

rock and shell fragments from a bulldozed site at Wailua. In 1951, the Museum recorded one set of human remains from Po'ipū from an anonymous donor. In 1956, Lawrence P. Richards donated one skull from Aweoweonui. In 1959, Adna Clarke, Jr., donated one set of human remains from Hanapēpē. In 1964, Robert N. Bowen, Museum employee, collected a single vertebra at Kōloa. In 1964, Frederic O. Wolf, donated one skull from Kaua'i. In 1965, Lloyd J. Soehren, Museum anthropologist, excavated one set of human remains and an animal bone fragment from Nu'alolo. In 1974, John E. Reinecke donated the remains of four partial skeletons from Po'ipū. In 1984, Stella Hobby donated one skull from Kaua'i. In 1989, Andrew J. Hingsberger donated one skull from Nu'alolo.

No known individuals were identified. In consultation with Native Hawaiian organizations and at their recommendation, the Bishop Museum decided that no attempt would be made to determine the age of the human remains from Kaua'i. Geographic location of the remains, types of associated funerary objects, and method of burial preparation are recognizable as burial practices of Native Hawaiians ancestral to contemporary Native Hawaiian organizations.

Based on the above information, officials of the Bishop Museum, in consultation with representatives of the Kaua'i / Ni'ihau Island Burial Council, Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna 'O Hawai'i Nei, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Edward Ka'iwi and Aletha Kaohi, have determined pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001(2) that there is a relationship of shared group identity which can be reasonably traced between these remains and present-day Native Hawaiian organizations.

This notice has been sent to the Kaua'i / Ni'ihau Island Burial Council, Hui Mālama I Nā Kūpuna 'O Hawai'i Nei, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Edward Ka'iwi and Aletha Kaohi. Representatives of any Native Hawaiian organization which believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these human remains and associated funerary objects should contact Anita Manning, NAGPRA Representative, Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, P. O. Box 19000, Honolulu, Hawai'i, 96817-0916, <manning@bishop.bishop.hawaii.org>, 808-848-4117, before October 27, 1995.

Dated: September 21, 1995.

Francis P. McManamon

*Departmental Consulting Archeologist
Archeology and Ethnology Program*

[FR Doc. 95-23893 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

Mississippi River Coordinating Commission Meeting

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces an upcoming meeting of the Mississippi River Coordinating Commission. Notice of this meeting is required under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463).

MEETING DATES AND TIMES: Wednesday, October 18, 1995; 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
ADDRESSES: Minnesota Department of Revenue, 8th Floor—Skagstad Room, 10 River Park Plaza, Saint Paul, Minnesota.

An agenda for the meeting will be available by October 6, 1995, from the Superintendent of the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area at the address below. Public statements about matters related to the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area will be taken at the meeting.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Mississippi River Coordinating Commission was established by Public Law 100-696, November 18, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent JoAnn Kyril, Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, 175 East Fifth Street, Suite 418, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 or telephone 612-290-4160.

Dated: September 15, 1995.

William W. Schenk,

Field Director.

[FR Doc. 95-23984 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 753-TA-32]

Carbon Steel Wire Rod From Zimbabwe

Determination

Pursuant to section 753(b)(4) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675b(b)(4)) (the Act), the Commission hereby determines that an industry in the United States is not likely to be materially injured by reason of imports from Zimbabwe of carbon steel wire rod if the countervailing duty order on such merchandise were to be revoked.

Background

Section 753(a) of the Act provides that, in the case of a countervailing duty order issued under section 303 of the Act with respect to which the requirement of an affirmative determination of material injury under

section 303(a)(2) was not applicable at the time the order was issued, interested parties may request the Commission to initiate an investigation to determine whether an industry in the United States is likely to be materially injured by reason of imports of the subject merchandise if the order is revoked. Further, section 753(a)(3) requires that such requests must be filed with the Commission within 6 months of the date on which the country from which the subject merchandise originates became a signatory to the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (the Subsidies Agreement), as referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

On May 26, 1995, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) published in the Federal Register notice of opportunity to request injury investigation(s) under section 753 of the Act (60 FR 27963, May 26, 1995). In that notice, Commerce stated that, for those countries becoming signatories to the Subsidies Agreement on January 1, 1995, requests for injury investigations must be filed with the Commission no later than June 30, 1995. In addition, Commerce noted that in the case of Zimbabwe, that country became a signatory to the Subsidies Agreement on March 3, 1995. 2

Section 753(b)(4) of the Act provides that, if a request for an injury investigation is not made within 6 months of the time the country of origin of the subject merchandise became a signatory to the Subsidies Agreement, the Commission shall notify the administering authority that it has made a negative determination with regard to the question of the likelihood of material injury by reason of imports of the subject merchandise if the order is revoked. As of September 5, 1995, the Commission had not received a request for investigation under section 753(a) with regard to the outstanding countervailing duty order on carbon steel wire rod from Zimbabwe. Accordingly, pursuant to section 753(b)(4) of the Act, the Commission hereby notifies Commerce of its negative injury determination with regard to the outstanding countervailing duty order on carbon steel rod from Zimbabwe.

