Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before December 18, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Gerald Taché, Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument and instructions should be directed to Steven Rudolph, Economic Planning and Coordination Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233, (301) 457–2586 voice and (301) 457–4433 fax.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

In the Fall of 1994, the Census Bureau conducted the National Employers Survey for the National Center on the Employment Quality of the Workforce (EQW), a non-profit research group. This survey collected data for a regression-based econometric study on employment, hiring, training, investment, and productivity, as they relate to each other. We surveyed a representative panel of just over 3,000 domestic business establishments with 20 or more employees. This was the first attempt to measure the factors. The EQW began issuing findings from the study in February 1995 and the results generated great interest from all levels. Their first large-scale technical reports are now being issued.

Major findings included information on what attributes firms looked for when hiring new employees. They found that attitude and communications skills were highly valued by employers while grades and teachers' recommendations were not. Their analysis indicates that investment in human capital (training) had at least as big, and in many groups including services, or bigger return than investment in physical capital. These findings provide a baseline for employers, public and private, for formulating and gauging human resources decisions and policies in a manner that will provide the most effective return on productivity in the workplace.

As this was the first attempt to gather this type of data, responses in four areas were weak. This proposed follow up will address this problem by changing the intent of the original questions. In addition, as the original study was looking at relationships between, for example, training and productivity, it would be very useful to have data for consecutive years. This proposed survey will ask for a small amount of data for the following year.

The follow-up questions fall into four categories:

Updating last year's data (questions 1–6 are examples) these are designed to test the stability of the survey's initial findings that linked productivity to education. This is the central theme of the survey and the results' usefulness will be greatly increased with an additional data period.

Providing more precise definitions of the target population (who would be candidates for training) (question 8 is an example) the original question (number 14 in the initial survey) did not provide as clear an understanding of skills required by the categories of employees. We believe this version should improve the findings.

Providing greater detail where important policy considerations are at stake (questions 17 and 18 are examples) after reviewing results from the original questions, we felt that the attributes that employers valued during hiring could have been clarified and better specified.

Testing the initial results in areas that seem anomalous to prevailing wisdom (questions 19–23 are examples) in the initial findings the utilization rate for tuition remissions was relatively low. These questions should be better tailored to the information the respondents are likely to have at hand.

By surveying the original panel respondents, we need only ask the additional questions (which should take an average of 10 to 12 minutes).

In addition to the Department of Education, which had a basic interest in the project from its inception, other governmental agencies have shown a strong interest. This includes the GAO and the Department of Labor.

II. Method of Collection

We will conduct the survey with Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as with the initial NES. Since the respondents are familiar with the survey, they would not require additional preparation and instruction. As with the initial survey, the EQW is analyzing relationships rather than tabulating totals. For this reason we will accept and encourage the use of reasonable estimates. This allows the sponsor to use the initial data more effectively as the new data will augment and add valuable information to the original data set. We will provide all respondents (or a panel member who does not or cannot respond to the interview) who indicate they want one, with a copy of the latest findings of the surveys.

III. Data

OMB Number: 0607–0787 (for original National Employers Survey).

Form Number: Not applicable.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3,000.

Estimated Time Per Respondent: 12 minutes.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 600 hours.

Estimated Total Cost: $125,000.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: October 12, 1995.

Gerald Taché,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 95–25806 Filed 10–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

International Trade Administration

Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the antidumping duty order listed below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 18, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed

under Antidumping Proceeding at: Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482–4737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation, pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 353.25(d)(4)(iii), if no interested party has requested an administrative review for four consecutive annual anniversary months and no domestic interested party objects to the revocation or requests an administrative review.

The anniversary month for the Certain Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube (P & T) from Taiwan antidumping duty order is May. With regard to P & T from Taiwan, the Department published its notice of intent to revoke the order on May 3, 1994. However, due to a ministerial oversight, the Department failed to notify the domestic interested parties of its action. On June 20, 1994, the Department sent a letter to the domestic interested parties notifying them of our previous action and informing them that any objections to the Department's intent to revoke the order on P & T from Taiwan must be made within 30 days. Domestic interested parties filed an objection on July 11, 1994.

