

Lo-Vaca Gathering Company ("Lo-Vaca") proposes to enter into a settlement agreement ("Settlement Plan") with several of its major natural gas customers in compromise of various claims by those customers against Lo-Vaca. The effectiveness of the Settlement Plan is conditioned on, among other things: (a) The approval of the courts wherein the settling customers have cases pending and (b) an order by the Texas Railroad Commission establishing a new permanent rate for Lo-Vaca becoming final and non-appealable. Lo-Vaca is a wholly owned subsidiary of Coastal States Gas Producing Corporation ("Producing"), which is, in turn, a wholly owned subsidiary of Coastal States Gas Corporation ("Coastal").

Coastal, through its subsidiaries, is engaged in processing, gathering, transporting and selling natural gas to and for municipalities, utilities, other pipeline companies and industrial concerns. Through its Rio Grande Valley Gas Company Division ("Rio Grande"), Coastal is directly engaged in the distribution of natural gas at retail in a number of small cities and communities in the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. Coastal is, accordingly, a "gas utility company," within the meaning of Section 2(a)(4) of the Act.

The Settlement Plan provides, among other things, for the restructuring of Producing into a new enterprise to be named Valero Energy Corporation ("Valero"), which will consist of Producing's present gas extraction and transportation facilities and Coastal's Rio Grande division, and for the creation of the Settlement Trust, to which various securities of Coastal and Valero, including approximately 19% of the voting securities of Valero, will be transferred for the benefit of and in settlement of claims by Lo-Vaca's customers.

The Settlement Plan further provides that the Trustee of the Settlement Trust will use its best effort to sell the securities held by the Settlement Trust by public or private sale for cash within seven years and to distribute the proceeds to the settling customers of Lo-Vaca.

Section 2(a)(7)(A) of the Act defines a "holding company" to mean any company which "owns, controls, or holds with power to vote" 10% or more of the voting securities of a public utility company. Accordingly, upon transfer of 19% of the voting securities of Valero, a public utility company, to the Settlement Trust, the Settlement Trust and the Trustee will become "holding companies." The applicants state, however, that they are entitled to an exemption from all provisions of the Act, except Section 9(a)(2), pursuant to Section 3(a)(4). Section 3(a)(4) provides an exemption for a holding

company and every subsidiary company thereof if "such holding company is temporarily a holding company solely by reason of the acquisition of securities for purposes of liquidation or distribution in connection with a bona-fide debt previously contracted or in connection with a bona-fide arrangement for the underwriting or distribution of securities."

The applicants state in support of the application that the Settlement Trust will hold the securities only temporarily until disposition can be appropriately accomplished in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Plan.

Notice is further given that any interested person may, not later than April 9, 1979, request in writing that a hearing be held on such matter, stating the nature of his interest, the reasons for such request, and the issues of fact or law raised by said application which he desires to controvert; or he may request that he be notified if the Commission should order a hearing thereon. Any such request should be addressed: Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C. 20549. A copy of such request should be served personally or by mail upon the applicants at the above-stated address, and proof of service (by affidavit or, in the case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. At any time after said date, the application, as filed or as it may be amended, may be granted in the manner provided in Rule 23 of the General Rules and Regulations promulgated under the Act or the Commission may take such other action as it may deem appropriate. Persons who request a hearing or advice as to whether a hearing is ordered will receive any notices and orders issued in this matter, including the date of the hearing (if ordered) and any postponements thereof.

For the Commission, by the Division of Corporate Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

GEORGE A. FITZSIMMONS,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 79-8904 Filed 3-22-79; 8:45 am]

[4710-07-M]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice CM-8/176]

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT, TECHNOLOGY, AND DEVELOPMENT

Meeting

The Department of State will hold a meeting on April 17 of the Working Group on UN-OECD Investment Undertakings of the Advisory Committee on International Investment, Technology, and Development. The Working

Group will meet from 9:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. The meeting will be held in Room 6320 of the State Department, 2201 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20520. The meeting will be open to the public.

The purpose of the meeting is to provide the Working Group with the opportunity to discuss outstanding issues in connection with the OECD Review and to review the results of the March 12-23 meeting of the UN Intergovernmental Working Group on a Code of Conduct.

Requests for further information on the meeting should be directed to Richard Kauzlarich, Department of State, Office of Investment Affairs, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Washington, D.C. 20520. He may be reached by telephone on (area code 202) 632-2728.

