substances for which he has received extensive treatment.

As to factor three, there is some dispute as to whether Respondent has been convicted of controlled substance related offenses. Respondent pled guilty to two felony charges related to the illegal obtaining of controlled substances, and as a result received a four-year deferred sentence. Respondent argues that this deferred sentence may not be considered a conviction under Oklahoma state law, citing *White* v. *State*, 702 P.2d 1058, 1062 (Okla. Crim. App. 1985). However, DEA has consistently held that a deferred adjudication, following the entry of a guilty plea, is considered a ''conviction'' for purposes of the Controlled Substances Act. *See Yu–To Hsu, M.D.*, 62 FR 12840 (1997), *Harlan J. Borcherding, D.O.*, 60 FR 28796 (1995); *Mukand Lal Arora, M.D.*, 60 FR 4447 (1995); *Clinton D. Nutt, D.O.*, 55 FR 30992 (1990). Thus for purposes of this factor, Respondent has been convicted of two felony counts relating to controlled substances. However, the Deputy Administrator also recognizes that these convictions were a result of Respondent's addiction to controlled substances, and that he is in the midst of successful recovery efforts from this addition. As Judge Randall noted, ''[at]t the present time, the Respondent is halfway through the term of his deferred adjudication and has shown no signs of relapse.''

As to factor five, during his addiction, Respondent lied to his colleagues and family about his drug abuse. The Deputy Administrator agrees with Judge Randall that ''[a]bsent rehabilitation, such behavior supports the Government's position that the Respondent could pose a threat to the public health and safety of the citizens of Oklahoma.''

Judge Randall concluded that the Government made a prima facie case for the denial of Respondent's application for registration. However, she further concluded that it would not be in the public interest to deny the application. The Deputy Administrator agrees. Respondent has accepted responsibility for his prior actions and has shown remorse. He cooperated with law enforcement authorities from the moment he was questioned about the forged prescriptions. He is no longer affiliated with the medical practice that caused the stress which led to his addiction. He has taken affirmative steps toward rehabilitation and is being closely monitored by the Board, the OBN, the PRP, the treatment center, his family and his colleagues. As Judge Randall noted. ''the Respondent lives and works in a community dedicated to his recovery and personal growth. This external support system ensures to a high probability that the Respondent will remain free of narcotic and alcoholic substances.'' Of even greater significance to the Deputy Administrator than this external support system is Respondent's apparent commitment to continuing with his rehabilitative efforts and to living a drug-free life.

Judge Randall recommended that Respondent be granted a DEA registration without restrictions since ''[t]he State of Oklahoma and the OBN have implemented substantial and aggressive monitoring procedures to ensure that the Respondent continues to comply with his licensing conditions and to ensure that any possible relapse is immediately detected.'' Judge Randall further recommended that should the deputy Administrator find that additional monitoring by DEA is necessary, Respondent should be required to file with DEA duplicate copies of the documents being filed with the State of Oklahoma.

The Deputy Administrator agrees with Judge Randall that denial of Respondent's application is not warranted. However, the Deputy Administrator believes that some restrictions on Respondent's registration are necessary to protect the public health and safety in light of Respondent's fairly recent abuse of controlled substances, his forging of prescriptions and his felony convictions.

Therefore, the Deputy Administrator concludes that Respondent's application for registration should granted subject to the following restrictions for three years from the date of issuance of the DEA Certificate of Registration:

1. Respondent must maintain his contractual relationship with the Oklahoma Physicians Recovery Program and abide by its recommendations.

2. Respondent shall continue to undergo random urinalysis at his own expense on at least a monthly basis regardless of whether he is released from his probation with the Oklahoma Board and the OBN. He shall forward copies of the results of these tests to the DEA Oklahoma City office.

3. Respondent shall make copies of his prescriptions available to DEA personnel upon request for inspection and copying.

4. Respondent shall notify the DEA Oklahoma City office within 30 days of any change in his employment.

5. Respondent shall consent to periodic inspections by DEA personnel based on a Notice of Inspection rather than an Administrative Inspection Warrant.

