Signed in Washington, D.C. this 1st day of December 1997.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 97–32298 Filed 12–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

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 November, 1997.

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–33,797; SMS Textile Mills, Allentown, PA

TA–W–33,893; Simpson Industries, Jackson, MI

TA–W–33,815; Amity Dyeing & Finishing, Augusta, GA

TA–W–33,982; Gary Peterson Logging, Inc., Cascade, ID

TA–W–33,923; Timberline Lumber, Inc., Kalispell, MT

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

TA–W–33,933; University Technical Service, Inc., San Diego, CA

TA–W–33,879; Cygne Design, Inc., New York, NY

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

TA–W–33,890; Wolverine World Wide Hy-Test, Inc., Kirksville, MO

TA–W–33,909; Redco Foods, Inc., Little Falls, NY

TA–W–33,840; Energizer Power Systems, Gainesville, FL

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–33,675; J.G. Furniture Group, Inc., Quakertown, PA

The predominant cause of worker separations at the subject firm was caused by a transfer of production to other another existing domestic company facility.

TA–W–33,826; Chevron Fox Oil Team

TA–W–34,006; Packwood Lumber Co, A Subsidiary of Pacific Lumber and Shipping, Packwood, WA

TA–W–33,833; University Technical Service, Inc., San Diego, CA

TA–W–33,863; Batesville Casket Co., Campbellsville, KY

TA–W–33,573; The Bethlehem Corp., Easton, PA

TA–W–33,917; International Paper Co., Erie Mill, Erie, PA

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

TA–W–33,739; Tsumura International, A Subsidiary of Tsumura & Co., North Bergen, NJ

The subject company made a decision to sell a part of the business and to consolidate the functions of two leased facilities in New Jersey into an owned facility in Minnesota.

TA–W–33,952; Amesbury Group, Inc., Amesbury, MA

The investigation revealed that criteria (2) and criteria (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 sale 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–33,872; Franklin Furniture Corp., Greeneville, TN: September 22, 1996.

TA–W–33,899; Gandalf Systems Corp., Delran, NJ: September 26, 1996.

TA–W–33,657; O & H Manufacturing Co., Inc., Allentown, PA: June 30, 1996.

TA–W–33,956; Veratec, A Division of International Paper Co., Lewisburg, PA; October 10, 1996.

TA–W–33,960 & A; Wilhold, Sunbury, PA and Distribution Center, Milton, PA: October 20, 1996.

TA–W–33,915; DO Investment Corp., d/b/a Accudate Data Entry Operations, San Diego, CA: September 30, 1996.

TA–W–33,938 & TA–W–33,939; Lees Manufacturing Co., Cannon Falls, MN and KD Industries, Lees Manufacturing, Blountsville, AL: October 9, 1996.

TA–W–33,581; Pro Line Cap Co., Bowie, TX: May 9, 1996

TA–W–33,783; General Electric Co., Motors Div., General Electric Co Transformer Div., Fort Wayne, IN: July 19, 1997.

TA–W–33,898; Weyerhaeuser Wood Products, Plywood Division, Philadelphia, MS: October 3, 1996.

TA–W–33,868; About Sportswear, New York, NY: September 18, 1996.

TA–W–33,827; Standard Fittings (Jobs for St. Landry Parish, Inc), Opelousas, LA: September 11, 1996.

TA–W–33,931; The Stroh Brewery Co., St. Paul, MN: October 8, 1996.

TA–W–33,968; Pendleton Woolen Mills, Milwaukee, OR: October 23, 1996.

TA–W–33,966; Cason Manufacturing Co., Stephenville, TX: October 24, 1996.

TA–W–33,948; W.S.W. Company of Sharon, Inc., Bradford, TN: October 17, 1996.

TA–W–33,838; Elaine Benedict, Inc., Miami, FL: August 31, 1996.

TA–W–34,010; Parker Hannifin Co., Berea, KY: October 20, 1996.

TA–W–33,892; Port Clyde Canning Co., Rockland, ME: September 16, 1996.

Also, pursuant to Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (P.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 November, 1997.

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–01956; The Stroh Brewery Co., St. Paul, MN

NAFTA–TAA–02006; Gary Peterson Logging, Inc., Cascade, ID

NAFTA–TAA–01897; SMS Textile Mills, Allentown, PA

NAFTA–TAA–01758; Henry Franklin Green, Pahokee, FL

NAFTA–TAA–01962; Basler Electric, Corning Division, Corning, AR

NAFTA–TAA–02003; Packwood Lumber Co., a Subsidiary of Pacific Lumber and Shipping, Packwood, WA

NAFTA–TAA–01835; J.G. Furniture Group, Inc., Quakertown, PA

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

NAFTA–TAA–01793; Alpha Mills Corp., KXCF Division, Annville, PA

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

Affirmative Determinations NAFTA–TAA

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

NAFTA–TAA–01902; General Electric Co., Motors Division & Transformer Division, Frt Wayne, IN: November 19, 1997

NAFTA–TAA–01983; Sterling Stainless Tube Corp. (A Subsidiary of ITT Automotive), Englewood, CO: October 15, 1996

NAFTA–TAA–01990; Cason Manufacturing Co., Stephenville, TX: October 24, 1996

NAFTA–TAA–01948; Texas Instruments, Inc., Central Lake, MI: September 30, 1996

NAFTA–TAA–01952; JLG Industries, Inc., McConnellsburg, PA: October 6, 1996

I hereby certify that the aforementioned determinations were issued during the month of November, 1997. Copies of these determinations are available for inspection in Room C–4318, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20210, during normal business hours or will be mailed to persons who write to the above address.

Dated: December 2, 1997.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 97–32299 Filed 12–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–33,870]

Solvay Animal Health, Incorporated, Mendota Heights, Minnesota; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on October 6, 1997 in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at Solvay Animal Health, Incorporated, Mendota Heights, Minnesota.

The petitioners have requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose; and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 25th day of November 1997.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 97–32293 Filed 12–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–33,338]

The Standard Products Company, Lexington, Kentucky; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of July 25, 1997, the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implements of America—UAW requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding worker eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance, applicable to workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on June 5, 1997 and was published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 34711) on June 27, 1997.

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.

The request for reconsideration claims that some of the equipment in the Lexington, Kentucky was being sent to Georgetown, Canada to produce parts that were produced at the subject firm and that some machinery was being sent to Goldsboro, North Carolina and would later be sent to the company's plant in Mexico.

In order for the Department to issue a worker group certification, all of the group eligibility requirements of Section 222 of the Trade Act must be met. Review of the investigation findings show that criterion (3) was not met. Layoffs at the subject firm were the result of the consolidation of extruded and molded rubber sealing system component production from the subject firm into two other company-owned plants located domestically in Gaylord,