Members of the public wishing to attend the meeting must contact Mr. Kauzlarich's office in order to arrange entrance to the State Department building.

The Chairman of the working group, will as time permits, entertain oral comments from members of the public attending the meeting.

Dated: March 16, 1979.

RICHARD D. KAUZLARICH,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 79-8891 Filed 3-22-79; 8:45 am]

[4710-07-M]

[Public Notice CN-8/175]

SHIPPING COORDINATING COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA

Meeting

The working group on standards of training and watchkeeping of the Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), a subcommittee of the Shipping Coordinating Committee, will hold an open meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 18, 1979, in room 6200 of the Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, Washington, D.C. 20590.

The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss the future work program of the IMCO Subcommittee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping in preparation for the meeting of the Subcommittee commencing July 9, 1979 in London, England.

Requests for further information should be directed to Captain D.E. Hand, United States Coast Guard, (GMVP/82), Washington, D.C. 20590, telephone (202) 426-1500.

The Chairman will entertain comments from the public as time permits.

RICHARD K. BANK,
Chairman,

Shipping Coordinating Committee.

MARCH 14, 1979.

[FR Doc. 79-8890 Filed 3-22-79; 8:45 am]

[4710-08-M]

Office of the Secretary

[Public Notice 655]

**PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR
REPRESENTATIVES ON U.S. DELEGATIONS**

Final Guidelines

AGENCY: Department of State.

ACTION: Final guidelines.

SUMMARY: This notice contains the final guidelines concerning participation of private citizens as representatives of affected private sector interests on U.S. delegations to international conferences, meetings and negotiations. The guidelines address criteria for inviting such participation on various delegations and the role on the delegation of such private citizens.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 23, 1979.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION
CONTACT:**

Jean Bailly, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, 2201 C Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20520. Telephone (202) 632-1572.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department published in the FEDERAL REGISTER of August 24, 1978, proposed guidelines on participation of private sector representatives on U.S. delegations for public comment (Public Notice 623; 43 FR 37783). The Department received a number of comments, for which we express appreciation. As a result, we have made changes in the guidelines, primarily to clarify points which were subject to misinterpretation.

In the case of other comments and suggestions, we did not believe that changes were warranted, or, in some cases, that suggested changes could be accommodated within existing legal constraints. Following is a summary of the principal changes.

AMENDMENTS TO THE GUIDELINES

A new Section I has been added to clarify the scope of the guidelines. The new language makes clear that the guidelines do not apply in three cases:

First, the guidelines do not, of course, supersede provisions of law applicable to particular delegations, e.g. provisions of Title I of the Trade Act of 1974 applicable to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations.

Second, the guidelines do not apply to private citizens or nationals who participate in international meetings

in a personal or private capacity rather than as members of a United States delegation. The guidelines would not apply, for example, to private international meetings (e.g., Rotary International), or to the conduct of private citizens invited by an international conference or organization to provide expert advice or views in a private capacity.

Third, the guidelines do not regulate the selection and role of individuals who participate on U.S. delegations as "special government employees." The Department and other agencies on occasion appoint individuals from the private sector to serve temporarily as consultants, government advisers, or even negotiators on U.S. delegations. Such individuals are not chosen to represent private sector interests, but to provide on a temporary or part-time basis the same services as full-time government employees. As such, they may speak and negotiate for the United States to the extent decided by their government superiors. Special government employees are subject to the conflict of interest laws (18 U.S.C. 202 et seq.) and to other laws and regulations pertaining to special government employees, including restrictions on government employees embodied in the guidelines.

Several commentators objected that Section I of the proposed guidelines (now Section II) appeared to subordinate concern for the public interest and fulfillment of the delegation's mission to the objective of minimizing the size of delegations. This was not our intention, and that section has now been revised. The Department does believe—as Section III(b) continues to reflect—that delegations should not be any larger than is absolutely necessary. Larger-than-necessary delegations are more difficult to administer, may create an extravagant appearance, and may cause doubts as to the authority of the head of the U.S. delegation.

The guidelines have been amended in Section III(c)(1) to make clear that in determining invitations to prospective private sector representatives, the Department should take into account their ability to meet the objectives set out in Section II(b). The Department does not have the resources or capability in every case to determine the "best" representative or representatives of a private sector interest. Given necessary limits on delegation size, however, it is important that those invited be able to contribute.

