

must consider under Section 246 of the Trade Act are:

1. Whether a significant number of workers in the workers' firm are 50 years of age or older.
2. Whether the workers in the workers' firm possess skills that are not easily transferable.
3. The competitive conditions within the workers' industry (i.e., conditions within the industry are adverse).

The Department has determined that with respect to workers producing switches and connectors, criterion 2 has not been met. The workers' possess skills that are easily transferable to new positions.

Conclusion

After careful review, I determine that all workers of Cequent Electrical Products, Light Assemblies Product Line, Albion, Indiana (TA-W-57,567) are denied eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Furthermore, after careful review, I determine that increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by the Breakaway Switches Product Line contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of workers and to the decline in sales or production and at that firm or subdivision. I also determine that there was a shift in production from the Cable Connectors Product Line to Mexico of articles that are like or directly competitive with those produced by the subject firm or subdivision. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Cequent Electrical Products, Breakaway Switches Product Line, Albion, Indiana (TA-W-57,567A), and Cequent Electrical Products, Cable Connectors Product Line Albion, Indiana (TA-W-57,567B), who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after July 15, 2004 through two years from the date of certification are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

I further determine that all workers of Cequent Electrical Products, Light Assemblies Product Line (TA-W-57,567), Breakaway Switches Product Line, (TA-W-57,567A), and Cable Connections Product Line, Albion, Indiana (TA-W-57,567B), are denied eligibility to apply for alternative trade adjustment assistance under section 246 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 14th day of September, 2005.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6-1492 Filed 2-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,391]

John Crane, Inc., Vandalia, IL; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to Section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on November 22, 2005 in response to a petition filed on behalf of workers at John Crane, Inc., Vandalia, Illinois.

The petitioners, separated from employment in July 2005, indicated that the plant closed in August 2005. A review of petition certifications determined that the petitioners are covered by a certification, TA-W-53,322, that did not expire until November 12, 2005.

Consequently, further investigation in this case would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC this 24th day of January, 2006.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. E6-1493 Filed 2-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-58,435]

Negative Determination Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2273), the Department of Labor herein presents the results of an investigation regarding certification of eligibility to apply for worker adjustment assistance. The group eligibility requirements for directly-impacted (primary) workers under Section 222(a) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, can be satisfied in either of two ways:

I. In section (a)(2)(A), all of the following must be satisfied:

A. A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision of the firm, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

B. The sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely; and

C. Increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by such firm or subdivision have contributed importantly to such workers' separation or threat of separation and to the decline in sales or production of such firm or subdivision; or

II. In section (a)(2)(B), both of the following must be satisfied:

A. A significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm, or an appropriate subdivision of the firm, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

B. There has been a shift in production by such workers' firm or subdivision to a foreign country of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by such firm or subdivision; and

C. One of the following must be satisfied:

1. The country to which the workers' firm has shifted production of the articles is a party to a free trade agreement with the United States;

2. The country to which the workers' firm has shifted production of the articles is a beneficiary country under the Andean Trade Preference Act, African Growth and Opportunity Act, or the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act; or

3. There has been or is likely to be an increase in imports of articles that are like or directly competitive with articles which are or were produced by such firm or subdivision.

The investigation was initiated on December 1, 2005 in response to a petition filed by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW), Local 2067 on behalf of workers at Paxar Americas, Inc., Thomas Avenue Plant, a subsidiary of Paxar Corporation, Systems Division, Sayre, Pennsylvania. The workers at the subject firm produce electronic imprint machines (e.g., label printing machines). The subject firm also leased workers on-site from Adecco to produce electronic imprint machines.

The investigation revealed that criteria (a)(2)(A)(I.C) and (a)(2)(B)(II.B) were not met.

The investigation revealed that the subject firm did not import electronic imprint machines, nor did it shift