Agreement, including the measures set forth in the ''Report on China's Enforcement Measures'' and ''Other Measures'' of June 17, 1996, pursuant to section 306 of the Trade Act.

EFFECTIVE DATES: USTR's determinations as to the termination of the import surge mechanism and revocation of China's designation as a priority foreign country were made on June 17, 1996, and are effective June 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Lehr, Deputy Assistant USTR for China and Mongolian Affairs (202) 395–5050 or Catherine Field, Senior Counsel for Multilateral Affairs (202) 395–3432.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 15, 1996, the USTR announced that based on monitoring carried out pursuant to section 306(a) of the Trade Act, China was not satisfactorily implementing the 1995 Agreement on Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights and Market Access (1995 Agreement). Pursuant to sections 301 (a) and (c)(1) and section 306(b)(1), the USTR proposed to impose increased duties on selected products of China and requested public comment on that proposed action. See 61 FR 2500 of May 17, 1996, for background on the announcement and proposed action.

To prevent import surge of products subject to quantitative restraints, pursuant to section 304(b)(1) and sections 301 (a) and (c) the USTR directed the Commissioner of Customs to limit the quantity of imports of the textile and apparel products listed in Annex II to that Federal Register notice. On June 12, 1996, the USTR extended her directive for an additional 30-day period commencing on June 14, 1996.

On June 17, 1996, the Chinese government confirmed that two documents of that date, entitled ''Report on China's Enforcement Measures'' and ''Other Measures'' are an accurate description of the measures that the Chinese government has taken and will take in the future to implement key elements of the 1995 Agreement. Based on this confirmation, on June 17, 1996, the USTR, pursuant to section 301(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Trade Act, determined not to impose the proposed sanctions and to terminate the directive to Customs limiting entry of certain products. In addition, pursuant to section 182(c)(1)(A) of the Trade Act, the USTR determined to revoke China's designation as a ''priority foreign country.''

Pursuant to section 306 of the Trade Act the USTR will monitor China's implementation of the 1995 Agreement, including the measures described in the documents of June 17, 1996. If, on the basis of this monitoring, the USTR considers that China is not satisfactorily implementing the 1995 Agreement or these measures, the USTR will decide what further action to take under section 301(a) of the Trade Act.

Irving A. Williamson,

Chairman, Section 301 Committee.

[FR Doc. 96–16320 Filed 6–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

Request for Third-Country Antidumping Investigation of Sodium Azide From Japan

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Request for written comments.

SUMMARY: On March 11, 1996 the Government of Canada, through its embassy in the United States, filed with the United States Trade Representative (''USTR'') a request for the initiation of a third-country antidumping duty investigation with respect to sodium azide from Japan, pursuant to section 783 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1677n). The petition attached to the request alleges that imports of sodium azide from Japan are being sold in the United States at less than fair value (i.e., dumped), and that an industry in Canada is materially injured and threatened with material injury by reason of these imports. The petition alleges that ICI Canada Inc. is the sole Canadian producer of sodium azide. USTR invites comments from the public on the appropriateness of initiating a section 783 investigation with respect to sodium azide from Japan, on the substantive and procedural standards USTR should establish for the determinations of the Department of Commerce and International Trade Commission (''ITC'') in such an investigation, if initiated, and on other issues that may be relevant.

DATES: Written comments from the public are due on or before 12 noon, on July 26, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Kane, Associate General Counsel, (202) 395–6800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 232 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994 added section 783 to the Tariff Act of 1930 concerning antidumping petitions by third countries. Under section 783, the government of a WTO member may file with USTR a petition requesting that an investigation be conducted to determine if imports from another country are being sold in the United States at less than fair value, and an industry in the petitioning country is materially injured by reason of those imports. After receiving a petition, USTR must consult with Commerce and ITC, provide an opportunity for public comment, and determine whether to initiate an investigation. Before initiating any investigation, USTR must obtain the approval of the WTO Council for Trade in Goods. The URAA Statement of Administrative Action (H.R. Doc. 103–316, vol. l1, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 845–6) (''SAA'') notes that, in determining whether to initiate an investigation, USTR will take into account whether the petitioning country provides an equivalent opportunity to the United States to seek the initiation of an antidumping investigation.

Should USTR determine to initiate an investigation, it must request Commerce and the ITC to make determinations with respect to dumping and injury, respectively. If both determinations are affirmative, Commerce must issue an antidumping order in accordance with section 736 of the Tariff Act.

USTR is to specify the substantive and procedural requirements for the Commerce and ITC determinations. The SAA indicates that USTR is to develop consistent, transparent standards of general applicability that provide meaningful guidance to Commerce and ITC, while according them the necessary flexibility to develop appropriate procedures. With regard to procedural issues, USTR is to specify deadlines, persons who may participate in the investigation, and the applicability of requirements such as hearings and exchanges of information under administrative protective order. With regard to substantive issues, USTR is to specify the extent to which existing antidumping standards will apply, particularly with regard to the ITC's injury determination. In the SAA, the Administration stated its intention that the standards should, to a considerable extent, permit the ITC to incorporate by analogy existing standards concerning injury to a U.S. industry, but also noted that certain concepts, such as regional industry, may have little applicability in third-country investigations.

