The proposed Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Southern District of Indiana, United States Courthouse, 5th Floor, 46 East Ohio Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204; at U.S. EPA Region 5, Office of Regional Counsel, 77 West Jackson Boulevard (C–29A), Chicago, Illinois 60604; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 3rd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 3rd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of $5.00 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

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

[FR Doc. 99–606 Filed 1–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on December 23, 1998, a proposed Consent Decree in *United States* v. *Southern California Edison Company,* Civil Action number F–98–5595 AWI SMS, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

In this action, the United States sought to recover past response costs as well as future response costs incurred and to be incurred by the United States at the Southern California Edison Visalia Poleyard Superfund Site (''Site'') in Visalia, Tulare County, California. The Consent Decree resolves claims pursuant to Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. § 9607, against defendant Southern California Edison Company. In the proposed consent decree, the Defendant agrees to pay to the United States $264,000 for past response costs which the United States paid through February 28, 1998, and has also agreed to reimburse the United States for all costs paid at or in connection with the Site after February 28, 1998 that are not inconsistent with the National Contingency Plan.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Southern California Edison Company,* D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–06062.

The Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Eastern District of California, Federal Building Room 3654, 1130 ''O'' Street, Fresno, CA 93721, at U.S. EPA Region 9, 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, CA 94105–3901, and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 3rd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the Consent Decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 3rd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of $7 (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. 99–609 Filed 1–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, and Section 122 of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9622, notice is hereby given that on December 17, 1998, a proposed *De Minimis* Consent Decree in *United States* v. *Stricker Paint Products, Inc.,* Civil Action No. 98–40421, was lodged with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division. This consent decree represents a settlement of claims of the United States against Stricker Paint Products, Inc. for reimbursement of response costs and injunctive relief in connection with the Metamora Landfill Superfund Site (''Site'') pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.*

Under this settlement with the United States, Stricker Paint Products, Inc. will pay $105,192, over a period of three years, in reimbursement of response costs incurred by the United States Environmental Protection Agency at the Site.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Stricker Paint Products, Inc.,* D.J. Ref. 90–11–3–289/2.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, 211 West Fort Street, Suite 2300, Detroit, MI 48226, at the Region 5 Office of the Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604–3590, and at the Consent Decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 3rd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 3rd Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of $5.25 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel. Gross,

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

[FR Doc. 99–607 Filed 1–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

U.S. versus Concert plc and MCI Communications Corporation; United States Notice of Defendant's Motion to Terminate Modified Final Judgment

Notice is hereby given that MCI WorldCom, Inc. (''MCI WorldCom''), successor-in-interest to defendant MCI Communications Corporation (''MCI''), and British Telecommunications plc (''BT''), predecessor-in-interest to defendant Concert plc, have moved to terminate the Modified Final Judgment entered by this Court on September 16, 1997. In a stipulation also filed with the Court, the Department of Justice (''Department'') has tentatively consented to termination of the Judgment, but has reserved the right to withdraw its consent pending receipt of public comments.

On June 15, 1994, the United States filed its complaint in this case. The complaint alleged that the acquisition by British Telecommunications plc (''BT'') of a 20% ownership interest in MCI Communications Corporation (''MCI'') created an incentive for BT, using its existing market power in the

United Kingdom, to favor MCI at the expense of other United States international carriers in the market or markets for international telecommunications services between the United States and the United Kingdom. The complaint also alleged that the formation of a joint venture between BT and MCI to provide seamless global network services to multinational corporations created an incentive for BT to use its dominance in the UK to favor the joint venture at the expense of other global network service providers in the provision of the UK segment essential to any seamless global network.

The Final Judgment, filed contemporaneously with the complaint and entered by the Court on September 29, 1994 after a Tunney Act review, contained three categories of provisions designed to remedy the anticompetitive effects of the partial acquisition: (1) transparency or reporting provisions; (2) confidentiality provisions; and (3) a provision relating to International Simple Resale (''ISR''). These provisions were specifically designed to diminish the risk that BT would successfully act on its incentive to use its market power to discriminate in favor of MCI or the joint venture. After the Final Judgment was entered, BT and MCI consummated BT's 20% acquisition and formed the joint venture known as Concert Communications Company.