A new Section III(c)(4) has been added to provide for the separate responsibility of the head of delegation, or his or her designee, to provide advance information for private sector representatives on the logistical details and substance of the conference.

The degree of advance briefing may depend on time constraints and the sensitivity of the information, but the Department understands and agrees that advance preparation is desirable.

Section IV(f) has been revised for clarity. Some or all private sector representatives may hold or advocate the same views on matters under individual discussion, but when they differ, government officials must assess the differing views, as well as other factors. The Department does not expect, and cannot require, private sector representatives to compromise among themselves in order to present united private sector views. (Private sector representatives are not expected to agree with the U.S. position in all respects.)

Section V(b) has been amended to reflect the concern among members of private groups and associations that classification restrictions may prevent desirable communication between a private sector representative and such a group. Classified information cannot be released to unauthorized persons, but in many cases government officials can provide guidance to minimize the problem.

Section V(c) has been modified with regard to positions which private sector representative may advocate outside the delegation. We have no desire to "muzzle" the expression of private sector views outside the delegation, but private sector representatives should not use their positions to undercut the U.S. at a conference or negotiation. Private sector representatives should therefore understand that encouraging other delegations to resist those positions is cause for dismissal from a delegation. Hopefully, our intent is better spelled out in the revised language.

Several other comments and suggestions were not incorporated in the guidelines.

**PROHIBITIONS AGAINST SPEAKING OR
NEGOTIATING FOR THE GOVERNMENT**

The most frequent complaint about the guidelines was the limitation against private sector representatives' speaking or negotiating for the United States. We believe that private sector representatives can be effective spokesmen and negotiators, but this would be inconsistent with conflict of interest laws and regulations. Persons authorized to speak or negotiate for the United States at intergovernmental meetings are considered to be "special government employees" within the meaning of—and subject to—the conflict of interest laws (sections 202 through 209 of title 18 of the United States Code). (The fact that they serve without pay is irrelevant.)

Among other things, the conflict of interest laws prevent government em-

ployees (including special government employees), from working on matters on which they or their relatives or private organizations have a private financial interest. Private sector representatives are normally chosen because of their private interests; they cannot simultaneously represent the United States on the same subject.

Not all private sector representatives have the kind of financial interest forbidden under the conflict of interest laws. For example, a representative of environmental interests may have no direct or indirect private financial stake in a marine pollution conference which would bar his or her participation as a special government employee under the laws. However, the Department does not believe that such a representative should be permitted to speak or negotiate when a representative of the shipping industry on the same delegation could not.

Some commentators suggested that conflict of interest concerns be met by requiring private sector representatives to follow instructions and policies established by the government. At least in some cases, the public interest might be served by the use of private sector representatives under appropriate safeguards, but the conflict of interest laws do not permit this flexibility. The laws are intended to avoid even the appearance of conflict. The conflict of interest requirement can be waived only if the private interest is so insubstantial that the government determines it would not be likely to affect the integrity of the services of the special government employee.

DISCRETIONARY NATURE OF PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES

Some commentators suggested that, at least in particular subject areas, the guidelines should require the participation of private sector representatives on delegations and/or guarantee them access to all meetings attended by and information available to government officials on the delegation. We do not believe that either requirement would be helpful.

Many factors are considered in determining whether private sector representatives should be included on delegations or invited to attend particular meetings. Where views of affected private sector interests are well known or may be adequately obtained in advance of an intergovernmental meeting, there is less justification to include private sector representatives on a delegation. In some cases, other governments are unwilling to discuss some matters, or will be less candid, in the presence of persons other than government officials. It would also be improper to permit private sector representatives access to meetings or in-

formation where this would accord them a financial advantage not available to members of the public. Moreover, some information involves national security or foreign policy matters not relevant to the purposes of including private sector representatives on delegations.

CONCLUSION

These guidelines constitute the first codification of Departmental rules in this area. We intend to monitor our practices, and would welcome further suggestions from the public based on experience under the guidelines.

I. APPLICATION

(a) The provisions of this part apply to delegations accredited or chosen by the Department of State to represent the United States at international conferences, meetings or negotiations. These provisions regulate the selection and role of private citizens or nationals who are invited to participate on such delegations as representatives of private sector interests and who do not perform governmental duties or functions.