On September 19, 1994, Kao Hsing Chang Iron & Steel Corporation (KHC), a respondent, requested that the Department revoke the order because no interested party had objected by the last day of May 1994. KHC, citing the Court of International Trade's (CIT) ruling in *Kemira Fibres Oy v. United States,* 861 F. Supp. 144 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1994), argued that the objection of July 11, 1994, ''was invalid because the objection ensued in response to an invitation erroneously extended as the time to issue the notice had expired and Commerce was obligated to revoke the order.'' The CIT held that, pursuant to 19 C.F.R. § 353.25(d)(4)(iii), if no interested party objects to the Department's notice of intent to revoke by the last day of the fifth anniversary month of the order, then the Department must revoke the order, regardless of the time limit for objections specified by the Department in its notice of intent to revoke.

On August 2, 1995, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) overturned the CIT 's ruling in *Kemira Fibres Oy v. United States,* Slip Op. 95–1077 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 2, 1995). Among other things, the CAFC held that notice is of paramount importance in the ''sunset'' process:

> * * * there may be cases when administrative review is not warranted because interested parties are satisfied with an existing order. . . . In such a case, the domestic industry may have no incentive to request administrative review of the order. Thus, the absence of a request for administrative review, while it may indicate lack of interest, can also indicate satisfaction with the status quo. Consequently, Commerce may not reasonably conclude that there is a lack of interest in an outstanding order merely by the absence of a request for review, rather, only after publishing notice of proposed revocation may Commerce properly conclude that the order at issue is no longer of interest so as to be revocable.
>
> It is clear that notification of domestic parties so that their interest in revocation of an outstanding order may be ascertained and addressed is an overriding consideration in the regulatory framework and the legislative history of the antidumping statute. Given this, we conclude that Commerce's interpretation was a reasonable one. *See Chevron,* 467 U.S. at 844. Revocation must be predicated on a lack of industry interest and such interest must be ascertained through notification of an intent to revoke. The timing requirements of section 353.25(d)(4)(i)–(ii) are merely procedural aids in accomplishing this prerequisite to revocation. They are subordinate to the overriding requirement of notice. A contrary interpretation would defeat the clear intent of Congress.

Within the time frame specified in our notice to interested parties of June 20, 1994, we received objections from the ''domestic interested parties'' to our intent to revoke this antidumping duty order. Therefore, in accordance with the CAFC's decision, because the ''domestic interested parties'' timely objected to our intent to revoke, we no longer intend to revoke this antidumping duty order. Furthermore, in light of the CAFC's decision, the alternative arguments raised by the parties are moot.

Antidumping Proceeding

A–583–008

Taiwan

Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe & Tubes

Objection Date: July 11, 1994

Objector: Wheatland Tube Corporation

Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475

Dated: October 11, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–25860 Filed 10–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Determination Not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings Nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the antidumping duty orders and findings nor to terminate the suspended investigations listed below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 18, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed under Antidumping Proceeding at: Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone (202) 482–4737.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation, pursuant to 19 CFR § 353.25(d)(4)(iii), if no interested party has requested an administrative review for four consecutive annual anniversary months and no domestic interested party objects to the revocation or requests an administrative review.

We had not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months. Therefore, pursuant to § 353.25(d)(4)(i) of the Department's regulations, on April 28, 1995, we published in the Federal Register a notice of intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations and served written notice of the intent to each domestic interested party on the Department's service list in each case. Within the specified time frame, we received objections from domestic interested parties to our intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations. Therefore, because domestic interested parties objected to our intent to revoke or terminate, we no longer intend to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations.

Antidumping Proceeding

A–583–008