gases and residual products. These processes do not include the incidental separation of individual components of a gas during its conveyance through a pipeline.

Additional Rule 4 reflects the substantial transformation of uncalcined petroleum coke of subheading 2713.12 to calcined petroleum coke of subheading 2713.11.

Additional Rule 5(a) enumerates preparatory operations involved in refineries and processing plants that are not considered to be origin conferring.

Additional rule 5(b) provides that blending of bituminous materials of subheading 27.13.20 or heading 27.14 to produce bituminous mixtures of heading 27.15 is not to be considered origin conferring.

[FR Doc. 95–23981 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–369]

Certain Health and Beauty Aids and Identifying Marks Thereon; Notice of Commission Determination Not To Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation on the Basis of a Settlement Agreement

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's (ALJ's) initial determination (ID) in the above-captioned investigation terminating the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rhonda M. Hughes, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3083.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 2, 1994, Redmond Products, Inc. filed a complaint with the Commission alleging a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the importation, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of health and beauty aids bearing marks that infringe Redmond's registered and common law trademarks.

The Commission instituted an investigation of the complaint, and published a notice of investigation in the Federal Register on January 19, 1995. 60 FR 3,875 (1995). The notice named Belvedere International, Inc. of Ontario, Canada as respondent.

On July 13, 1995, complainant and respondent filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement. On August 25, 1995, the ALJ granted the joint motion and issued an ID (Order No. 17) terminating the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement. No petitions for review were received.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and Commission rule 210.42, 19 CFR 210.42.

Copies of the ALJ's ID, and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation, are or will be 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, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

Issued: September 19, 1995.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23979 Filed 9–26–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

[Civil Action No. 94–01555 (HHG), D.D.C.]

United States v. AT&T Corporation and McCaw Cellular Communications, Inc.; Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b)–(h), the United States publishes below the comments received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States* v. *AT&T Corporation and McCaw Cellular Communications, Inc.,* Civil Action 94–01555 (HHG), United States District Court for the District of Columbia, together with the response of the United States to the comments.

Copies of the response and the public comments are available on request for inspection and copying in Room 200 of the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530, and for inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, United States Courthouse, Third Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001.

Constance Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

In the Matter of: United States of America, Plaintiff, v. AT&T Corp. and McCaw Cellular Communications, Inc., Defendants. Civil Action No. 94–01555 (HHG). Received July 25, 1995.

Response to Public Comments to the Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b)–(h) (1994) ("APPA"), the United States of America hereby files its Response to Public Comments to the proposed Final Judgment in this civil antitrust proceeding. The United States has reviewed the comments on the proposed Final Judgment and remains convinced that its entry is in the public interest.

A proposed Final Judgment, Stipulation and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with this Court.[1] The proposed Final Judgment is subject to approval by the Court after the expiration of the statutory sixty-day public comment period and compliance with the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b)–(h).

I. Compliance with the APPA

The APPA requires a sixty-day period for the submission of public comments on the proposed Final Judgment, 15 U.S.C. 16(b). The United States has received four comments[2] and a response

[1] See 59 FR 44,158 (1994).

[2] Comments objecting to the proposed decree were submitted to the Department by Bell Atlantic and NYNEX (jointly), SBC Communications Inc. ("SBC"), BellSouth Corp. ("BellSouth") and the Ad Hoc Association Long Distance Carriers ("Ad Hoc IXCs"). SBC requested permission from the Court to file supplemental comments on January 17, 1995; however, that request has not been granted by the Court. SBC's supplemental comments request that the decree be clarified and modified to provide that pending conversion of the McCaw systems to equal access, AT&T is prohibited from (1) expanding its calling areas, and (2) advertising its existing interLATA calling areas so as to disadvantage cellular systems that are competing with the McCaw systems. SBC also believes that AT&T should be required to restrict the scope of such calling areas pending conversion to equal access. AT&T's response to these comments asserts that it has not expanded the McCaw calling areas, and that the purpose of the proposed decree is not to establish identical calling areas with those of the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs). Further, AT&T maintains that to impose additional requirements pending the completion of its conversion to equal access this fall would simply encourage additional frivolous complaints with no competitive benefit and could delay the conversion of its cellular systems to equal access. The Department believes that the changes proposed by SBC are

Continued