(b) These provisions do not apply:

(1) To the extent of any inconsistency with provisions of law regulating particular U.S. delegations.

(2) To the conduct of private persons invited by an international organization or conference to participate in a meeting in a personal or private capacity, rather than as a representative of the United States, or as a member of a U.S. delegation.

(3) To the selection and role of private citizens or nationals who participate on delegations as "special government employees." Such persons are subject to the conflict of interest laws (18 U.S.C. 202 et seq.) and other laws and regulations. (See the Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter 735, Appendix C for the distinction between "special government employees" and persons who are invited to work with an agency in a representative capacity.)

II. GENERAL

(a) *General policy.* Private sector representatives shall be invited to participate on U.S. delegations only when such participation will further the public interest. Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed to require inclusion of private sector representatives on any delegation or to accord any right to any person, private association, or interest group to participate on any delegation.

(b) *Objective's of including private sector representatives on delegations.* Private sector representatives are invited to participate on delegations in order to:

(1) Provide, on an individual basis, informed views on policy and technical

details of matters under discussion, including matters that may arise in the course of the delegation's activities (such as the need to develop a response to proposals put forth by other countries during a conference).

(2) Enable representatives of private interests directly affected by a negotiation to understand the positions being taken by other countries, the alternatives available to the United States, and the process by which agreements are reached.

(c) *Balanced representation.* Many international negotiations and meetings concern matters directly and substantially affecting two or more private interests with materially differing views, including in some cases, particular economic interests, such as industry, labor or agricultural producers, and broader-based interests, such as retail consumer or environmental interests. When private sector representatives are to be invited to participate on a U.S. delegation in such cases, officers responsible for selection and/or accreditation of the delegation shall endeavor to obtain a balanced representation of interests on the delegation. The responsible officers shall exercise judgment as to what private interests are most likely to be directly and substantially affected and the degree of difference of interest, bearing in mind the provisions set forth below in III(b). In exercising such judgment, the responsible officers shall place special emphasis on inviting a representative or representatives of broadly based interests such as retail consumers or environmental groups, where these interests are directly and substantially affected.

III. SELECTION OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES

(a) *Responsibility of Department officials.* With respect to delegations accredited by the Office of International Conferences, Department of State, that office, in consultation with the head of delegation, shall be responsible for inviting participation of private sector representatives in accordance with these regulations. With respect to all other delegations accredited or selected by the Department of State, the action office, in consultation with the head of delegation, shall be responsible.

(b) *Initial justification.* In determining whether private sector representatives should be invited to participate on a delegation, the following factors shall be considered:

(1) The importance of obtaining the informed views of private interests during the conference or negotiation.

(2) Whether consultations or the opportunity to provide written comments prior to the conference would be an adequate alternative to including par-

particular private sector representatives on the delegation.

(3) The need to limit overall delegation size to the minimum necessary best to carry out the mission of the delegation.

(4) The number of private sector representatives that would be required, if any such representatives are included on the delegation, to provide balanced representation of the interests directly affected.

(5) Whether participation of private sector representatives is feasible within any applicable rules or understandings of the international conference or meeting.

(c) *Selection procedures.* (1) Private sector representatives may be invited from labor groups, the academic community, trade associations, specific business firms, public interest groups or from any other sources, including the public at large. Representatives shall be invited with a view to their ability to meet the objectives set out above in paragraph II(b). To the extent feasible, the responsible officers should consult with and seek the recommendations of representative private groups and associations concerning private sector representatives, but the responsible office shall not be bound by recommendations of such groups, nor shall the recommendation of such a group be required before a private sector representative may be invited to participate on a delegation.

(2) The responsible office shall not be required to invite more than one representative of a private sector interest merely because there is more than one private association or because there are differing views among individuals or entities within a private sector interest group. The representative invited is not required to commit his or her interest group, entity or association.

(3) Private sector representatives shall be given written letters of invitation. The letter of invitation shall describe the role of the representative and outline the limitations on participation as set forth in sections IV and V of these guidelines. The letter of invitation to private sector representatives of trade or business interests shall enclose antitrust guidance prepared by the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice.

(4) To the extent practicable, the head of delegation, or his or her designee, shall provide private sector representatives with advance information concerning the substance and logistics of the meeting or conference.

(5) The Department shall publish monthly in the FEDERAL REGISTER a list of those delegations which included private sector representatives, and the names of Government officials and private sector representatives par-

ticipating in each such delegation during the previous month. The private affiliation or interest group of such private sector representative shall be included in the published list.

