carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings, provided for in subheading 7307.93.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that have been found by the Department of Commerce to be subsidized by the Governments of India and Israel. The Commission also determines pursuant to section 735(b) of the Act that an industry in the United States is not materially injured or threatened with material injury, and the establishment of an industry in the United States is not materially retarded, by reason of imports from France,[2] India, Israel, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea, Thailand,[3] the United Kingdom, or Venezuela of certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings that have been found by the Department of Commerce to be sold in the United States at LTFV.

Background

The Commission instituted countervailing duty investigations Nos. 701–TA–360 and 361 (Final) effective June 1, 1994, following preliminary determinations by the Department of Commerce that imports of certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from India and Israel were being subsidized within the meaning of section 703(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1671b(b)). The antidumping duty investigations (invs. Nos. 731–TA–688 through 695 (Final)) were instituted effective October 3, 1994, following preliminary determinations by the Department of Commerce that imports of certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from France, India, Israel, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela were being sold at LTFV within the meaning of section 733(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. § 1673b(b)). Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public hearing to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notices in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notices in the Federal Register of July 20, 1994 (59 FR 37054) and October 19, 1994 (59 FR 52806).[4] The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on February 28, 1995, and persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on April 3, 1995. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 2870 (April 1995) entitled ''Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from France, India, Israel, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela: Investigations Nos. 701–TA–360 and 361 (Final) and 731–TA–688 through 695 (Final).''

Issued: April 6, 1995.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–8992 Filed 4–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[2] Commissioner Don E. Newquist did not participate in this investigation.

[3] Only the certain carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings exported by Awaji Sangyo (Thailand) Co., Ltd. from Thailand were found to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV). All other producers and exporters of such product in Thailand are subject to a 1992 antidumping order currently in effect.

[4] Notice of the Commission's revised schedule for the subject countervailing and antidumping duty investigations was published on November 30, 1994 (59 FR 61342).

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Docket No. AB–167 (Sub-No. 1143]

Consolidated Rail Corporation—Abandonment—Between North Warren and Kent, in Trumbull and Portage Counties, OH

The Commission has issued a certificate authorizing Consolidated Rail Corporation to abandon its 28.95-mile rail line, known as the Freedom Secondary, between milepost 161.10 at North Warren and milepost 190.05 near Kent, in Trumbull and Portage Counties, OH, subject to environmental, historic, labor protective, and public use conditions. The abandonment certificate will become effective 30 days after this publication unless the Commission finds that: (1) a financially responsible person has offered financial assistance (through subsidy or purchase) to enable rail service to continue; and (2) it is likely that the assistance would fully compensate the railroad.

Any financial assistance offer must be filed with the Commission and the applicant no later than 10 days from the publication of this Notice. The following notation shall be typed in bold face on the lower left-hand corner of the envelope containing the offer: ''Office of Proceedings, AB–OFA''. Any offer previously made must be remade within this 10-day period.

Information and procedures regarding financial assistance for continued rail service are contained in 49 U.S.C. 10905 and 49 CFR 1152.27.

Decided: March 30, 1995.

By the Commission, Chairman McDonald, Vice Chairman Morgan, and Commissioners Simmons and Owen.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–8974 Filed 4–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980

Notice is hereby given that on March 28, 1995, a proposed Stipulation and Settlement Agreement in In Re Carl Subler Trucking, Inc., et al., (S.D. Ohio, Bankruptcy Ct., Case Nos. 3–87–02026), was lodged with the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Ohio. The United States, pursuant to Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9607, seeks recovery of past response costs incurred and costs to be incurred by the United States in connection with the Peak Oil Superfund Site, Tampa, Florida (the ''Site''). The Site is located in Hillsborough County, Florida, and occupies approximately 4 acres. From the mid-1950's until the mid-1980's, the Site was used for recovery and storage of waste oil.

The Stipulation and Settlement Agreement in In Re Carl Subler Trucking, Inc., et al, provides that the Debtor will pay a total of $25,000.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed Stipulation and Settlement Agreement. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environmental and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530. Comments should refer to In Re Carl Subler Trucking, Inc., et al, D.O.J. Ref. 90–11–2–897F.

The proposed Stipulation and Settlement Agreement may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Southern District of Ohio, 200 W. Second Street, Rm. 602, Dayton, Ohio 45402; Office of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IV, 345 Courtland Street NE., Atlanta, GA 30365; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street NW.,

Washington, DC 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed Stipulation and Settlement Agreement may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street NW., 4th floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of $1.50 for the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

Acting Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 95–9002 Filed 4–11–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Office of the Attorney General

[AG Order No. 1962–95]

RIN 1105–AA36

Proposed Guidelines for the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registratioan Act

AGENCY: Department of Justice.

