Lilly Industries, Inc., Chemical Plant, Kilometer 146.7, State Road 2, Mayaquez, Puerto Rico 00708, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of bulk dextropropoxyphene (9273), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule II.

No comments or objections have been received. Therefore, pursuant to section 303 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 and Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1301.54(e), the Deputy Assistant Administrator hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic class of controlled substance listed above is granted.

Gene R. Haislip,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

Dated: December 15, 1987.

[FR Doc. 87-29227 Filed 12-21-87; 8:45 am].

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances Application; Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.

Pursuant to § 1301.43(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on November 12, 1987, Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, New Jersey 07110, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370)	I.
Alphaprodine (9010)	II.
Levorphanol (9220)	II

Any other such applicant and any perons who is presently registered with DEA to manufacturer such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the above application and may also file a written request for a hearing thereon in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.54 and in the form prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.47.

Any such comments, objections or requests for a hearing may be addressed to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, 1405 I Street NW., Washington, DC 20537, Attention: DEA Federal Register Representative (Room 1112), and must be filed no later than January 21, 1988.

Gene R. Haislip,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

Dated: December 15, 1987.

[FR Doc. 87-29228 Filed 12-21-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Registration; Johnson Matthey, Inc.

By Notice dated September 1, 1987, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 1987; (52 FR 33881), Johnson Matthey, Inc., Pharmaceuticals Department, 2002 Nolte Drive, West Deptford, New Jersey 08066, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of alfentanil (9737), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule II.

No comments or objections have been received. Therefore, pursuant to section 303 of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 and Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1301.54(e), the Deputy Assistant Administrator hereby orders that the application submitted by the above firm for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic class of controlled substance listed above is granted.

Dated: December 15, 1987

Gene R. Haislip,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 87-29225 Filed 12-21-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

Importation of Controlled Substances, Registration; Minn-Dak Growers Assoc.

By Notice dated September 16, 1987, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 24, 1987; (52 FR 35973), Minn-Dak Growers Association, Highway 81 North, P.O. Box 1276, Grand Forks, North Dakota 58206-1276, made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration to be registered as an importer of marihuana (7360), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule I. This application is exclusively for the importation of marihuana seed which will be rendered non-viable and used as bird feed.

No comments or objections have been received. Therefore, pursuant to section 1008(a) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act and in accordance with Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1311.42, the above firm is granted registration as an importer of the basic class of controlled substance listed above.

Gene R. Haislip,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control Drug Enforcement Administration.

Dated: December 15, 1987.

[FR Doc. 87-29226 Filed 12-21-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

[Secretary of Labor's Order 7-87]

Delegation of Authority and Assignment of Responsibilities for Employment Standards Programs

December 11, 1987.

1. *Purpose.* To delegate authority and assign responsibilities to the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards.

2. *Background.* Heretofore authority for carrying out activities in connection with the administration of employment standards programs had been delegated to a Deputy Under Secretary for Employment Standards. An Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards position has now been established to replace the position of Deputy Under Secretary for Employment Standards. Consistent with that decision, this Order delegates authority of Secretary's Order 6-84 which was previously vested in the Deputy Under Secretary to the Assistant Secretary. This Order also incorporates those responsibilities under Sections 216(g)(2) and 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

3. *Delegation of Authority and Assignment of Responsibilities.*

a. *The Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards* is hereby delegated authority and assigned responsibility, except as hereinafter provided, for carrying out in the employment standards policies, programs, and activities of the Department of Labor, including those functions to be performed by the Secretary of Labor under:

(1) The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA), as amended, 29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.*, including the issuance of child labor hazardous occupation orders and other regulations concerning child labor standards. Authority and responsibility for the Equal Pay Act, section 6d of the FLSA, were transferred to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) on July 1, 1979, pursuant to the

President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of February 1978.

(2) The Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act of 1936, as amended, 41 U.S.C. *et seq.*, except those provisions relating to safety and health delegated to the Assistant Secretaries for Occupational Safety and Health and Mine Safety and Health.

(3) The Service Contract Act of 1965, as amended, 41 U.S.C. 351 *et seq.*, except those provisions relating to safety and health delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health.

(4) The Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, and any laws now existing or subsequently enacted, providing for prevailing wage findings by the Secretary in accordance with or pursuant to the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 276a–f; the Copeland Act, 40 U.S.C. 276c; Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950; and, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, 16 U.S.C. 831.

(5) The Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 327 *et seq.*, except those provisions relating to safety and health delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health.

(6) Title III of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, 15 U.S.C. 1671 *et seq.*

(7) The State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act (Revenue Sharing), as amended, 31 U.S.C. 1221 *et seq.*, as it pertains to prevailing wage rates under the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 276a–f.