(6) Private sector representatives must have security clearances from the Government at a level equivalent to the classification of information which may be necessary to their participation on the delegation.

IV. ROLE OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES

(a) Subject to the provisions of these guidelines and any applicable law, private sector representatives on the delegation may offer views and information to government officials on the delegation, and government officials may solicit such views and information, on any matter under consideration by the delegation. The head of delegation will decide when private sector representatives may attend any meeting of the delegation or any meeting with foreign officials.

(b) Government officials shall not discuss or reveal any commercially sensitive information of an individual business entity except with other U.S. Government officials with a need to know such information. Commercially sensitive information includes but is not necessarily limited to an individual business entity's specific or anticipated costs, prices, profit margins or production goals, unless this information is already public. Government officials may not solicit or receive commercially sensitive information from a private sector representative in the presence of anyone other than government officials, and may disseminate such information only on an aggregated basis and only if such aggregated information will not tend to reveal the commercially sensitive information of any individual business entity. Aggregated information may be solicited from or provided by a private sector representative, provided that such information was aggregated by an independent auditor or other independent body, or the Government, or otherwise in accordance with U.S. law. No private sector representative is obligated, by participation on a delegation, to provide any commercially sensitive information.

(c) Government officials shall take account of the private interests of an adviser in assessing any views or information received. Government officials, wherever possible, shall seek views of other private sector representatives on the delegation representing different private interests, if views on a material point are received from one such representative.

(d) Subject to any limitations established by the head of delegation and the provisions of these guidelines, gov-

ernment officials may, in their discretion, provide to private sector representatives any information pertaining to the negotiation, provided that:

(1) No information classified above the level at which the private sector representatives have security clearance shall be provided, nor shall any classified information be provided to such representatives if it is not necessary to their function.

(2) No information shall be provided to any private sector representative if such information knowingly could be used for private gain, unless such information is made available to the public in timely fashion so as to preclude special financial advantage for private sector representatives. This shall include all information and proposals which would have the effect of giving commercial, competitive or market advantage to the private sector representatives or their employers or interest groups.

(e) The head of delegation shall assure that the private affiliation of private sector representatives on the delegation is made known to other delegations, wherever possible by inclusion of the private affiliation in listings of the delegation on conference records.

(f) While two or more private sector representatives may present the same or similar views on particular issues, government officials shall not request or require private sector representatives to present joint or compromise views or reports.

V. LIMITATIONS ON PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES

(a) No government official shall permit private sector representatives to speak for the U.S. Government at any meeting with foreign government officials. However, the head of delegation may authorize a private sector representative to explain a technical or factual point, if, in the judgment of the head of delegation, (1) this will advance U.S. objectives at the conference or negotiation; and (2) the private sector representative is best able to speak on the point under discussion.

(b) Heads of delegation shall remind private sector representatives that they may not, by law, divulge classified information to anyone but authorized to receive such information. The head of delegation shall inform private sector representatives what information is classified. It is recognized that private sector representatives may wish to report to the groups or interests they represent, and to receive views or information from those groups or interests. The head of delegation shall endeavor to provide guidance which will not inhibit such activities, within the legitimate require-

ments for protection of classified information.

(c) Private sector representatives shall not at any time negotiate or purport to negotiate for the United States Government, nor shall they advocate positions outside of the delegation during a conference or negotiation which would tend to undermine the tactical or substantive positions of the United States as determined by the head of delegation. However, no private citizen or entity shall be prohibited from expressing views on publicly available U.S. positions, whether or not the interest of the citizen or entity is represented by a private sector representative on the delegation, nor shall any private sector representative be prohibited from expressing views on the outcome of a negotiation after conclusion of the negotiation so long as classified information is not released thereby.

(d) Private sector representatives are not immune from any laws or regulations of the United States as a result of participation on a U.S. delegation, and no government officials may represent that participation confers any such immunity.

(e) Private sector representatives are not to be considered employees of the government. The Government will not pay any expenses of private sector representatives, except as funds are authorized and appropriated for this purpose. Private sector representatives are not entitled to use of any facilities of the Government, if such use would entail additional expense to the Government, nor shall they be given access to government files or communications facilities (except facilities which do not entail additional expense to the Government, or which are necessary to protect the security of information pertaining to official functions of the delegation).