ACTION: Proposed guidelines.

SUMMARY: The United States Department of Justice (DOJ) is publishing Proposed Guidelines to implement the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act.

DATES: Comments must be received by July 11, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Bonnie J. Campbell, Director, Violence Against Women Office, U.S. Department of Justice, Tenth and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530, 202–616–8894.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 170101 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103–322, 108 Stat. 2038 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 14071), contains the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children and Sexually Violent Offender Registration Act (hereafter referred to as the ''Jacob Wetterling Act'' or ''the Act''). The Act provides a financial incentive for states to establish 10-year registration requirements for persons convicted of certain crimes against minors and sexually violent offenses, and to establish a more stringent set of registration requirements for a sub-class of highly dangerous sex offenders, characterized as ''sexually violent predators.'' States that fail to establish such systems within three years (subject to a possible two year extension) face a 10% reduction in their Byrne Formula Grant funding (under 42 U.S.C. 3756), and resulting surplus funds will be reallocated to states that are in compliance with the Act.

Proposed Guidelines

These guidelines carry out a statutory directive to the Attorney General, in § 170101(a)(1), to establish guidelines for registration systems under the Act. Before turning to the specific provisions of the Act, four general points should be noted concerning its interpretation and application.

First, states that wish to achieve compliance with the Jacob Wetterling Act should understand that its requirements constitute a floor for state registration systems, not a ceiling, and that they do not risk the loss of part of their Byrne Formula Grant funding by going beyond its standards. For example, a state may have a registration system that covers a broader class of sex offenders than those identified in the Jacob Wetterling Act, or requires address verification for such offenders at more frequent intervals than the Act prescribes, or requires offenders to register for a longer period of time than the period specified in the Act.

Exercising these options creates no problem of compliance, since the provisions in the Jacob Wetterling Act concerning duration of registration, covered offenders, and other matters, do not preclude states from imposing additional or more stringent requirements that encompass the Act's baseline requirements. The general objective of the Act is to protect people from child molesters and violent sex offenders through registration requirements. It is not intended, and does not have the effect, of making states less free than they were under prior law to impose registration requiremnts for this purpose.

Second, states that wish to achieve compliance with the Jacob Wetterling Act also should understand that they may, within certain constraints, use their own criminal law definitions in defining registration requirements, and will not necessarily have to revise their registration systems to use technical definitions of covered sex offenses based on federal law. This point will be explained more fully below.

Third, the Jacob Wetterling Act contemplates the establishment of programs that will impose registration requirements on offenders who are subsequently convicted of offenses in the pertinent categories. The Act does not require states to attempt to identify and impose registration requirements on offenders who were convicted of offenses in these categories prior to the establishment of a conforming registration system. Nevertheless, the Act does not preclude states from imposing any new registration requirements on offenders convicted prior to the establishment of the registration system.

Fourth, the Act gives states wide latitude in designing registration programs that best meet their public safety needs. For instance, the Act allows states to release relevant information necessary to protect the public, including information released through community notification programs. Some state registration and notification systems have been challenged on constitutional grounds. A few courts have struck down registration requirements in certain cases. *See Rowe* v. *Burton,* No. A94–206 (D. Alaska July 27, 1994) (on motion for preliminary relief); *State* v. *Babin,* 637 So.2d 814 (La. App. 1994), *writ denied,* 644 So.2d 649 (La. 1994); *State* v. *Payne,* 633 So. 2d 701 (La. App. 1993), *writ denied,* 637 So.2d 497 (La. 1994); *In re Reed,* 663 P.2d 216 (Cal. 1983) (en banc). However, a majority of courts that have dealt with the issue have held that registration systems like those contemplated by the Jacob Wetterling Act do not violate released offenders' constitutional rights.

A few recent decisions, currently on appeal, have held that aspects of New Jersey's community notification program violate due process guarantees, or violate ex post facto guarantees as applied to persons who committed the covered offense prior to enactment of the notification statute. *See Artway* v. *Attorney General of New Jersey,* No. 94–6287 (NHP) (D.N.J. Feb. 28, 1995); *Diaz* v. *Whitman,* No. 94–6376 (JWB) (D.N.J. Jan. 6, 1994); *John Doe* v. *Deborah Poritz,* No. BUR–1–5–95 (N.J. Super. Ct. Law Div. Feb. 22, 1995). However, the Department of Justice takes the position in briefs filed that the New Jersey community notification statute at issue in those cases does not violate the Ex Post Facto Clause, and that the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause of its own force does not require recognition of such a liberty interest on the part of offenders affected by that statute.

The remainder of these guidelines address the provisions of the Jacob Wetterling Act in the order in which they appear in § 170101 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

General Provisions—Subsection (a)(1)–(2)

Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of § 170101 directs the Attorney General to