landlords, rental agents, neighbors or other knowledgeable persons. Private and public sector organizations use these rates extensively to gauge and analyze the housing market with regard to supply, cost, and affordability at various points in time. In addition, the rental vacancy rate is a component of the leading economic indicators, published by the Department of Commerce.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Frequency: Monthly.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Jerry Coffey, (202) 395–7314.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, Acting DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5312, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to Jerry Coffey, OMB Desk Officer, room 10201, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: July 24, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

Acting Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 96–19434 Filed 7–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–F

International Trade Administration

[A–588–817]

Electroluminescent High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass Therefor From Japan; Notice of Court Decision and Rescission of Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of court decision and rescission of revocation of antidumping duty order.

SUMMARY: On August 25, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of revocation of the antidumping duty order on electroluminescent (EL) high information content flat panel displays (FPDs) and display glass therefor from Japan (*see Electroluminescent High Information Content Flat Panel Displays and Display Glass Therefor from Japan; Amendment of Notice of Court Decision and Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order,* 59 FR 43809 (Aug. 25, 1994)) pursuant to a mandamus order to enforce judgment issued by the United States Court of International Trade (the CIT) in *Hosiden Corporation* v. *United States,* 861 F. Supp. 115 (CIT August 12, 1994) (*Hosiden II*). In *Hosiden II*, the CIT ordered the Department to suspend liquidation of entries, but to otherwise reverse all action taken by the Department pursuant to its determination of sales at less-than-fair value, in order to implement its earlier decision affirming the International Trade Commission's (ITC's) negative injury determination on remand (*Hosiden Corporation* v. *United States,* 852 F. Supp. 1050 (CIT April 14, 1994) (*Hosiden I*). The Department appealed the CIT's mandamus order and, on May 31, 1996, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (the Federal Circuit) held that the mandamus order was contrary to law and, thus, vacated the CIT's mandamus order in *Hosiden Corp., et al.* v. *United States,* Appeal No. 95–1027 (Fed. Cir. May 31, 1996) . Therefore, we are now rescinding the revocation of the antidumping duty order on EL FPDs from Japan, reinstating the suspension of liquidation of entries of EL FPDs from Japan pursuant to the Department's May 6, 1994 notice of court decision and suspension of liquidation (59 FR 23690), and reinstating the collection of cash deposits on EL FPDs from Japan as of the date of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 31, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Chip Hayes or Richard Rimlinger of Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 4, 1991, the Department published an antidumping duty order on EL FPDs (56 FR 43937) following an affirmative determination of sales at less-than-fair value by the Department on July 16, 1991 (56 FR 32376) and an August 26, 1991 decision by the ITC that a U.S. industry was being materially injured by reason of imports of flat panel displays and display glass therefor from Japan (56 FR 43937, September 5, 1991). Exporters of EL FPDs appealed the ITC determination to the CIT. The CIT remanded the determination to the ITC to reconsider its injury determination, and on March 8, 1993, the ITC determined on remand that no U.S. industry was being materially injured by reason of imports of EL FPDs. The ITC's remand was affirmed by the CIT on April 14, 1994, in *Hosiden I.* In accordance with the decision of the Federal Circuit in *Timken* v. *United States,* 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), the Department published a notice on May 6, 1994 (59 FR 23690) stating that the Department would continue to order the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise and that ''[i]f the case is not appealed, or is affirmed on appeal, then the antidumping duty order on EL FPDs will be revoked.''

Subsequently, on August 12, 1994, the CIT issued a decision and mandamus order in *Hosiden II* requiring that the Department: (1) direct the U.S. Customs Service to cease the collection of cash deposits for estimated antidumping duties on EL FPDs and return any previously collected cash deposits; (2) end any previously ordered suspension of liquidation and suspend the liquidation of entries of EL FPDs in accordance with the CIT's Preliminary Injunction order, dated January 20, 1994; (3) refrain from imposing any further obligation on any party involved in any administrative review by the Department relating to EL FPDs; and (4) execute all documents and take all necessary actions to effectuate a revocation of the antidumping duty order. On August 25, 1994, the Department published the revocation of the antidumping duty order on EL FPDs (59 FR 43809, August 25, 1994) and took all other action required by the CIT's mandamus order.

The Department then appealed the CIT's August 12, 1994 decision and mandamus order to the Federal Circuit. On May 31, 1996, the Federal Circuit issued a decision that held that the August 12, 1994 mandamus order was contrary to law, and vacated the CIT's mandamus order. *Hosiden Corp., et al.* v. *United States,* Appeal No. 95–1027 (Fed. Cir. May 31, 1996). On July 22, 1996, the Federal Circuit issued a mandate finalizing its May 31, 1996 decision in Appeal No. 95–1027.