(f) The head of delegation or the Office of International Conferences may limit the period of participation on a delegation of any private sector representative. The head of delegation may exclude from the delegation any private sector representative whose conduct or actions are (1) contrary to the provisions of these guidelines; (2) contrary to limitations or prohibitions imposed by the head of delegation pursuant to these guidelines or other authority; or (3) prejudicial to the interests of the United States, including the effective functioning of the delegation. No private sector representative, however, may be excluded from the delegation merely because of views provided in good faith to government officials on the delegation, nor may a private sector representative be excluded from the delegation for declining to provide views on a matter where

he or she believes this would be inappropriate or prejudicial.

These guidelines will be published in the Foreign Affairs Manual.

Dated: March 15, 1979.

BEN H. READ,
*Under Secretary for
Management.*

[FR Doc. 79-8887 Filed 3-22-79; 8:45 am]

[4710-19-M]

[Public Notice 654]

**PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE-SECTOR
REPRESENTATIVES ON U.S. DELEGATIONS**

**List of Accredited U.S. Delegations, February
1979**

As announced in Public Notice No. 623 (43 FR 37783), August 24, 1978, the Department is submitting the following list of U.S. Delegations accredited during the month of February, 1979, which included private-sector representatives.

Publication of this list is required by Article IV(c)(4) of the guidelines published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on August 24, 1978.

Dated: March 2, 1979.

PAUL J. BYRNES,
*Director, Office of
International Conferences.*

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE
WORKING GROUP THREE, INTERNA-
TIONAL NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE EVALUA-
TION (INFCE), VIENNA, JANUARY 22-
FEBRUARY 2, 1979

Representative

Frank Hodsoll, Deputy United States Representative on Nuclear Non-Proliferation Matters, Department of State.

Advisers

Harry R. Marshall, Office of the General Counsel, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Fred McGoldrick, Office of Nuclear Affairs, Department of Energy.

Jarvis L. Schwennesen (Week of January 22 only), Deputy Director, Division of Uranium Resources and Enrichment, Department of Energy.

Robert D. Sloan, Attorney Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State.

Eleanor B. Steinberg (Week of January 29 only), Office of Energy and Safeguards Technology, Department of State.

Private Sector Adviser

Lawrence T. Scheinman (January 26-February 2), Director, Program on Science Technology and Society, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE
THIRD MEETING OF THE PREPARATORY
COMMITTEE, UNITED NATIONS CONFER-
ENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
FOR DEVELOPMENT, NEW YORK, JANU-
ARY 22-FEBRUARY 3, 1979

Representative

The Honorable Jean M. Wilkowsky, Coordinator, United Nations Conference on Science and Technology, Department of State.

Alternate Representative

The Honorable William Stibravy, Deputy Permanent Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Advisers

Alvin Adams (January 29-February 2), Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State.

William Eilers, Bureau for Development Support, Agency for International Development.

Francis M. Kinnelly, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Department of State.

Frank Lancetti, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

James Stromayer, Deputy Coordinator, United Nations Conference on Science and Technology, Department of State.

Gilda Varrati, United States Mission to the United Nations.

Private Sector Adviser

Rodney W. Nichols, President, Rockefeller University, New York, New York.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE TO NE-
GOTIATE AN INTERNATIONAL ARRANGE-
MENT TO REPLACE THE INTERNATIONAL
WHEAT AGREEMENT 1971, (RESUMED),
UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (UNCTAD),
GENEVA, JANUARY 22-FEBRUARY 9,
1979

Representative

Thomas R. Saylor, Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.

Advisers

Michael P. Boerner, Office of Food Policy and Programs, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State.

Marsha Echols, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.

Lawrence E. Hall, Grain and Feed Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.

Dan T. Morrow, Office of the Assistant Secretary, International Affairs and Commodity Programs, Department of Agriculture.

James V. Parker, American Embassy, London.

Edmund M. Parsons, Office of Food Policy and Programs, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State.

Charles E. Roh, Jr., Attorney Adviser, Department of State.

Private Sector Advisers

Michael L. Hall, President, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Robert Kohlmeyer, North American Export Grain Association, Washington, D.C.

Sheila Sidles, Executive Secretary, Iowa Consumers League, Centerville, Iowa.

Eugene B. Vickers, Vice President, Western Wheat Associates, Washington, D.C.

