

less costly settlement through the consent decree process.”³ Rather,

[a]bsent a showing of corrupt failure of the government to discharge its duty, the Court, in making its public interest finding, should * * * carefully consider the explanations of the government in the competitive impact statement and its responses to comments in order to determine whether those explanations are reasonable under the circumstances.

United States v. Mid-America Dairymen, Inc., 1977-1 Trade Case. (CCH) ¶ 61,508, at 71,980 (W.D. Mo. 1977).

Accordingly, with respect to the adequacy of the relief secured by the decree, a court may not “engage in an unrestricted evaluation of what relief would best serve the public.” *United States v. BNS, Inc.*, 858 F.2d 456, 462 (9th Cir. 1988) (citing *United States v. Bechtel Corp.*, 648 F.2d 660, 666 (9th Cir. 1981); see also *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1460-62. Precedent requires that the balancing of competing social and political interests affected by a proposed antitrust consent decree must be left, in the first instance, to the discretion of the Attorney General. The court’s role in protecting the public interest is one of insuring that the government has not breached its duty to the public in consenting to the decree. The court is required to determine not whether a particular decree is the one that will best serve society, but whether the settlement is “within the reaches of the public interest.” More elaborate requirements might undermine the effectiveness of antitrust enforcement by consent decree.⁴

The proposed Final Judgment, therefore, should not be reviewed under a standard of whether it is certain to eliminate every anticompetitive effect of a particular practice or whether it mandates certainty of free competition in the future. Court approval of a final judgment requires a standard more flexible and less strict than the standard required for a finding of liability. “[A]

³ 119 Cong. Rec. 24598 (1973). See *United States v. Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 713, 715 (D. Mass. 1975). A “public interest” determination can be made properly on the basis of the Competitive Impact Statement and Response to Comments filed pursuant to the APPA. Although the APPA authorizes the use of additional procedures, 15 U.S.C. § 16(f), those procedures are discretionary. A court need not invoke any of them unless it believes that the comments have raised significant issues and that further proceedings would aid the court in resolving those issues. See H.R. Rep. 93-1463, 93d Cong. 2d Sess. 8-9 (1974), reprinted in U.S.C.C.A.N. 6535, 6538.

⁴ *Bechtel*, 648 F.2d at 666 (emphasis added); see *BNS*, 858 F.2d at 463; *United States v. National Broadcasting Co.*, 449 F. Supp. 1127, 1143 (C.D. Cal. 1978); *Gillette*, 406 F. Supp. At 716. See also *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1461 (whether “the remedies [obtained in the decree are] so inconsonant with the allegations charged as to fall outside of the ‘reaches of the public interest’”).

proposed decree must be approved even if it falls short of the remedy the court would impose on its own, as long as it falls within the range of acceptability or is ‘within the reaches of public interest.’” *United States v. American Tel. & Tel Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131, 151 (D.D.C. 1982), *aff’d sub nom.*, *Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983) (quoting *Gillette Co.*, 406 F. Supp. at 716); *United States v. Alcan Aluminum, Ltd.*, 605 F. Supp. 619, 622 (W.D. Ky. 1985).

Moreover, the court’s role under the Tunney Act is limited to reviewing the remedy in relationship to the violations that the United States has alleged in its Complaint, and does not authorize the court to “construct [its] own hypothetical case and then evaluate the decree against that case.” *Microsoft*, 56 F.3d at 1459. Since “[t]he court’s authority to review the decree depends entirely on the government’s exercising its prosecutorial discretion by bringing a case in the first place,” it follows that the court “is only authorized to review the decree itself,” and not to “effectively redraft the complaint” to inquire into other matters that the United States might have but did not pursue. *Id.*

VIII. Determinative Documents

There are not determinative materials or documents within the meaning of the APPA that were considered by the United States in formulating the proposed Final Judgment. Consequently, the United State has not attached any such materials to proposed Final Judgment.

Dated: December 21, 2000.

Respectfully submitted,
Donald J. Russell,
Chief.

A. Douglas Melamed,
Acting Assistant Attorney General.
Constance K. Robinson,
Director of Operations and Merger
Enforcement.

David F. Smutny (DC Bar No. 435714),
J. Parker Erkmann,
Lorenzo McRae II,
Trial Attorneys, U.S. Department of Justice,
Antitrust Division.
Telecommunications Task Force, 1401 H.
Street, N.W., Suite 8000, Washington, D.C.
20530 (202) 514-5621.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing Competitive Impact Statement was served, as indicated below, this 21st day of December, 2000 upon each of the parties listed below:

Charles F. Rule, Esq. (BY HAND),
Covington & Burling, 1201
Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20004-2401, (202)

662-5119, Counsel for WorldCom, Inc.

Brad E. Mutschelknaus, Esq. (BY HAND), Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP, 1200 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 955-9600, Counsel for Intermedia Communications, Inc.

David F. Smutny,
Counsel for Plaintiff.

[FR Doc. 01-928 Filed 1-11-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Justice.

Meeting of the Compact Council for the National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact

AGENCY: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Justice.

ACTION: Meeting notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to announce a meeting of the Compact Council created by the National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact Act of 1998 (Compact). Thus far, the federal government and eight states are parties to the Compact which governs the exchange of criminal history records for licensing, employment, and similar purposes. The Compact also provides a legal framework for the establishment of a cooperative Federal-state system to exchange such records.

