specific types of textiles and apparel products that are most likely to be produced in Sub-Saharan African countries, and which would have the most significant impact on U.S. producers, workers, and consumers. As requested by the Committee, the Commission will seek to provide its advice not later than September 2, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lee Cook, Office of Industries (202–205–3471) or Mary Elizabeth Sweet, Office of Industries (202–205–3455), or William Gearhart, Office of the General Counsel (202–205–3091) for information on legal aspects. The media should contact Margaret O'Laughlin, Office of External Relations (202–205–1819). Hearing impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the TDD terminal on (202–205–1810).

Background

Among the provisions in H.R. 4198 is one relating to increased U.S. market access for textiles and apparel from Sub-Saharan Africa. According to the Committee's request, Sub-Saharan Africa supplied less than 1 percent, or about $400 million, of U.S. imports of textiles and apparel in 1995. H.R. 4198 provides that, until imports of these articles from Sub-Saharan Africa reach a much higher level, the transitional safeguards provided in Article 6 of the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing should not apply. In addition, H.R. 4198 would eliminate existing U.S. quotas on imports of textiles and apparel from Sub-Saharan Africa. The Sub-Saharan African countries currently covered by U.S. textiles and apparel quotas are Kenya and Mauritius.

The Sub-Saharan African countries covered in this investigation include the following 48 countries: Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, São Tomé and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo, Tanzania, Uganda, Zaire, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

Public Hearing

A public hearing in connection with this investigation is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. on May 1, 1997, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, 500 E Street SW., Washington, D.C. All persons have the right to appear by counsel or in person, to present information, and to be heard. Persons wishing to appear at the public hearing should file a letter asking to testify with the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, not later than the close of business (5:15 p.m.) on April 17, 1997. In addition, persons testifying should file prehearing briefs (original and 14 copies) with the Secretary by the close of business on April 17, 1997. In the event that no requests to appear at the hearing are received by the close of business on April 17, 1997, the hearing will be canceled. Any person interested in attending the hearing as an observer or non-participant may call the Secretary (202–205–1816) after April 17, 1997 to determine whether the hearing will be held. Posthearing briefs/statements and other written submissions should be filed not later than the close of business on May 8, 1997.

Written Submissions

In lieu of or in addition to appearing at the public hearing, interested persons are invited to submit written statements concerning the investigation. Written statements should be received by the close of business on May 8, 1997. Commercial or financial information which a submitter desires the Commission to treat as confidential must be submitted on separate sheets of paper, each clearly marked ''Confidential Business Information'' at the top. All submissions requesting confidential treatment must conform with the requirements of section 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.6). All written submissions, except for confidential business information, will be made available for inspection by interested persons. All submissions should be addressed to the Secretary at the Commission's office in Washington, D.C.

Issued: February 10, 1997

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97–4286 Filed 2–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Automation and Technology; Notice of Opportunity To Comment and of Public Hearing on the ABA Citation Resolution

AGENCY: Judicial Conference of the United States, Committee on Automation and Technology.

ACTION: Notice of opportunity to comment and of public hearing on the ABA Citation Resolution.

In August 1996, the American Bar Association (ABA) approved a resolution made by its Special Committee on Citation Issues calling for state and federal courts to develop a standard citation system and recommending a format that could be used by state and federal courts. That resolution calls for courts to identify the citation on each decision at the time it is made available to the public. The ABA resolution is available through the Internet (http://www.ABANET.ORG/citation/home.html).

The federal judiciary seeks written public comments from judges, court personnel, the bar, and the public as to:

(1) Whether the federal courts should adopt the form of official citation for court decisions recommended by the ABA resolution; and,

(2) The costs and benefits such a decision would have on the courts, the bar, and the public.

In addition, a public hearing will be held on Thursday, April 3, beginning at 9 a.m. in the ceremonial courtroom of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 3rd and Constitution Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. to address issues (1) and (2) stated above.

Persons and organizations wishing to submit written comments should do so by sending them to: Appellate Court and Circuit Administration Division, ATTN: ABA Citation Resolution, Suite 4–512, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544, Fax (202) 273–1555. *Internet address:* citation@ao.uscourts.gov.