(8) The labor standards provisions contained in sections 5(i), 5(j), and 7(g) of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 954(i), 954(j), and 956(g), except those provisions relating to safety and health delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health.

(9) The Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act of 1983, Pub. L. 97–470, 29 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

(10) Any remaining activity under the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963, as amended and repealed, Pub. L. 88–583, 78 Stat. 920.

(11) Section 3 (relating to education and research) and Section 5 (relating to studies) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA), as amended, 29 U.S.C. 621 *et seq.* Authority and responsibility for the remaining provisions of ADEA were transferred to the EEOC on July 1, 1979, pursuant to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of February 1978.

(12) Section 1450(i) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, Pub. L. 93–523, 42 U.S.C. 300 j–9(i).

(13) Section 507 of the Federal Water Pollution Prevention and Control Act, Pub. L. 89–234, 33 U.S.C. 1367.

(14) Section 23 of the Toxic Substances Control Act, 15 U.S.C. 2622.

(15) Section 7001 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, 42 U.S.C. 6971.

(16) Section 322 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7622.

(17) Section 210 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 5851.

(18) Section 110 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. 9610.

(19) Such additional Federal Acts as may from time to time confer upon the Secretary of Labor duties and responsibilities similar to: the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.*; or the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, 40 U.S.C. 276a-f, and related Acts; or employee protection responsibilities similar to those listed under 4a(12)–(18) above.

(20) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended and extended, 5 U.S.C. 8101 *et seq.*, except 8149 as it pertains to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board.

(21) The Longshore and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, as amended and extended, 33 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.*, except: 33 U.S.C. 921(b) as it applies to the Benefits Review Board; 33 U.S.C. 941 relating to activities assigned to the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health; and, 33 U.S.C. 919(d) with respect to hearing examiners in the Office of Administrative Law Judges.

(22) Title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, as amended, 30 U.S.C. 901 *et seq.*

(23) Title 38, U.S.C. 2012, except for monitoring of the Federal contractor job listing activities under section 2012(a) and the annual Federal contractor reporting obligations under 2012(d) delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training.

(24) Sections 501(a), 501(f), 502, and 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, Pub. L. 93–112, and Executive Order 11758.

(25) Executive Order 11246, as amended by Executive Order 11375 and Executive Order 12086—Federal Contract Compliance.

(26) Section 216(g)(2) (relating to the H-2A program) and section 274A(b)(3) (relating to employment eligibility verification and related recordkeeping) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) of 1952, as amended, Pub. L. 82–414, as amended by Pub. L. 99–603.

b. *The Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards* is hereby delegated authority to designate appropriate officers of the Employment Standards Administration to perform functions provided under section 274A(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) of 1952, as amended, Pub. L. 82–414, as amended by Pub. L. 99–603.

c. *The Solicitor of Labor* shall have the responsibility for providing legal advice and assistance to all officers of the Department relating to the administration of the statutes and Executive orders listed in paragraph 4a above. The bringing of legal proceedings under the statutes and Executive orders listed in paragraph 4a above, the representation of the Secretary of Labor and/or other officials of the Department of Labor, and the determination of whether such proceedings or representation is appropriate in a given case are delegated exclusively to the Solicitor of Labor.

4. *Reservation of Authority.*

a. The submission of reports and recommendations to the President and the Congress concerning the administration of statutes and Executive orders listed in paragraph 4a above is reserved to the Secretary.

b. The jurisdiction of the Wage and Appeals Board, as presently described in Secretary's Order 24–70 (36 FR 306) and its rules of practice (29 CFR Part 7), is reserved, and the Board shall be authorized to review decisions under this Order relating to the Davis-Bacon Act and related laws within the scope of its jurisdiction, and relating to the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (except under contracts subject to the Service Contract Act).

c. The jurisdiction of the Board of Service Contract Appeals, as presently described in 29 CFR Part 8 and its rules of practice is reserved, and the Board shall be authorized to review decisions under this Order relating to the Service Contract Act and to the Contract Work Hours and Safey Standards Act under contracts subject to the Service Contract Act.

d. The determination of the application of the ineligible list provisions of section 3 of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, 41 U.S.C. 37, is reserved to the Secretary.

e. The determination of the

application of the ineligible list provisions of section 5 of the Service Contract Act, 41 U.S.C. 354, is reserved to the Secretary, with respect to all cases in which recommendations of administrative law judges were issued prior to March 21, 1984.

f. Decisions under section 103(b)(2) and 503(b)(2) of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act which permit the Secretary to modify or vacate the decision of an administrative law judge shall also be reserved to the Secretary.

g. Final decisions under paragraph 4(a)(12)–(18), and related final decisions which may be made under paragraph 4(a)(19), are reserved to the Secretary.

5. *Directive Affected.* Secretary's Order 6–84 is canceled.

6. *Effective Date.* This Order is effective immediately.

