determined that the seven-day advance notice of the change to a meeting was not possible. See Commission rule 201.35(a), (c)(1) (19 CFR 201.35(a), (c)(1)).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marc A. Bernstein, Office of General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–3087, e-mail mbernstein@usitc.gov. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter may be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission believes that the respondents have justified the need for a closed session. A full discussion of information relating to the condition of the domestic industry, domestic and subject import shipment data, and pricing can only occur if a portion of the hearing is held in camera. Because much of this information is not publicly available, any discussion of issues relating to this information will necessitate disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI). Thus, such discussions can only occur if a portion of the hearing is held in camera. In making this decision, the Commission nevertheless reaffirms its belief that whenever possible its business should be conducted in public.

The hearing will include the usual public presentations by petitioner and by respondents, with questions from the Commission. In addition, the hearing will include an in camera session for a confidential presentation by respondents and for questions from the Commission relating to the BPI, followed by an in camera rebuttal presentation by petitioner. For any in camera session the room will be cleared of all persons except those who have been granted access to BPI under a Commission administrative protective order (APO) and are included on the Commission's APO service list in this investigation. See 19 CFR 201.35(b)(1), (2). The time for the parties' presentations and rebuttals in the in camera session will be taken from their respective overall allotments for the hearing. All persons planning to attend the in camera portions of the hearing should be prepared to present proper identification.

Authority: The General Counsel has certified, pursuant to Commission Rule 201.39 (19 CFR 201.39) that, in her opinion, a portion of the Commission's hearing in Extruded Rubber Thread from Malaysia, Inv. No. 753–TA–34, may be closed to the public to prevent the disclosure of BPI.

Issued: May 1, 1998.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–12014 Filed 5–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. No. 337–TA–383 (Bond Forfeiture/Return Proceeding]

In the Matter of Certain Hardware Logic Emulation Systems and Components Thereof; Notice of Referral to Administrative Law Judge of Complainant's Motion for Forfeiture of Respondents' Bonds and Respondents' Motion for Return of Their Bonds

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Commission has referred to the presiding administrative law judge complainant's motion for forfeiture of respondents' bonds posted during the temporary relief and Presidential review periods, and respondents' motion for return of those bonds in the above-captioned investigation.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter L. Sultan, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3152. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing the Commission's Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and Commission rule 210.50, 19 CFR 210.50.

This patent-based section 337 investigation was instituted on March 8, 1996, based upon a complaint and motion for temporary relief filed on January 26, 1996, by Quickturn Design Systems, Inc. (''Quickturn''). 61 FR 9486. The respondents are Mentor Graphics Corporation (''Mentor'') and Meta Systems (''Meta'') (collectively ''respondents''). On July 8, 1996, the presiding administrative law judge (''ALJ'') issued an initial determination (''ID'') granting Quickturn's motion for temporary relief. On August 5, 1996, the Commission determined not to modify or vacate the ID, issued a temporary limited exclusion order against respondents and a temporary cease and desist order against Mentor, and determined that the amount of respondents' bond during the pendency of temporary relief should be 43 percent of the entered value of imported hardware logic emulation systems and components thereof. On September 24, 1997, the Commission determined to modify respondents' temporary relief bond. Respondents' temporary relief bond remained at 43 percent of the entered value of the subject imported articles when the articles are appraised at transaction value (as defined in applicable U.S. Customs Service regulations), but increased to 180 percent of the entered value of the subject imported articles when the articles are appraised at other than transaction value.

On July 31, 1997, the ALJ issued a final ID finding that respondents have violated section 337 by infringing claims of all five of Quickturn's asserted patents. On that same date, the ALJ issued a recommended determination (''RD'') recommending the issuance of a permanent exclusion order and a cease and desist order. On October 2, 1997, the Commission issued its notice of the decision not to review the ALJ's final ID, thereby finding that respondents are in violation of section 337. On December 3, 1997, the Commission issued a permanent limited exclusion order directed to Meta and a permanent cease and desist order against domestic respondent Mentor.

On February 26, 1998, Quickturn filed a motion for forfeiture of respondents' temporary relief bonds. On March 13, 1998, respondents filed an opposition to Quickturn's motion and a motion for the return of their bonds. On that same date, the Commission investigative attorneys filed a response in support of Quickturn's motion. The Commission has referred these motions to Administrative Law Judge Paul Luckern for adjudication in an initial determination to be issued within nine months. Pursuant to rule 210.50(d) (19 CFR 210.50(d)), the ALJ's initial determination shall have a 45-day effective date and shall be subject to review under the provisions of Commission rules 210.42 through 210.45, 19 CFR 210.42–210.45.