Submission of written comments is preferred in electronic form and should be sent to citation@ao.uscourts.gov in ASCII or WordPerfect 6.1 or earlier versions. Alternatively, comments may be submitted in printed form through mail or facsimile. Persons without access to Internet may send a diskette. If printed comments are submitted, ten copies should be provided. Written comments are due no later than Friday, March 14, 1997. All comments received will be considered public information.

Anyone submitting written comments who also is interested in testifying at the

public hearing should submit a written request to the above address no later than Friday, March 14, 1997. Since it is expected that only a limited number of requests can be granted, the request should set forth reasons why an oral presentation in addition to written comments would be helpful to consideration of these issues. The request should identify the persons who wish to testify, the subjects to be addressed, the estimated amount of time desired (the maximum is 15 minutes), and the organization represented, phone number, and fax number. If possible, advance copies of testimony should be submitted.

Any questions about this notice may be directed to Joan Countryman at (202) 273–1543.

Dated: February 12, 1997.

Leonidas Ralph Mecham,

Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

[FR Doc. 97–4230 Filed 2–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 2210–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (''CERCLA'')

Consistent with the policy set forth in Section 122(d)(2)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9622(d)(2)(B), and the Department of Justice regulations at 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that on January 21, 1997, a proposed Consent Decree was lodged with the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana in *United States* v. *Jonathan W. Bankert, Jr., et al.,* Cause No. IP–91–1181C–M/S. This Consent Decree settles claims asserted by the United States pursuant to Section 107 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9607, for partial reimbursement of response costs incurred by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in connection with response actions at the Northside Sanitary Landfill Site in Zionsville, Indiana.

The Department of Justice will receive written comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree for thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this notice. Comments should be directed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Jonathan W. Bankert, Jr., et al.,* DOJ Reference # 90–11–2–48H.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana, U.S. Courthouse, 5th Floor, 46 East Ohio Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, at the Region V offices of the Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois 60604–3590, and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of $2.75, (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environment and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 97–4278 Filed 2–20–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95–29]

Roger D. McAlpin, D.M.D., Grant of Restricted Registration

On March 7, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued an Order to Show Cause to Roger McAlpin, D.M.D. (Respondent) of Louisville, Kentucky, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his application for registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated March 29, 1995, the Respondent, acting *pro se,* timely filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Louisville, Kentucky on February 21, 1996, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing, both parties called witnesses to testify and the Government introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, the Government submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On July 3, 1996, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision, recommending that Respondent's application for a DEA Certificate of Registration should be granted in Schedules III non-narcotic, IV and V subject to various restrictions. On July 22, 1996, the Government filed exceptions to the Recommended Ruling of the Administrative Law Judge, and on August 6, 1996, Judge Bittner transmitted the record of these proceedings, including the Government's exceptions to the Deputy Administrator.

The Acting Deputy Administrator has considered the record in it entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Acting Deputy Administrator adopts, except as specifically noted below, the Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge. The Acting Deputy Administrator's adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that Respondent received his D.M.D. degree from the University of Kentucky in 1979. Following graduation, Respondent worked for a non-profit dental clinic in California for approximately two years. Over the ensuing years, Respondent practiced dentistry at various times in Kentucky, Illinois and Tennessee.

According to Respondent, he began using cocaine recreationally while in dental school. He testified that he quit using cocaine after graduation, but then resumed using cocaine and other controlled substances in 1981. Respondent quit abusing drugs again after approximately two years and then recommenced his abuse in the late 1980's. According to Respondent, in April 1988 he entered into a 30-day in-patient rehabilitation treatment facility. Following his discharge from the facility, he continued to attend Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous meetings three to four nights a week. Subsequently, Respondent concluded that he was cured of his addiction, stopped attending support meetings, and broke off all contact with his sponsor.

In 1989, Respondent was working for a dental clinic in Tennessee which was owned by an individual who was not a dentist. In November 1989, the Tennessee Department of Health and Environment, Health Related Boards initiated an investigation of Respondent after receiving a complaint from a local pharmacist that Respondent was possibly overprescribing and distributing controlled substances. A review of Respondent's prescriptions revealed that several of Respondent's patients had received Schedule II