United States v. *Bechtel*, 648 F.2d at 666 (citation omitted) (emphasis added).

The proposed Final Judgment, therefore, should not be reviewed under a standard of whether it is certain to eliminate every anticompetitive effect of a particular practice or whether it mandates certainty of free competition in the future. Court approval of a final judgment requires a standard more flexible and less strict than the standard required for a finding of liability. ''[A] proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is 'within the reaches of public interest.' '' (citations omitted). *United States* v. *American Tel. and Tel. Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 150 (D.D.C. 1982), *aff'd sub nom., Maryland* v. *United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983).

VIII

Determinative Documents

There are no determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

Executed on: April ____, 1996.

John Schmoll,

Attorney, State of Wisconsin #1013897 Dept. of Justice, Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 4000, Washington, D.C. 20530, (202) 307–5780.

Gregory M. Sleet,

United States Attorney,

By:

Richard G. Andrews,

Esquire, State of Delaware #2199, 1201 Market Street, Suite 1100, Wilmington, Delaware 19899, (302) 573–6277.

[FR Doc. 96–9767 Filed 4–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993; Michigan Materials and Processing Institute

Notice is hereby given that, on March 13, 1996, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), the Michigan Materials and Processing Institute (''MMPI'') filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its organization. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. The following companies were recently accepted as a Class A Shareholders in MMPI: American Commodities, Inc., Flint, MI; Automotive Composites Consortium, Dearborn, Auburn Hills, and Warren, MI; B&P Process Equipment and Systems, L.L.C., Saginaw, MI; Raybestos Products Company, Crawfordsville, IN; RheTech, Inc., Whitmore Lake, MI; and Dow Chemical Company, Midland, MI. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation is no longer a shareholder in MMPI.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or the planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and MMPI intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On August 7, 1990, MMPI filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act of September 6, 1990, 55 FR 36710. The last notification was filed with the Department on August 1, 1995, and is unpublished.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 96–9766 Filed 4–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993; Semiconductor Research Corporation

Notice is hereby given that, on March 25, 1996, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. § 4301 *et. seq.* (''the Act''), Semiconductor Research Corporation (''SRC'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, SRC has added LV Software, Inc. (dba Logic Vision) of San Jose, CA; as an Affiliate Member and Shipley Company, L.L.C. of Marlborough, MA, as a Science Area Member.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and SRC intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 7, 1985, SRC filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on January 30, 1985 (50 FR 4281).

The last notification was filed with the Department on December 11, 1995. A notice was published in the Federal Register pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 5, 1996 (61 FR 4289).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 96–9765 Filed 4–19–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of Existing Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice of information collection under review; application to replace alien registration card.

The proposed information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted for ''sixty days'' from the date listed at the top of this page in the Federal Register.

Request written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the proposed information collection instrument with instructions, or