The meeting will be a strategic planning session to devise short and long term goals and to define the mission statement of the Compact Council.

The meeting will be open to the public on a first-come, first-seated basis. Any member of the public wishing to file a written statement with the Compact Council or wishing to address this session of the Compact Council should notify Ms. Cathy L. Morrison at (304) 625-2736, at least 24 hours prior to the start of the session. The notification should contain the requestor’s name and corporate designation, consumer affiliation, or government designation, along with a short statement describing the topic to be addressed, and the time needed for the presentation. Requestors will ordinarily be allowed not more than 15 minutes to present a topic.

DATES AND TIMES: The Compact Council will meet in open session from 9 a.m. until 5 p.m. on February 13, 2001.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at the Sheraton Uptown Albuquerque, 2600 Louisiana Boulevard, N.E.,

Albuquerque, New Mexico, telephone (505) 881-0000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Inquiries may be addressed to Ms. Cathy L. Morrison, Management Analyst, Programs Development Section, CJIS Division, FBI, 1000 Custer Hollow Road, Clarksburg, West Virginia 26306-0147, telephone (304) 625-2736, facsimile (304) 625-5388.

Dated: January 4, 2001.

Thomas E. Bush, III,

Section Chief, Programs Development Section, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

[FR Doc. 01-1071 Filed 1-11-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-02-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Parole Commission

Sunshine Act Notice; Public Announcement

Pursuant To The Government In the Sunshine Act (Public Law 94-409) [5 U.S.C. Section 552b].

AGENCY HOLDING MEETING: Department of Justice, United States Parole Commission.

TIME AND DATE: 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 17, 2001.

PLACE: 5550 Friendship Blvd., Fourth Floor, Chevy Chase, MD 20815.

STATUS: Open.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

The following matters have been placed on the agenda for the open Parole Commission meeting:

1. Approval of minutes of previous Commission meeting.
2. Reports from the Chairman, Commissioners, Legal, Chief of Staff, Case Operations, and Administrative Sections.
3. Adoption of Rule for attorney qualifications for District of Columbia Code cases similar to Rule adopted for federal cases at 28 CFR § 2.61.
4. Adoption of Final Version of the U.S. Parole Commission Rules and Procedures Manual.

AGENCY CONTACT: Sam Robertson, Case Operations, United States Parole Commission, (301) 492-5962.

Dated: January 9, 2001.

Michael A. Stover,

General Counsel, U.S. Parole Commission.

[FR Doc. 01-1160 Filed 1-10-01; 10:55 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-31-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Parole Commission

Sunshine Act Meeting, Public Announcement

Pursuant To The Government In the Sunshine Act (Public Law 94-409) [5 U.S.C. Section 552b].

AGENCY HOLDING MEETING: Department of Justice, United States Parole Commission.

DATE AND TIME: 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 17, 2001.

PLACE: U.S. Parole Commission, 5550 Friendship Boulevard, 4th Floor, Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815.

STATUS: Closed—Meeting.

MATTERS CONSIDERED:

The following matter will be considered during the closed portion of the Commission's Business Meeting:

Appeals to the Commission involving approximately one case decided by the National Commissioners pursuant to a reference under 28 CFR 2.27. This case was originally heard by an examiner panel wherein inmates of Federal prisons have applied for parole and are contesting revocation of parole or mandatory release.

AGENCY CONTACT: Sam Robertson, Case Operations, United States Parole Commission, (301) 492-5962.

Dated January 9, 2001.

Michael A. Stover,

General Counsel, U.S. Parole Commission.

[FR Doc. 01-1161 Filed 1-10-01; 11:08 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-31-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment Standards Administration

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Labor, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, conducts a preclearance consultation program to provide the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing collections of information in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA95) [44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)]. This program helps to ensure that requested data can be provided in the desired format, reporting burden (time and financial resources) is minimized, collection instruments are clearly understood, and the impact of collection

requirements on respondents can be properly assessed. Currently, the Employment Standards Administration is soliciting comments concerning the proposed extension collection of the following information collections: (1) Maintenance of Receipts for Benefits Paid by a Coal Mine Operator (CM-200); (2) Claim for Reimbursement-Assisted Reemployment (CA-2231); and (3) Vehicle Mechanical Inspection Report for Transportation Subject to Department of Transportation Requirements (WH-514) and Vehicle Mechanical Inspection Report for Transportation Subject to Department of Labor Safety Standards (WH-514a). Copies of the proposed information collection requests can be obtained by contacting the office listed below in the addressee section of this Notice.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted to the office listed in the addressee section below on or before March 13, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Ms. Patricia A. Forkel, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave., NW., Room S-3201, Washington, DC 20210, telephone (202) 693-0339 (this is not a toll-free number), fax (202) 693-1451.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Maintenance of Receipt for Benefits Paid by a Coal Mine Operator (CM-200)

I. Background

The Office of Worker's Compensation Programs (OWCP) administers the Federal Black Lung Benefits Act (FBLBA). Under 20 CFR 725.531, self-insured coal mine operators or insurance carriers must maintain receipts for black lung benefits payments made for five years after the date on which the receipt was executed. This requirement is designated as CM-200, Maintenance of Receipts for Benefits Paid by A Coal Mine Operator. There is no form or format for the receipts; a cancelled check will satisfy the requirement.

II. Review Focus

The Department of Labor is particularly interested in comments which:

- Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;
- Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;