Copies of all nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. General information

concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (http://www.usitc.gov).

Issued April 28, 1998.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98–12011 Filed 5–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DOJ)

President's Advisory Board on Race; Meeting

ACTION: President's Advisory Board on Race; notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The President's Advisory Board on Race will meet from approximately 9:00 am to Noon on May 19, 1998 in Washington, D.C. at a site to be determined to discuss issues relating to race and crime and the administration of justice. The meeting will include a panel discussion with national experts.

The public is welcome to attend the Advisory Board meeting on a first-come, first-seated basis. Members of the public may also submit to the contact person, any time before or after the meeting, written statements to the Board. Written comments may be submitted by mail, telegram, facsimile, or electronic mail, and should contain the writer's name, address and commercial, government, or organizational affiliation, if any. The address of the President's Initiative on Race is 750 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20503. The electronic mail address is http://www.whitehouse.gov/Initiatives/OneAmerica.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Contact our main office number, (202) 395–1010, for the exact time and location of the meetings. Other comments or questions regarding this meeting may be directed to Randy D. Ayers, (202) 395–1010, or via facsimile, (202) 395–1020.

Dated: May 1, 1998.

Randy Ayers,

Executive Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–12040 Filed 5–5–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

[Civil Action No. 98–CIV–2716]

Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement United States of America, State of New York, and State of Illinois v. Sony Corporation of America, LTM Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Loews Theatres, Cineplex Odeon Corporation, and J.E. Seagram Corp.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 98–CIV–2716. The proposed Final Judgment is subject to approval by the Court after the expiration of the statutory 60-day public comment period and compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h).

The United States, the State of New York, and the State of Illinois filed a civil antitrust Complaint on April 16, 1998, alleging that the proposed merger of LTM Holdings, Inc. (''Loews'') and Cineplex Odeon Corporation (''Cineplex'') would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The Complaint alleges that the proposed merger would have combined the first and second largest theatre chains in Manhattan and Chicago. In Manhattan and Chicago, the combined chains would have had market shares, by revenue, of 67 percent and 77 percent, respectively. The complaint states that the merger would have reduced competition in both markets, leading to higher ticket prices and reduced theatre quality for first-run movies. It also would have allowed the newly merged firm to reduce competition by lowering film rentals paid to distributors for first-run movies.

The prayer for relief seeks: (a) Adjudication that the proposed merger would violate Section 7 of the Clayton Act; (b) permanent injunctive relief preventing the consummation of the proposed merger; (c) an award to each plaintiff of the costs of the action; and (d) such other relief as is proper.

A Stipulation and Order and a proposed Final Judgment were filed with the court at the same time the Complaint was filed. The proposed Final Judgment requires Loews and Cineplex to divest 14 theatres in Manhattan and 11 theatres in the Chicago area to a buyer or buyers, acceptable to the United States (after consultation with the State of New York or the State of Illinois as the case may be), that will continue to operate them as movie theatres. Unless the United States grants a time extension, the divestitures must be completed within one-hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the filing of the Complaint in this matter or five (5) days after notice of the entry of the Final Judgment by the Court, whichever is later.

If the divestitures are not completed within the divestiture period, the Court, upon application of the United States, is to appoint a trustee selected by the United States to sell the assets. The proposed Final Judgment also requires that, until the divestitures mandated by the Final Judgment have been accomplished, Loews and Cineplex must maintain and operate the 25 theatres to be divested as active competitors, maintain the management, staffing, sales, and marketing of the theatres, and maintain the theatres in operable condition at current capacity configurations. Further, the proposed Final Judgment requires defendants to give the United States prior notice regarding future motion picture theatre acquisitions in Manhattan or Cook County, Illinois.

The plaintiffs and the defendants have stipulated that the proposed Final Judgment may be entered after compliance with the APPA. Entry of the proposed Final Judgment would terminate this action, except that the Court would retain jurisdiction to construe, modify, or enforce the provisions of the proposed Final Judgment and to punish violations thereof.

A Competitive Impact Statement filed by the United States describes the Complaint, the proposed Final Judgment, and remedies available to private litigants.

Public comment is invited within the statutory 60-day comment period. Such comments, and the responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Written comments should be directed to Craig W. Conrath, Chief, Merger Task Force, Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street, NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–307–0001).

Copies of the Complaint, Stipulation and Order, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection in Room 215 of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 325 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: 202–514–2481) and at the office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, 500 Pearl Street, New York, NY 10007.