

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731-TA-125 (Second Review)]

### Potassium Permanganate From China

#### Determination

On the basis of the record<sup>1</sup> developed in the subject five-year review, the United States International Trade Commission determines, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act),<sup>2</sup> that revocation of the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

#### Background

The Commission instituted this review on October 1, 2004 (69 FR 58955), and determined on January 4, 2005, that it would conduct an expedited review (70 FR 2428, January 13, 2005).

The Commission transmitted its determination in this review to the Secretary of Commerce on May 31, 2005. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3778 (June 2005), entitled *Potassium Permanganate from China: Investigation No. 731-TA-125 (Second Review)*.

Issued: May 26, 2005.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**

*Secretary to the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 05-10964 Filed 6-1-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-56,286]

#### Duracell, a Division of the Gillette Company, Lexington, NC; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration

By letter postmarked April 15, 2005 a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration regarding the Department's Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance, applicable to the workers of the subject

firm engaged in the production of high power lithium film camera batteries.

The initial investigation resulted in a split determination signed on March 2, 2005. The investigation revealed that workers at the subject facility are separately identifiable as workers engaged in the packaging of zinc air hearing aid batteries and workers engaged in the production of high power lithium film camera batteries. Based on the investigation results, the first group was certified eligible for Trade Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance, while the second group was denied these benefits. The negative determination was based on the finding that imports of high power lithium film camera batteries did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on April 1, 2005 (70 FR 16846).

In the request for reconsideration the petitioner alleges that all workers of the subject firm have been cross-trained to perform various tasks within the subject firm and are not separately identifiable by the products manufactured.

A company official was contacted to verify these allegations. The company official stated that the information provided by the subject firm to the Department during the initial investigation was not detailed. The official further stated that in fact, employees of Duracell in Lexington, North Carolina are cross-trained to perform multiple tasks and it is impossible to separate them according to the production lines. Therefore, workers of the subject firm are not separately identifiable.

In accordance with Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974 (26 U.S.C. 2813), as amended, the Department of Labor herein presents the results of its investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance (ATAA) for older workers.

In order for the Department to issue a certification of eligibility to apply for ATAA, the group eligibility requirements of Section 246 of the Trade Act must be met. The Department has determined in this case that the requirements of Section 246 have been met.

A significant number of workers at the firm are age 50 or over and possess skills that are not easily transferable. Competitive conditions within the industry are adverse.

### Conclusion

After careful review of the initial investigation, I determine that there was a shift in production from the workers' firm or subdivision to a foreign country of articles that are like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm or subdivision, and there has been or is likely to be an increase in imports of like or directly competitive articles. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Duracell, a division of the Gillette Company, Lexington, North Carolina, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after December 30, 2003 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, and are eligible to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under Section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 19th day of May, 2005.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-2797 Filed 6-1-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-56,923]

#### Engineered Machined Products, Inc., Plants 1 and 2, Escanaba, MI; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on April 7, 2005 in response to a petition filed by a District Representative of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local #328 on behalf of workers at Engineered Machined Products, Inc., Plants 1 and 2, Escanaba, Michigan.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of May, 2005.

**Linda G. Poole,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E5-2801 Filed 6-1-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

<sup>1</sup> The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.2(f)).

<sup>2</sup> 19 U.S.C. 1675(c).