Dennis E. Whitfield.

Deputy Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 87–29288 Filed 12–21–87; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 4510–23–M

Employment and Training Administration

Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

Petitions have been filed with the Secretary of Labor under section 221(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 ("the Act") and are identified in the Appendix to this notice. Upon receipt of these petitions, the Director of the Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, has instituted investigations pursuant to section 221(a) of the Act.

The purpose of each of the investigations is to determine whether the workers are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Title II, Chapter 2, of the Act. The investigations will further relate, as appropriate, to the determination of the date on which total or partial separations began or threatened to begin and the subdivision of the firm involved.

The petitioners or any other persons showing a substantial interest in the subject matter of the investigations may request a public hearing, provided such request is filed in writing with the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 4, 1988.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments regarding the subject matter of the investigations to the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, at the address shown below, not later than January 4, 1988.

The petitions filed in this case are available for inspection at the Office of the Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 601 D Street NW., Washington, DC 20213.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 14th day of December 1987.

Marvin M. Fooks,

Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

APPENDIX

Petitioner (union/workers/firm)	Location	Date received	Date of petition	Petition No.	Articles produced
Alcan Rolled Products, Co. (company)	Terre Haute, IN	12/14/87	12/2/87	20,325	Aluminum.
Cortelco (workers)	Corinth, MS	12/14/87	12/1/87	20,326	Telephones.
Diebold, Inc. (workers)	Hebron, OH	12/14/87	11/30/87	20,327	Bank teller machines.
Eaton Corp. Fluid Power Division (U.A.W.)	Marshall, MI	12/14/87	11/3/87	20,328	Viscous fan drives.
Editorial American, S.A. (workers)	Virginia Gardens, FL	12/14/87	10/26/87	20,329	Magazines.
Format Printing Co. (CCIU)	Totowa, NJ	12/14/87	12/1/87	20,330	Business forms.
Hanover Dowel (workers)	Bethel, ME	12/14/87	12/3/87	20,331	Dowels.
Hydreco, Inc. (IAM)	Kalamazoo, MI	12/14/87	12/3/87	20,332	Pumps & motors.
Ken Wing Manufacturing Co., Inc. (ILGWU)	New York, NY	12/14/87	12/3/87	20,333	Sportswear.
Motor Wheel Corp. (AIW)	Lansing, MI	12/14/87	12/2/87	20,334	Wheels.
Northeast Wire Co. (UER&MWA)	Holyoke, MA	12/14/87	12/2/87	20,335	Wire.
Raymark (workers)	Stratford, CT	12/14/87	12/2/87	20,336	Clutches & brakes.
Stone Container Corp. (workers)	Bristol, TN	12/14/87	11/19/87	20,337	Paper bags.
Universal Producing, Co. (IAM&AW)	Fairfield, IA	12/14/87	11/25/87	20,338	Bags.

[FR Doc. 87–201289 Filed 12–21–87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

[TA–W–17,406]

Delco Systems Operations, Culpeper, VA; Negative Determination on Remand

Pursuant to the U.S. Court of International Trade remand of November 5, 1987 in *Former Employees of Delco Systems Operations* v. *the United States* [USCIT No. 86–12–01545], and on further review, it is recommended that the Department's original denial of trade adjustment assistance for workers for Delco Systems Operations, Culpeper, Virginia be reaffirmed.

The Diesel Division of General Motors (DDGM) in Canada was awarded a contract by the U.S. Department of Defense to build several different models of light armored vehicles. One of the models was the LAV–25MC. The LAV–25MC required gun turrets the production of which was exclusively subcontracted to Delco Systems Operations in Culpeper, Virginia in order to increase the domestic labor content provisions of the contract. DDGM in Canada did not simultaneously produce finished gun turrets with the Culpeper facility. The Culpeper facility did not produce gun turrets for anyone else but DDGM in Canada.

Company officials confirmed investigative findings that the workers at Culpeper produced the finished gun turrets for LAV–25MC vehicles. The gun turrets were sold and shipped under contract to DDGM in Canada where they were mounted on the LAV–25MC vehicles which were imported into the United States by the U.S. Government. Company officials stated that the Culpeper facility was the only source of supply for gun turrents for the LAV–25MC vehicles until the facility closed in October 1985 and its work was consolidated with that of DDGM's plant in London, Ontario. The Culpeper facility did not produce gun turrets for anyone else. The contract under which Delco Systems Operations produced gun turrets provided a closed market where imports of other gun turrets could not be implicated.