In November 1996, BT and MCI entered into a Merger Agreement and Plan of Merger pursuant to which BT agreed to acquire the remaining 80% of MCI. The new parent company was to be renamed Concert plc. Although the Department had thoroughly analyzed all of the competitive consequences associated with BT's initial 20% acquisition of MCI, the Department undertook an evaluation of the changes in market conditions since 1994 in order to determine whether a modification of the existing decree was appropriate under the circumstances.

As a result of its new analysis, the Department concluded that BT's incentives and ability to discriminate against MCI's and Concert's competitors still existed. Consequently, the Department recommended that the provisions of the Final Judgment aimed at deterring and detecting discrimination be retained and, in some circumstances, strengthened. In addition, the Department determined that certain modifications to the confidentiality provisions were necessary in order to ensure that the proposed full integration of BT and MCI would not impair the effectiveness of the protection afforded by the Final Judgment. On September 16, 1997, after fully considering the comments received and the United States' response to those comments, the Court entered the Modified Final Judgment proposed by the parties.

Thereafter, on November 9, 1997, MCI and BT terminated their merger agreement and BT agreed to acquire MCI's 24.9% interest in the Concert joint venture. Contemporaneously therewith, MCI entered into a new merger agreement with WorldCom, Inc. (''WorldCom''), and WorldCom agreed to acquire BT's 20% interest in MCI. On September 15, 1998, the foregoing transactions were consummated. Currently, BT has no equity interest in MCI or MCI WorldCom. Conversely, neither MCI WorldCom nor MCI has any equity interest in the Concert joint venture.

The Department, MCI WorldCom and BT have filed memoranda with the Court setting forth the reasons why they believe that termination of the Modified Final Judgment would serve the public interest. Copies of MCI WorldCom's and BT's motion to terminate, the stipulation containing the Department's consent, the supporting memoranda, and all additional papers filed with the Court in connection with this motion will be available for inspection at the Antitrust Documents Group of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Room 215, North Liberty Place Building, 325 7th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Copies of these materials may be obtained from the Antitrust Division upon request and payment of the duplicating fee determined by Department of Justice regulations.

Interested persons may submit comments regarding the proposed termination of the Judgment to the Department. Such comments must be received by the Antitrust Division within sixty (60) days and will be filed with the Court by the Department. Comments should be addressed to Donald J. Russell, Chief, Telecommunications Task Force, Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, 1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 8000, Washington, D.C. 20005, telephone (202) 514–6381.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations & Merger Enforcement, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 99–610 Filed 1–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 98–29]

Bill Lloyd Drug; Revocation of Registration

On April 17, 1998, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Bill Lloyd Drug (Respondent) of Graham, Texas, notifying it of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke its DEA Certificate of Registration AB2243246, and deny any pending applications for renewal of such registration as a retail pharmacy pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(4) and 823(f) for reason that its continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated May 15, 1998, Respondent filed a request for a hearing and the matter was docketed before Administrative Law Judge Gail A. Randall. On May 21, 1998, Judge Randall issued an Order for Prehearing Statements, and on June 10, 1998, the Government filed its prehearing statement. Respondent was given until July 2, 1998, to file its prehearing statement. In her Order for Prehearing Statements, the Administrative Law Judge cautioned Respondent ''that failure to file timely a prehearing statement as directed above may be considered a waiver of hearing and an implied withdrawal of a request for hearing.'' On July 8, 1998, Judge Randall issued an Order indicating that she had not yet received a prehearing statement from Respondent; advising Respondent that failure to file a prehearing statement will be deemed a waiver of its right to a hearing; and giving Respondent until July 22, 1998, to file such a statement along with a motion for late acceptance.

On July 27, 1998, the Administrative Law Judge issued an Order Terminating Proceedings, finding that Respondent had failed to file a prehearing statement, and therefore, concluding that Respondent waived its right to a hearing. Judge Randall noted that the record would be transmitted to the then-Acting Deputy Administrator for entry of a final order based upon the investigative file. Therefore, the Deputy Administrator, finding that Respondent has waived its right to a hearing, hereby enters his final order without a hearing and based upon the investigative file pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43(e) and 1301.46.