Don A. Woodward, Special Trade Affairs Representative, National Association of Wheat Growers, Washington, D.C.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE POPULATION COMMISSION, UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, NEW YORK, JANUARY 29-FEBRUARY 9, 1979

Representative

The Honorable Marshall Green, Ambassador, Coordinator of Population Affairs, Department of State.

Alternate Representative

Stephen Joseph, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Human Resources Development, Development Support Bureau, Agency for International Development.

Advisers

Samuel Baum, Assistant Chief for Demographic Research, International Statistical Programs Center, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

Franch Brecher, Economic and Social Affairs, U.S. Mission to the United Nations.

Irvin M. Cushner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lydia Giffler, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State.
Carl J. Hemmer, Office of Population, Agency for International Development.

Theodore C. Nelson, Office of the Coordinator of Population Affairs, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Department of State.

Private Sector Advisers

Philander P. Claxton, Jr., President, World Population Society, Washington, D.C.

Conrad Taeuber, Director, Center for Population Research, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS COCOA CONFERENCE, UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (UNCTAD), GENEVA, JANUARY 29-FEBRUARY 23, 1979

Representative

John P. Ferriter, Chief, Tropical Products Division, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State.

Alternate Representative

David A. Ross, Tropical Products Division, Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Department of State.

Advisers

Ralph Ives, Resources Policy Division, Department of Commerce.

Paul A. Pilkauskas, American Embassy, London.

William Quinn, Office of Raw Materials, Department of the Treasury.

Gordon Streeb, U.S. Mission, Geneva.

Private Sector Advisers

Merrill Bateman (January 29-February 9), Dean, School of Business Administration, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

John C. K. Buckley (February 19-23), Vice President, Purchasing, The Nestle Company, White Plains, New York.

Walter Clayton (February 19-23), Vice President, Gill and Duffus, New York, New York.

Thomas H. Edwards (February 12-16), Vice President, Lonray, Inc., New York, New York.

Harold J. Gettinger (February 19-23), Vice President, Commercial, M&M/Mars, Inc., Hackettstown, New Jersey.

Julian Hemphill (January 29-February 23), Consultant, New York Cocoa Exchange, New York, New York.

Joanna Moss (February 5-9), Economist, Public Interest Economic Foundation, San Francisco, California.

William J. Shaughnessy (February 5-16), Manager, Commodity Analysis, Hershey Foods, Hershey, Pennsylvania.

Elizabeth Wood (February 12-23), Assistant Coordinator of Nutrition and Consumer Education, Consumers Co-Operative of Berkeley, Berkeley, California.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE TWENTY-THIRD SESSION OF THE GROUP OF RAPORTEURS OF THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS, UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (ECOSOC), GENEVA, FEBRUARY 5-16, 1979

Representative

Edward A. Altemos (February 5-16), Chief, International Standards Coordination, Office of Hazardous Materials Regulation, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation.

Alternate Representative

Kenneth L. Pierson (February 12-16), Deputy Director, Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.

Advisers

George E. Cushmac (February 5-16), Office of Hazardous Materials Regulation, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation.

Larry H. Gibson, Lt., USCG (February 5-16), Chief, Cargo Systems Branch, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

David G. Ortez (February 5-9), Office of the Chief Counsel, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation.

Private Sector Adviser

Orton Overman (February 12-16), Stauffer Chemical Co., Westport Connecticut.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BULK CHEMICALS, INTERGOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION (IMCO), LONDON, FEBRUARY 5-16, 1979

Representative

William N. Spence, Captain, USCG, Cargo and Hazardous Materials Division, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

Alternate Representative

Ronald W. Tanner, Lieutenant, USCG, Chief, Chemical Engineering Branch, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

Advisers

H. Clay Black, Shipping Attache, American Embassy, London.

Emmanuel P. Pfersich, Chemical Engineering Branch, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

Robert G. Williams, Commander, USCG, Engineering Branch, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

Fritz Wybenga, Chemical Engineer, Hazardous Materials Division, Office of Merchant Marine Safety, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

Private Sector Adviser

Robert K. Gregg, Assistant Manager Ocean Transportation, Dow Chemical, Freeport, Texas.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE TWENTY-EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (ECOSOC), GENEVA, FEBRUARY 12-23, 1979

Representative

The Honorable Mathea Falco, United States Representative on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Alternate Representatives

Peter Bensinger (February 12-16, 1979), Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

Louis N. Cavanaugh, Jr., U.S. Mission, Geneva.

