

The Deputy Administrator adopts the opinion and recommended decision of the administrative law judge in its entirety. The Drug Enforcement Administration cannot register or maintain the registration of a practitioner who is not duly authorized to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts his business. 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See *James H. Nickens, M.D.*, 57 FR 59847 (1992); *Elliott Monroe, M.D.*, 57 FR 23246 (1992); *Bobby Watts, M.D.*, 53 FR 11919 (1988).

The administrative law judge properly granted the Government's motion for summary disposition. It is well-settled that when no question of fact is involved, or when the facts are agreed upon, a plenary, adversary administrative proceeding involving evidence and cross-examination of witnesses is not obligatory. The rationale is that Congress does not intend administrative agencies to perform meaningless tasks. *Phillip E. Kirk, M.D.*, 48 FR 32887 (1983), *aff'd* sub nom *Kirk v. Mullen*, 749 F.2d 297 (6th Cir. 1984); *Alfred Tennyson Smurthwaite, N.D.*, 43 FR 11873 (1978); see also, *NLRB v. International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Ironworkers, AFL-CIO*, 549 F.2d 634 (9th Cir. 1977); *United States v. Consolidated Mines and Smelting Co., Ltd.*, 455 F.2d 432, 453 (9th Cir. 1971).

In his exceptions to the opinion and recommended decision of the administrative law judge, the Respondent argued, *inter alia*, that actions taken by the New Mexico Board of Medical Examiners and the New Mexico Board of Pharmacy, which resulted in the revocation of his state license to handle controlled substances, were improper. However, Respondent presented no evidence to contradict the fact that he is currently without authorization to handle controlled substances in the State of New Mexico.

Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b), hereby orders that DEA Certificate of Registration, AN5283697, previously issued to Charles L. Novosad, Jr., M.D., be, and it hereby is, revoked and that any pending applications for renewal of such registration be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective October 11, 1995.

Dated: September 5, 1995.

Stephen H. Greene,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95-22400 Filed 9-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-31,345]

Adams-Millis, High Point, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on August 21, 1995 in response to a worker petition which was filed on August 9, 1995 on behalf of workers at Adams-Millis, High Point, North Carolina (a division of the Sara Lee Corporation).

An active certification covering the petitioning group of workers remains in effect (TA-W-30,083, Adams-Millis, High Point, North Carolina, certified August 29, 1994, impact date of June 29, 1993 and an expiration date of August 29, 1996). Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 29th day of August, 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-22472 Filed 9-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-30,647]

Amerada Hess Corporation Headquartered in Houston, TX and Operating at Various Locations in the Following States; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the Department of Labor issued an Amended Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on March 21, 1995, applicable to all workers at the subject firm. The amended notice was published in the **Federal Register** on March 31, 1995 (60 FR 16667).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for the subject firm. New findings show that worker separations have occurred at Amerada Hess locations in New Mexico.

The Department is again amending the certification to cover these workers.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Amerada Hess adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-30,647 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Amerada Hess Corporation, headquartered in Houston, Texas (TA-W-30,647) and operating at various locations in the following cited States who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 17, 1994 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974:

TA-W-30,647A Oklahoma
TA-W-30,647B Louisiana
TA-W-30,647C North Dakota
TA-W-30,647D Texas (except Houston)
TA-W-30,647E New Mexico"

Signed at Washington, DC this 29th day of August 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-22473 Filed 9-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-30,353; TA-W-30,353A]

E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., Inc., Du Pont Industrial Imaging Rochester, NY and Field Offices Located in Florida; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on December 10, 1994, applicable to all workers at E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., Inc., Du Pont Industrial Imaging located in Rochester, New York. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on January 3, 1995 (60 FR 14).

At the request of a petitioner, the Department reviewed the certification for the subject firm. The findings show that support staff (sales, service and administrative) of the subject firm located in Florida should have been included in the certification.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Du Pont Industrial Imaging adversely affected by imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-30,353 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of E.I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., Inc., Du Pont Industrial Imaging, Rochester, New York and support staff

operating in field offices in the State of Florida engaged in employment related to the production of NDT X-ray films who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after July 11, 1993 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC this 25th day of August 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-22474 Filed 9-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-30,985; FHF Apparel, Miami, FL

TA-W-30,985A; 500 Fashion Group, Northampton, PA

TA-W-30,985B; 500 Fashion Group, Whitehall, PA

TA-W-30,985C; 500 Fashion Group, Philadelphia, PA]

Amended Certification 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 issued a Notice of Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on June 9, 1995, applicable to all workers of FHF Apparel, Miami, Florida. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 27, 1995 (60 FR 33235). The certification was amended on August 1, 1995, to include the parent company, Fashion 500 Group located in Northampton, Pennsylvania. The notice will soon be published in the **Federal Register**.

The Department reviewed the subject certification, and is again amending the certification to cover the workers at the Fashion 500 Group locations in Whitehall and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The workers produce men's suits and sportcoats.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of FHF Apparel and the 500 Fashion Group who were adversely affected by imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-30,985 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of FHF Apparel, Miami, Florida (TA-W-30,985), and the 500 Fashion Group, Northampton, Pennsylvania (TA-W-30,985A), Whitehall, Pennsylvania (TA-W-30,985B), and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (TA-W-30,985C) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after April 24, 1994 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, DC this 29th day of August 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-22475 Filed 9-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-31,329]

H.L. Brown, Jr., Midland, TX; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on August 14, 1995 in response to a worker petition which was filed on August 14, 1995 on behalf of workers at H.L. Brown, Jr., Midland, Texas.

All workers were separated from the subject firm more than one year prior to the date of the petition. Section 223 of the Act specifies that no certification may apply to any worker whose last separation occurred more than one year before the date of the petition. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC this 28th day of August, 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-22476 Filed 9-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-31,102]

Rockwell Graphics Systems of Rockwell, Reading, PA; Notice of Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

On July 31, 1995, the union requested administrative reconsideration of the Department of Labor's Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance for workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on July 25, 1995 and published in the **Federal Register** on August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42589).

The union claims that the Department's survey of Rockwell Graphics Systems' customer base was inadequate, and recent competitive bids lost to foreign firms caused layoffs at the subject facility.

Conclusion

After careful review of the application, I conclude that the claim is of sufficient weight to justify reconsideration of the Department of

Labor's prior decision. The application is, therefore, granted.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 25th day of August, 1995.

Victor J. Trunzo,

Program Manager, Policy and Reemployment Services, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-22477 Filed 9-8-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-31,102]

Rockwell Graphics Systems of Rockwell Reading, PA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By an application dated July 31, 1995, the union requested administrative reconsideration of the subject petition for trade adjustment assistance. The denial notice was signed on July 25, 1995 and published in the **Federal Register** on August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42589).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

Investigation findings show that the workers Manufactured commercial printing presses.

The Department's denial was based on the fact that the "contributed importantly" test of the Group Eligibility Requirements of Trade Act was not met.

The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's customers. The Department's survey revealed that none of the respondents increased their purchases of imports while decreasing their purchases from Rockwell Graphics Systems during the relevant period.

District 10 of the United Steelworkers of America claim that recent competitive bids were lost to foreign firms, causing substantial loss of jobs at the Rockwell Graphics Systems Reading, Pennsylvania location.

Investigation findings show that the Department surveyed the major declining customers of Rockwell Graphics Systems at Reading. Further findings show that Rockwell Graphics at