For Further Information Contact: Jonathan Seiger (202-205-3183) or Vera Libeau (202-205-3176), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street S.W., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810.

Authority

These determinations are being made under authority of the Tariff Act of 1930, title VII, as amended by the URAA. This notice is published pursuant to section 207.12 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: September 18, 1995.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-23980 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

[Investigation No. 332-360]**International Harmonization of Customs Rules of Origin**

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment on draft rules for Harmonized System chapters 25, 26, and 27.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eugene A. Rosengarden, Director, Office of Tariff Affairs and Trade Agreements (O/TA&TA) (202-205-2595), or Lawrence A. DiRicco (202-205-2606). Questions with regard to specific chapters of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) should now be directed to the following coordinators in view of product reassignments:

Chapters 1-24, 41-49—Ronald H. Heller (202-205-2596)

Chapters 25-40—Edward J. Matusik (202-205-3356)

Chapters 50-63—Janis L. Summers (202-205-2605)

Chapters 64-83, 86-89, 92-97—Lawrence A. DiRicco (202-205-2606)

Chapters 84-85, 90-91, 98-99—Craig M. Houser (202-205-2597)

Parties having an interest in particular products or HTS chapters and desiring to be included on a mailing list to receive available documents pertaining thereto should advise Diane Whitfield by phone (202-205-2610) or by mail at the Commission, 500 E St SW, Room 404, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. The media should contact Margaret O'Laughlin, Director, Office of Public Affairs (202-205-1819).

Background

Following receipt of a letter from the United States Trade Representative (USTR) on January 25, 1995, the Commission instituted Investigation No. 332-360, International Harmonization

of Customs Rules of Origin, under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (60 FR 19605, April 19, 1995).

The investigation is intended to provide the basis for Commission participation in work pertaining to the Agreement on Rules of Origin (ARO), developed during the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations and adopted along with the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO), as part of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 1994.

The ARO is designed to harmonize and clarify nonpreferential rules of origin for goods in trade on the basis of the substantial transformation test; achieve discipline in the rules' administration; and provide a framework for notification, review, consultation, and dispute settlement. These harmonized rules are intended to make country-of-origin determinations impartial, predictable, transparent, consistent, and neutral, and to avoid restrictive or distortive effects on international trade. The ARO provides that technical work to those ends will be undertaken by the Customs Cooperation Council (CCC) (now informally known as the World Customs Organization or WCO), which must report on specified matters relating to such rules for further action by parties to the ARO. Eventually, the WTO Ministerial Conference is to "establish the results of the harmonization work program in an annex as an integral part" of the ARO.

In order to carry out the work, the ARO calls for the establishment of a Committee on Rules of Origin of the WTO and a Technical Committee on Rules of Origin (TCRO) of the CCC. These Committees bear the primary responsibility for developing rules that achieve the objectives of the ARO.

A major component of the work program is the harmonization of origin rules for the purpose of providing more certainty in the conduct of world trade. To this end, the agreement contemplates a 3-year CCC program, to be initiated as soon as possible after the entry into force of the Agreement Establishing the WTO. Under the ARO, the TCRO is to undertake (1) to develop harmonized definitions of goods considered wholly obtained in one country, and of minimal processes or operations deemed not to confer origin, (2) to consider the use of change in Harmonized System classification as a means of reflecting substantial transformation, and (3) for those products or sectors where a change of tariff classification does not allow for the reflection of substantial transformation, to develop supplementary or exclusive origin criteria based on value, manufacturing

or processing operations or on other standards.

To assist in the Commission's participation in work under the Agreement on Rules of Origin (ARO), the Commission is publishing for public comment a draft of proposed rules for goods of chapters 25, 26, and 27 of the Harmonized System that are not considered to be wholly made in a single country. The rules rely largely on the change of heading as a basis for ascribing origin.

These proposals, which have been reviewed by interested government agencies, are intended to serve as the basis for the U.S. proposal to the Technical Committee on Rules of Origin (TCRO) of the Customs Cooperation Council (CCC) (now known as the World Customs Organization or WCO). The proposals do not necessarily reflect or restate existing Customs treatment with respect to country of origin applications for all current non-preferential purposes. Based upon a decision of the Trade Policy Staff Committee, the proposals are intended for future harmonization for the nonpreferential purposes indicated in the ARO for application on a global basis. They seek to take into account not only U.S. Customs' current positions on substantial transformation but additionally seek to consider the views of the business community and practices of our major trading partners as well. As such they represent an attempt at reaching a basis for agreement among the contracting parties. The proposals may undergo change as proposals from other administrations and the private sector are received and considered. Under the circumstances, the proposals should not be cited as authority for the application of current domestic law.

If eventually adopted by the TCRO for submission to the Committee on Rules of Origin of the World Trade Organization, these proposals would comprise an important element of the ARO work program to develop harmonized, non-preferential country of origin rules, as discussed in the Commission's earlier notice. Thus, in view of the importance of these rules, the Commission seeks to ascertain the views of interested parties concerning the extent to which the proposed rules reflect the standard of substantial transformation provided in the Agreement. In addition, comments are also invited on the format of the proposed rules and whether it is preferable to another presentation, such as the format for the presentation of the NAFTA origin or marking rules.