Robert Chasen (February 12-16, 1979), Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

George Dalley, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

Alfred R. DeAngelus (February 18-22, 1979), Assistant Commissioner for Enforcement Supports, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

Jean Paul Smith, Assistant Director for International Activities, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Congressional Adviser

The Honorable Thomas F. Railsback, United States House of Representatives.

Advisers

Robert Angarola, General Counsel, Domestic Policy Staff, Executive Office of the President.

R. G. Dickerson (February 18-22, 1979), Deputy Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

Donald Miller (February 18-22, 1979), Chief Counsel, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

Private Sector Adviser

David Musto, President's Strategy Council on Drug Abuse, Yale University, New Haven Connecticut.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE MEETING OF THE GROUP OF RAPPORTEURS ON AIR POLLUTION OF THE INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE, ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (ECE), GENEVA, FEBRUARY 12-26, 1979

Representative

Merrill W. Korth, Senior Technical Adviser, Emission Control Technology Division, Environmental Protection Agency.

Adviser

Irving L. Fuller, Office of International Activities, Environmental Protection Agency.

Private Sector Adviser

Alfred Cary, Jr., Cummins Engine Company.

[FR Doc. 79-8892 Filed 3-22-79; 8:45 am]

[4810-22-M]

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

CERTAIN FASTENERS FROM JAPAN

Receipt of Countervailing Duty Petition and Initiation of Investigation

AGENCY: U.S. Customs Service, Treasury Department.

ACTION: Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation.

SUMMARY: This notice is to advise the public that a satisfactory petition has been received and an investigation is being initiated to determine whether or not benefits which constitute a bounty or grant within the meaning of the countervailing duty law are granted by the Government of Japan to manufacturers of exporters of certain industrial fasteners. A preliminary determination will be made no later than August 22, 1979, and a final determination no later than February 22, 1980.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 23, 1979.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Chapman, Duty Assessment Division, U.S. Customs Service, 1301 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20229 (202-566-5492).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 22, 1979, a petition in proper form was received from the Industrial Fasteners Institute, alleging that payments conferred by the Government of Japan upon the manufacture, production or exportation of certain industrial fasteners constitute the payment or bestowal of a bounty or

grant within the meaning of section 303, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1303). The industrial fasteners covered by the instant petition enter the United States under the following item numbers of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (TSUS): 646.17, 646.40, 646.41, 646.49, 646.51, 646.53, 646.54, 646.56, 646.58, 646.60, 646.63, 646.65, 646.72, 646.74, 646.75, 646.76, 646.78. The investigation will be limited to the determination of the bestowal of bounties or grants on non-metric industrial fasteners. Products entering the United States under TSUS items 646.54 and 646.56 have, since May 6, 1977, been subject to the imposition of countervailing duties as the result of a previous investigation conducted by the Treasury Department under the countervailing duty law (T.D. 77-128, 41 FR 23146). The treatment of the allegations of additional bounties or grants paid or bestowed on those products is described in the notice of "Suspension of Liquidation and Estimated New Net Amount of Bounty or Grant," published concurrent with this Notice. Thus, products entering the United States under TSUS items 646.54 and 646.56 will not be included in this new investigation.

The bounties or grants alleged in the petition are as follows:

(1) "The Temporary Measures Act for Small and Midsize Business with Regard to the High Yen Exchange Market" established a number of methods by which the Japanese Government can provide assistance to small and midsize businesses which are export oriented and whose competitive position has been adversely affected by the rapid appreciation of the yen.

These include:

(a) Preferential financing at interest rates lower than those commercially available from the National Finance Corporation, the Okinawa Development Finance Corporation, the Small Business Finance Corporation, the Central Bank for Commercial and Industrial Cooperatives, and from so-called "Authorized Cooperative" trade associations.

(b) Preferential financing from the same sources as mentioned above for the building of facilities necessary for conversion of manufacturing operations.

(c) Those firms which previously had been granted loans under the "Medium and Small Enterprises Modernization Financing Assistance Law" were allowed to defer repayment for up to three years.

(d) Various government credit guarantees which liberalize the coverage limitations and reduce premiums for eligible firms.

(e) Revision of an already existing law, to now allow eligible firms to carry-back losses incurred currently to