Dated: July 16, 1996. John J. Da Ponte, Jr., Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–18674 Filed 7–22–96; 8:45 am]

# International Trade Administration

# Determination not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Determination not to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings nor to Terminate Suspended Investigations.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is notifying the public of its determination not to revoke the antidumping duty orders and findings nor to terminate the suspended investigations listed below.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 23, 1996.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed under Antidumping Proceeding at: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(iii), if no interested party has requested an administrative review for four consecutive annual anniversary months and no domestic interested party objects to the revocation or requests an

administrative review.

We had not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months. Therefore, pursuant to § 353.25(d)(4)(i) of the Department's regulations, on June 7, 1996, we published in the Federal Register a notice of intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations and served written notice of the intent to each domestic interested party on the Department's service list in each case. Within the specified time frame, we received objections from domestic interested parties to our intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations. Therefore, because domestic interested parties objected to our intent to revoke or

terminate, we no longer intend to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations.

**Antidumping Proceeding** 

A-423-077

Belgium

Sugar

Objection Date: June 27, 1996–June 28, 1996

Objector: Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association, Inc., U.S. Beet Sugar Association, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association

Contact: Lyn Johnson at (202) 482-5287.

A-427-078

France

Sugar

*Objection Date:* June 27, 1996–June 28, 1996

Objector: Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association, Inc., U.S. Beet Sugar Association, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association

Contact: Lyn Johnson at (202) 482-5287.

A-428-802

Germany

Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, Except Synchronous & V belts

Objection Date: June 25, 1996 Objector: Gates Rubber Company Contact: Ron Trentham at (202) 482– 4793.

A-428-061

Germany

Precipitated Barium Carbonate Objection Date: June 18, 1996 Objector: Chemical Products Corporation

Corporation

Contact: Tom Futtner at (202) 482-3814.

A-428-082

Germany

Sugar

Objection Date: June 27, 1996–June 28, 1996

Objector: Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association, Inc., U.S. Beet Sugar Association, U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association

Contact: Mark Ross at (202) 482-4852.

A-475-802

Italy

Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured

*Objection Date:* June 25, 1996–June 28, 1996

Objector: Gates Rubber Company, Mectrol Corporation

Contact: Ron Trentham at (202) 482–4793.

A-588-706

Japan

Nitrile Rubber

Objection Date: June 19, 1996 Objector: Zeon Chemicals Inc. Contact: Sheila Forbes at (202) 482–

5253.

A-401-040

Sweden

Stainless Steel Plate

Objection Date: June 12, 1996 Objector: Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corporation, Armco Inc., G.O.

Carlson, Inc., Lukens-Washington Operations

Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475.

A-583-080

Taiwan

Carbon Steel Plate Objection Date: June 28, 1996

Objector: Bethlehem Steel Corporation, U.S. Steel Group

Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475.

A-583-505

Taiwan

Oil Country Tubular Goods Objection Date: June 24, 1996 Objector: North Star Steel Company Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482– 4475

Dated: July 11, 1996.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 96–18673 Filed 7–22–96; 8:45 am]

[A-351-820]

## Ferrosilicon From Brazil; Affirmation of the Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand

SUMMARY: On May 21, 1996, the United States Court of International Trade (the Court) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) redetermination on remand of the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Ferrosilicon From Brazil (59 FR 732, January 6, 1994) and the Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Ferrosilicon From Brazil (59 FR 8598, February 23, 1994). See Aimcor et al. v. United States et al., Slip Op. 96–79 (CIT May 21, 1996).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 23, 1996.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Katherine Johnson or James Terpstra at (202) 482–4929 or (202) 482–3965, respectively, Investigations Office, Import Administration, International

Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On July 20, 1995, the Court issued an order remanding to the Department the final determination and amended final determination on ferrosilicon from Brazil. See *Aimcor et al.* v. *United States et al.*, Slip Op. 95–130 (CIT July 20, 1995) (*AIMCOR I*).

In its decision in *Timken Co.*, v. *United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Department determination, and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision.