In the Court's remand, plaintiffs object to the Department's application of *U.S. Shoe Workers of America, AFL–CIO* v. *Bedell*, 506 F.2d 174 (D.C. Cir. 1974) to this case because "the relationship of shoe counters to shoes is not analogous to the relationship of gun turrets to light armored vehicles. Plaintiffs argue that "all shoe counters are, of necessity, a part of shoes; all gun turrets are not, of necessity, a part of light armored vehicles." Plaintiffs' argument falls short

on at least two accounts. First, company officials confirmed the Department's finding that all the gun turrets produced at Culpeper were used for mounting on the LAV–25MC vehicle. All LAV–25MC vehicles were sold with turrets. Second, the gun turrets had no purpose in existing separately by themselves and none were imported into the United States—save one for warranty check-out by Delco Systems Operations.

Plaintiffs allege that the Department is inconsistent in the case at hand with respect to articles constituting a necessary part of or were a necessary factor in the production of a product. To support this allegation, the plaintiffs cite certain trade adjustment assistance cases where the Department did not consider the necessary article as a component. In *Gropper* v. *Donovan; Machine Printers & Engravers Ass'n* v. *Marshall,* and in *Dan Stipe* v. *U.S. Department of Labor* the Department determined, respectively, that imported knit fabric garments did not compete with domestic finished fabric used for production of knit fabric garments; that imported textile fabrics did not compete with domestically produced engraved rollers and screens used to print designs on fabric; and imported raw steel did not compete with domestic steel products such as tunnel liners and sectional plate. Each of these products in the cases cited above has a domestic market in which to test the increased import criterion. This is not the case for custom made gun turrets produced domestically and exported to Canada under an exclusive contract.

Findings on remand show that the gun turrets produced at Culpeper were produced to exact specifications for mounting on the LAV–24MC vehicle. Workers at Culpeper did not produce the LAV–25MC vehicle but only LAV–25MC gun turrets which had no market in themselves except with DDGM of Canada for mounting on the vehicle. The LAV–25MC vehicles are not interchangeable or substitutable with finished gun turrets produced for that vehicle. Accordingly, LAV–25MC vehicles are not like or directly competitive with gun turrets.

Further, the gun turrets produced at Culpeper were produced for an export market and although the gun turrets reentered the United States they did so as a component product incorporated into an altogether different finished article. Accordingly, sales of gun turrets to an export market would not provide a basis for certification.

In the case at hand, the gun turret component is custom made, under contract, for the LAV–25MC vehicle in a market closed by a contract. Production schedules had to be met. When the strike occurred in June, 1985 decisions were made that consolidated the Culpeper production in October 1985 with that of DDGM in Canada. Whether other gun turrets are or are not imported is a moot question since only gun turrets produced under contract by Delco in Culpeper to increase the domestic labor content provisions of the contract were used for mounting of the LAV–25MC vehicle prior to the consolidation.

Further, the Trade Act of 1974 provides benefits to workers when the Department can substantiate that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the workers' firm contributed importantly to decreased sales and/or production and decreased employment at the firm. The findings show that the decreased sales and production criterion of Section 222 of the Trade Act was not met in the period immediately preceding the strike. The strike began in early June, 1985. The findings show increased sales and production in both quantity and value in the first six months of 1985 compared to the same period in 1984. Workers can only receive trade adjustment assistance for separations resulting from a lack of work—not for entering a strike and voluntarily removing themselves from employment. Under the GM–UAW agreement settling the strike, GM workers at Culpeper were able to relocate to Delco Marine (a part of GMs commercial automobile operations) in Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Conclusion

After reconsideration on remand, I reaffirm the original denial of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance for former workers of Delco Systems Operations, Culpeper, Virginia.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 14th day of December 1987.

Robert O. Deslongchamps;

Director, Office of Legislation and Actuarial Services, UIS.

[FR Doc. 87–29290 Filed 12–21–87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

Minneapolis Electric Steel Casting Co. et al.; Determinations Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor herein presents summaries of determinations regarding eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance issued during the period December 7, 1987–December 11, 1987.

In order for an affirmative determination to be made and a certification of eligibility to apply for 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' firms, 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

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–20, 169; Minneapolis Electric Steel Castings Co., Minneapolis, MN

TA–W–20, 161; Facet Enterprises, Inc., Murfreesboro, NC

TA–W–20, 174; Bardons & Oliver, Inc., Cleveland, OH

TA–W–20, 159; Combustion Engineering, Inc., Monongahela, PA

TA–W–20, 082; Powerex, Inc., Auburn, NY

TA–W–20, 175; Castchem, Inc., Muse, PA

TA–W–20, 176; Castamerica, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA

In the following cases the investigation revealed that criterion (3) has not been met for the reasons specified.

TA–W–20, 179; Eureka Crude Purchasing, Inc., Eureka, KS

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

TA–W–20, 170; Navistar International, Waukesha, WI

The investigation revealed that criterion (2) has not been met. Sales or production did not decline during the relevant period as required for certification.

TA–W–20, 192; Shanhouse Outerwear, Inc., Magnolia, AR

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