On January 16, 1996, an antidumping petition was filed on behalf of American Azide Corporation, the sole U.S. producer of sodium azide, pursuant to section 732 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The petition alleges that sodium azide from Japan is being sold in the United States at dumped prices and that an industry in the United States is materially injured and threatened with material injury by reason of such imports. On March 1, 1996, the ITC issued an affirmative preliminary injury determination. 61 FR 10596 (March 14, 1996). Commerce is scheduled to issue a preliminary investigation of dumping by August 13, 1996. 61 FR 26878 (May 29, 1996).

Public Comment

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the following issues:

(A) whether it is appropriate to initiate a third-country antidumping investigation on sodium azide from Japan; including as part of this issue are, *inter alia*, the relevance of the pending antidumping investigation on sodium azide from Japan, and the extent to which Canada provides an opportunity to the United States to seek an antidumping investigation in Canada on behalf of a U.S. industry.

(B) if an investigation were initiated, what procedural and substantive standards USTR should establish for Commerce's and ITC's determinations required by section 783; persons submitting comments on this issue may wish simply to use as a starting point the existing standards for antidumping investigations on behalf of a U.S. industry, and specify how the procedural and substantive standards for a third-country antidumping investigation should differ.

(C) any other issues relevant to the request for the initiation of a third-country antidumping investigation on sodium azide from Japan.

Requirements for Submissions

Comments are due no later than 12 noon, July 26, 1996. Comments must be in English and provided in twenty copies to: Sodium Azide Antidumping, Room 223, USTR, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508.

Comments will be placed in a file (Docket 783–1) open to public inspection, except for confidential business information exempt from public inspection. (Confidential business information must be clearly marked ''BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL'' in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page on each of 20 copies, and must be accompanied by a nonconfidential summary of the confidential information. The nonconfidential summary shall be placed in the Docket which is open to public inspection.) USTR will generally apply to the standards set out in 15 C.F.R. § 2006.13 (Information Open to Public Inspection) and § 2006.15 (Information Exemption from Public Inspection) with respect to comments received.

Jennifer A. Hillman,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–16282 Filed 6–25–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding Concerning European Ban on the Import of Meat From Animals Treated With Certain Hormones

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 127(b)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)), the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice that a dispute settlement panel convened under the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO) at the request of the United States will examine the European Communities' ban on the importation of meat from animals treated with certain hormones. USTR also invites written comments from the public concerning the issues raised in the dispute.

DATES: Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before July 24, 1996, in order to be assured of timely consideration by USTR in preparing its first written submission to the panel.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to Carolyn Frank, Executive Secretary, Trade Policy Staff Committee, Room 501, Attn: Hormone dispute, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel Brinza, Senior Advisor and Special Counsel for Natural Resources, Office of the General Counsel, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20508, (202) 395–7305.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: At the United States' request, a WTO dispute settlement panel will examine whether the European Community (EC) Council Directive Prohibiting the Use in Livestock Farming of Certain Substances Having a Hormonal Action and related measures are consistent with the EC's obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 1994, the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (S&P Agreement), the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT Agreement), and the Agreement on Agriculture.

Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and Norway have reserved their rights to intervene in the panel proceedings as third parties.

Members of the panel are currently being selected, and the panel is expected to meet as necessary at the WTO headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland to examine the dispute. Under normal circumstances, the panel would be expected to issue a report detailing its findings and recommendations in six to nine months.

Major Issues Raised by the United States and Legal Basis of Complaint

The EC's measures (which in addition to the Directive cited above include, but are not limited to, the Council Directive of March 7, 1988, (88/146/EEC); the directives referenced in that directive (72/462/EEC, 81/602/EEC, 81/851/EEC, 81/852/EEC, and 85/358/EEC) the decisions referred to in Article 6(2) of directive 88/146/EEC; the control program referred to in Article 6(7) of directive 88/146/EEC; the derogations referred to in Article 7 of directive 88/146/EEC; and any amendments or modifications) adversely affect imports of U.S. meat and meat products and have no legitimate basis. They appear to be inconsistent with the EC's obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade, and the Agreement on Agriculture. The provisions of these agreements with which these measures appear to be inconsistent include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994, Article III or Article XI;

(2) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, Articles 2, 3 and 5;

(3) Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade, Article 2; and

(4) Agreement on Agriculture, Article 4.

These measures also appear to nullify or impair the benefits accruing to the United States directly or indirectly under the cited agreements.

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the issues raised in the dispute.