In AIMCOR I, the Court ordered the Department to do the following: (1) Determine if the amount of the "spread" (the difference between the interest rate and the inflation rate) is sufficiently quantified and, if so, account for this amount in the home market price, or, if not, grant Companhia Ferroligas Minas Gerais (Minasligas) an opportunity to provide such data; (2) reconsider the profit calculation in constructed value and explain the rationale for whatever methodology the Department chooses to apply; (3) apply a U.S. dollardenominated interest rate in calculating Minasligas' imputed U.S. credit expenses; (4) request from Minasligas data on the appropriate monetary correction for loans, and if that data is inadequate or not provided, to reconsider our selection of best information available, and also to reconsider whether the Department's interest expense adjustment and the selection, if any, of an adjustment for monetary correction for loans understate Minasligas' interest expenses included in cost of production and constructed value; and (5) determine whether Minasligas' value-added taxes on the inputs at issue were fully recovered prior to exportation of the subject merchandise.

These remand instructions constitute a decision not in harmony with the Department's final determination and amended final determination. This notice fulfills the publication requirements of *Timken*.

Absent an appeal, or, if appealed, upon a "conclusive" court decision affirming the Court's opinion, the Department will amend the amended final determination of the investigation

on ferrosilicon from Brazil to reflect as follows the amended margins in the Department's redetermination on remand: Minasligas 19.73 percent; Companhia Brasileira Carbureto de Calcio 17.93 percent; and All Others 42.17 percent. Liquidation of such entries is suspended pending final and conclusive affirmance of these remand results.

Dated: July 10, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–18672 Filed 7–22–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

#### [A-588-837]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components Thereof, Whether Assembled or Unassembled, From Japan

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 23, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bill Crow or Dennis McClure, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20230; Telephone: (202) 482–0116 or (202) 482–3530, respectively.

# The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act") are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act ("URAA").

#### **Final Determination**

We determine that large newspaper printing presses and components thereof ("LNPPs") from Japan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value ("LTFV"), as provided in section 735 of the Act.

# Case History

Since the preliminary determination on February 23, 1996 (60 FR 8029, March 1, 1995), the following events have occurred:

On February 26 and 27, 1996, the respondents, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries Ltd. ("MHI") and its U.S. affiliate Mitsubishi Lithographic Printing ("MLP"); Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho Ltd. ("TKS") and its U.S.

affiliate TKS USA; and the petitioner, Rockwell Graphics Systems Inc. and its parent company, Rockwell International Corporation, requested disclosure of the Department's calculation methodologies used in the preliminary determination. On March 4, 1996, the petitioner alleged that the Department made two ministerial errors in its calculation with respect to constructed value ("CV") and further manufacturing costs. The Department determined that neither of the allegations constituted ministerial errors. (See Memorandum from the Team to Richard W. Moreland, March 11, 1996.)

On February 27, 1996, the Department issued supplemental sales questionnaire to MHI and TKS. On March 7, 1996, the respondents submitted their responses to the supplemental sales questionnaire. On March 5, 1996, the Department issued a supplemental cost questionnaire to TKS and on March 8, 1996, TKS submitted its response.

In March and April 1996, we conducted verification of the sales and cost questionnaire responses of the respondents in Japan and the United States.

On May 8, 1996, the Department received comments it solicited from interested parties in its preliminary determination regarding scope issues. On May 31, 1996, respondents submitted new sales and cost databases which incorporated factual corrections noted during verification.

The respondents and the petitioner submitted case briefs on June 3, 1996 and rebuttal briefs on June 10, 1996. The Department held a public hearing for this investigation on June 17, 1996. On June 19, 1996, MHI protested that certain elements of the petitioner's rebuttal brief contained new factual information. On June 20, 1996, the petitioner objected to MHI's complaint. On June 26, 1996, the Department returned the rebuttal brief to the petitioner, and notified the petitioner that the new material to which MHI had objected should be removed from the record of the investigation. The petitioner submitted a revised rebuttal brief on June 27, 1996.

### Scope of Investigation

Note: The following scope language reflects certain modifications from the notice of the preliminary determination. As specified below, we have clarified the scope to include incomplete LNPP systems, additions and components. We have also clarified the scope to include "elements" (otherwise referred to as "parts" or "subcomponents") of a LNPP system, addition or component, which taken altogether constitute at least 50 percent of the cost of manufacture of the LNPP component of which they are a part. We have also