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) and 0.104, hereby orders that the November 20, 1996 application for registration submitted by Jimmy Harold Conway, Jr., M.D., be, and it hereby is, granted subject to the above described restrictions. This order is effective upon the issuance of the DEA Certificate of Registration, but no later than July 16, 1999.

Dated: June 7, 1999.

Donnie R. Marshall,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 99–15189 Filed 6–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–34,985 and TA–W–34,985A]

Bernstein & Sons Shirt Corp., UTICA, MS, and Crystal Springs, MS; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade At of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on November 9, 1998, applicable to all workers of Bernstein & Sons Shirt Corporation, Utica, Mississippi. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 4, 1998 (63 FR 16140).

At the request of the company, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New information shows that worker separations occurred at Bernstein & Sons' Crystal Springs, Mississippi facility. The workers are engaged in employment related to the production of men's and women's sport shirts.

Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover workers of Bernstein & Sons Shirt Corporation, Crystal Springs, Mississippi.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Bernstein & Sons Shirt Corporation adversely affected by increased imports.

The amended notice applicable to TA–W–34,985 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Bernstein & Sons Shirt Corporation, Utica, Mississippi (TA–W–34,985) and Crystal Springs, Mississippi (TA–W–34,985A) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after September 1, 1997 through November 9, 2000 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington DC, this 27th day of May, 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–15309 Filed 6–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–35,695]

Fellowes Manufacturing Co., Boone, NC; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on February 22, 1999, in response to a petition filed by the company on behalf of workers at Fellowes Manufacturing Company, Boone, North Carolina. The workers produce wood CD, video, and cassette racks.

A company official has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 27th day of May, 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–15306 Filed 6–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–35,132]

Guilford Fibers, Inc. Gainesville, GA; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

On April 23, 1999, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application on Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on May 6, 1999 (64 FR 24419).

The Department initially denied TAA to workers of Guilford Fibers, Inc., Gainesville, Georgia, producing nylon and polyester filament textile yarn because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met.

On reconsideration, the Department obtained more information about imports of like or directly competitive filament textile yarns. According to company officials, inexpensive filament yarns are flooding the U.S. market which has caused the subject firm's parent company to require price reductions from its internal supplier (the subject firm). the subject firm, as an internal supplier to its parent company, could not compete with the price of imported yarns. A review of imports of life or directly competitive articles revealed a significant increase in imports of polyester filament yarns accompanied by a decrease in U.S. production.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with nylon and polyester filament textile yarn, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers of Gilford Fibers, Inc., Gainesville, Georgia. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Guilford Fibers, Inc., Gainesville, Georgia who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after October 5, 1997 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 29th day of May 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–15308 Filed 6–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–36,159]

International Wire Group, Rolling Prairie, IN; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, an investigation was initiated on May 3, 1999, in response to a worker petition which was filed on behalf of workers at International Wire Group, Rolling Prairie, Indiana.

All workers of the subject firm are included under an existing certification (TA–W–33,467). Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 26th day of May 1999.

Grant D. Beale,

Acting Director, Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 99–15303 Filed 6–15–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–35,438]

Motorola Ceramic Products, Albuquerque, NM; Notice of Negative Determination on Reconsideration

On March 9, 1999, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration for the workers and former workers of the subject firm. The petitioners presented new evidence that indicated the Department had not fully investigated the subject firm's decision to shift production to an offshore location and the impact of the subsequent imports of RF filters. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 6, 1998 (64 FR 16757).

The Department initially denied TAA to workers of Motorola Ceramics because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, was not met. The workers at the subject firm were engaged in employment related to the production of RF filters.

On reconsideration, the Department requested additional information from the subject firm as to its shift in production and subsequent imports of RF filters. Upon further examination, it was revealed that in 1996 the subject firm transferred approximately 85% of the final production stage of RF filters to an offshore facility and the workers affected by that action were certified eligible to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TA–W–32,889). In mid-1997 the subject firm made a strategic business decision to transfer middle production stages offshore. The subject firm now manufactures the middle and final stages at its offshore location and imports final stage production into the U.S. The worker group under this investigation were affected by the latest transfer of production and were primarily engaged in middle production stages of RF filters and not engaged in