On May 31, 1996, the Federal Circuit also rendered a decision in a related case concerning the ITC's injury determination with respect to EL FPDs from Japan. In *Advanced Display Manufacturers Assn.* v. *United States,* Appeal No. 94–1380 (Fed. Cir. May 31, 1996), the Federal Circuit vacated the CIT's decision in *Hosiden I* with respect to the ITC's injury determination on remand, and remanded the matter for appropriate further proceedings. Thus,

in accordance with the Federal Circuit's *Timken* decision, the Department will continue to order the suspension of liquidation of EL FPDs from Japan and will not instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate entries of the subject merchandise until there is a final and conclusive court decision in the matter within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. § 1516a(e).

The Federal Circuit's May 31, 1996 decision concerning Appeal No. 95–1027 vacated the CIT's decision and mandamus order in *Hosiden II.* Thus, consistent with the Federal Circuit's decision, the Department hereby rescinds the revocation of the antidumping duty order on electroluminescent high information content flat panel displays and display glass therefor from Japan. Further, the Department is directing the U.S. Customs Service to reinstate the suspension of liquidation pursuant to the Department's May 6, 1994 notice of court decision and suspension of liquidation, and reinstate the collection of cash deposits in the amount of 7.02 percent *ad valorem*, the last published deposit rate, for each entry of the subject merchandise which is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the date of the publication of this notice. Thus, the purpose of this notice is to effect the rescission of the revocation of the antidumping duty order on EL FPDs from Japan and to reinstate all agency action taken pursuant to the Department's May 6, 1994 notice of court decision and suspension of liquidation (59 FR 23690).

For all purposes under the statute, the anniversary month of the antidumping duty order on EL FPDs, which was published on September 4, 1991, will continue to be September. With the reinstatement of the antidumping duty order, the Department is also reinstating the administrative review of the order on EL FPDs from Japan for the September 1, 1992 through August 31, 1993 period, which was being conducted by the Department at the time of the court-ordered revocation of the order.

Because we revoked the order in August 1994, we necessarily did not publish an opportunity to request review, and did not initiate an administrative review, of entries for the September 1, 1993 through August 31, 1994 period, or any subsequent period. Therefore, in September 1996, the Department will publish a notice of opportunity to request review of the order on entries of EL FPDs from Japan during the periods September 1, 1993 through August 31, 1994; September 1, 1994 through August 31, 1995; and September 1, 1995 through August 31 , 1996.

Dated: July 25, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–19476 Filed 7–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–122–814]

Pure Magnesium From Canada, Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 31, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Yeske or Carole Showers, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0189 or 482–3217, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 3, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (58 FR 41239) of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from Canada (57 FR 39390). Petitioner in this proceeding, Magnesium Corporation of America, requested an administrative review in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1993). On September 30, 1993, the Department published a notice of initiation of this review (58 FR 51053). The period of review is February 20, 1992, through July 31, 1993. The Department is now conducting this review pursuant to section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this review is pure magnesium. Pure unwrought magnesium contains at least 99.8 percent magnesium by weight and is sold in various slab and ingot forms and sizes. Granular and secondary magnesium are excluded from the scope of this review. Pure magnesium is currently classified under subheading 8104.11.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (''HTS''). HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The period of review is February 20, 1992, through July 31, 1993.

Preliminary Results of Review

Early in the period of review, NHCI, the single manufacturer/exporter subject to review, made several shipments of the subject merchandise to the United States. While this merchandise entered during the period of review and a portion of the merchandise was subsequently sold, the Department confirmed at verification that all of the merchandise which entered was either re-exported without sale or the sales were cancelled. According to its practice, the Department does not include cancelled sales transactions in its analysis (*see Certain Small Business Telephone Systems and Subassemblies Thereof from Korea*, 58 FR 44501, 44503, August 23, 1993). Therefore, we have preliminarily determined that there are no appropriate U.S. sales to analyze which are associated with the entries covered by this review, and hence, no basis for assessing antidumping duties on those entries (*see Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From the Federal Republic of Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 56 FR 31692, 31743, July 11, 1991). Accordingly, we will liquidate these entries without regard to antidumping duties (*see Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Thailand and the United Kingdom; Preliminary Results of Administrative Reviews, and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews*, 61 FR 35713, 35717, July 8, 1996).

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed firm will be that firm's rate established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original less-than-fair-value