City Center Building, Washington, DC 20530.

September 26, 1997.

John Heston, Senior MMIC Designer,
David Heston, Technical Director Space Programs,
Texas Instruments, Inc., 13510 North Central Expressway, MS 209, Dallas, Texas 75265

Re: *United States, et al.* v. *Raytheon Company, et al.; Civil Action No.: 1:97CV01515 (District of Columbia, July 2, 1997)*

Dear Messrs. John Heston and David Heston: This letter responds to your letter of August 4, 1997, commenting on the proposed Final Judgment in the above-captioned civil antitrust case challenging the acquisition by Raytheon Company of Texas Instruments' Defense Systems and Electronics Unit. The Complaint alleges that the acquisition violates Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. Section 18, because it is likely substantially to lessen competition in the manufacture and sale of gallium arsenide monolithic microwave integrated circuits (MMICs) in the United States. Under the proposed Final Judgment, the defendants are required to divest Texas Instruments' Defense Systems and Electronics Unit MMICs business located in Dallas, Texas.

In your letter, you expressed concern that the proposed Final Judgment may degrade national security, cause prices of MMICs to increase substantially, eliminate efficiencies, slow technological development of MMICs as well as transmit and receive modules (TR modules), which house the MMICs, and harm synergies between the development of MMICs and TR modules. Your letter recommended approval of the proposed acquisition, or in the alternative, that Texas Instruments' Defense Systems and Electronics Unit TR module business be divested along with the MMICs business.

With regards to the national security issue, the U.S. Department of Justice and the Department of Defense (DoD) found no evidence that challenging this transaction would compromise national security. After a thorough investigation, the Antitrust Division and DoD concluded that the proposed transaction, if not blocked, might lead to higher prices for MMICs. In addition, access to these critical components of advanced radar systems might be foreclosed to Raytheon's radar competitors, thereby, increasing DoD's costs for new radar programs. These radars are an important part of our nation's defense.

The MMIC cost increases you project, should the acquisition not occur, are not supported by the evidence obtained in the Department's investigation. Indeed, the very MMIC and TR module synergies you hypothesize that would be obtained from the acquisition will likely also be obtained by an alternative purchaser. For example, if the alternative purchaser is a commercial MMIC and/or TR module supplier, the design and capacity utilization efficiencies you discuss should accrue to that purchaser as well. Under these circumstances, the costs of MMICs will not increase and, ultimately, may decline. Moreover, there is little incentive for the commercial alternative purchaser to spurn military business, as you claim, especially in view of the excess capacity in the industry.

This same rational applies to the likelihood of advancement of the MMIC and TR module technology. As you point out, DoD programs require state-of-the-art MMICs and TR modules. First, technological advancements should be enhanced by maintaining competition in the industry not by eliminating it. Second, ''cost plus'' contracts, which are common in military procurement, by themselves will not ensure low costs or more technological development without ample competition in the marketplace. Without competition, there is little incentive to keep costs down or innovate in MMICs or TR modules. Third, Raytheon, by acquiring the Texas Instruments' TR module business, likely will achieve efficiencies in the research and development and production of its TR modules and MMICs making the achievement of ''cross functional technology breakthroughs'' possible.

Finally, because our investigation found that competition in the TR module industry is robust and that the MMIC business could easily be segregated for purposes of divestiture, sale of the entire R/F Microwave Unit, as you propose, is not required.

The Antitrust Division appreciates you bringing your concerns to our attention and hopes that this response will alleviate them. While the Department understands your positions, we believe that the proposed Final Judgment will adequately address the competitive concerns created by the Raytheon's acquisition of Texas Instruments' Defense Systems and Electronics Unit. Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, a copy of your letter and this response will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court.

Thank you for your interest in the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Sincerely yours,

J. Robert Kramer II,

Chief, Litigation II Section.

To: J. Robert Kramer
From: John Heston, Senior MMIC designer RTIS, David Heston, Technical Director Space Programs RTIS

Claim: We claim that the July 2 order of the Department of Justice (97 1515) to break up the R/F Microwave business unit of Raytheon TI Systems (i.e. divestiture of the 'MMIC Business') will degrade the national security in both the short term and long term. It is our premise that the Department of Justice made a premature decision due to time pressures, political pressures, and lack of complete information. This paper presents additional information relevant to the Department of Justice decision and asks for reconsideration.