It is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act (*see* Memorandum for Robert LaRussa from Roland L. MacDonald, Extension of Time Limits for 1994–95 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China, July 29, 1996). Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results to August 6, 1996. The Department adjusted the time limits by 28 days due to the government shutdowns, which lasted from November 14, 1995, to November 20, 1995, and from December 15, 1995, to January 6, 1996. *See* Memorandum to the file from Susan G. Esserman, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, January 11, 1996. This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: July 30, 1996.

Roland L. MacDonald,

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.*

[FR Doc. 96–19856 Filed 8–2–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

---

**[A–427–078]**

## Sugar From France: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Finding

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review, and revocation in part of antidumping duty finding.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request made on March 12, 1996, by Boiron-Borneman, Inc. (Boiron), the Department of Commerce (the Department) simultaneously initiated a changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review and issued the preliminary results of this review expressing an intent to revoke in part the finding on sugar from France. The scope of the finding currently includes sugar, both raw and refined, with the exception of specialty sugars. See Sugar From Belgium, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany; Finding of Dumping, 44 FR 33878 (June 13, 1979), and Memorandum For Dick Moreland From Frank R. Brennan (June 1, 1982). In accordance with sections 751(b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), and 19 CFR 353.25(d)(1)(i), we are now revoking in part this finding, with regard to homeopathic sugar pellets, based on the fact that domestic parties have expressed no interest in maintaining the finding on homeopathic sugar pellets produced in France.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 5, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Matthew Blaskovich or Zev Primor, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–5831/4114.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On March 12, 1996, Boiron-Borneman, Inc. (Boiron), requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review to determine whether to revoke the finding with regard to sugar pellets. The finding with regard to imports of other sugar products is not affected by this request. In addition, on February 26, 1996, the Florida Sugar Marketing and Terminal Association, Inc. (the petitioner) informed the Department in writing that it did not object to the changed circumstances review and had no interest in maintaining the finding on homeopathic sugar pellets produced in France.

We preliminarily determined that petitioner's affirmative statement of no interest constituted good cause for conducting a changed circumstances review. Consequently, on May 6, 1996, the Department published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review to determine whether to revoke this finding in part (61 FR 20236). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of this changed circumstances review.

### The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Act, as amended, are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

### Scope of Review

The final antidumping finding on sugar from France covers raw and refined sugar (44 FR 8949 (February 12, 1979)). The petition, filed by the Florida Sugar Marketing & Terminal Assn., Inc., on July 3, 1978, states that ''[t]he product being imported and which is the subject of this petition, is raw and refined, semi-refined or ''off-white'' sugar produced from sugar beets. Raw beet sugar and raw cane sugar are very similar chemically and nutritionally, with the result that they are interchangeable in terms of meeting refiners' needs for raw sugar.'' See Petition of Florida Sugar Marketing & Terminal Assn., Inc., July 3, 1978, at 7. Excluded from the finding are specialty sugars. Imports of the merchandise subject to the finding are currently classifiable under various subprovisions of item number 1701.91 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS). HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes. This written description remains dispositive.

The merchandise covered by this changed circumstances review includes homeopathic sugar pellets meeting the following criteria: (1) Composed of 85 percent sucrose and 15 percent lactose; (2) have a polished, matte appearance, and more uniformly porous than domestic sugar cubes; (3) produced in two sizes of 2 mm and 3.8 mm in diameter. According to a May 1990 letter ruling from Customs and a September 1990 Presidential Decree, imports of homeopathic sugar pellets enter under HTS item number 1701.99.02.

### Final Results of Review; Partial Revocation of Antidumping Duty Finding

On May 20, 1996, the United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association (USCSRA), an interested party in this review objected to the relief requested by Boiron in its request for a changed circumstances administrative review. The USCSRA claimed that there was a strong likelihood that Boiron would circumvent the antidumping finding and, thereby, U.S. refiners of cane sugar would face injury in the U.S. market. See the USCSRA's letter of May 20, 1996, at 2. Upon further consideration, the USCSRA withdrew its opposition to revocation of the antidumping finding with respect to homeopathic sugar pellets. We received no other comments objecting to revocation of the finding with regard to Boiron's sugar pellets.

The affirmative statement of no interest by petitioners in this case constitutes changed circumstances sufficient to warrant partial revocation of this finding. Therefore, the Department is partially revoking this

finding on sugar from France, with regard to homeopathic sugar pellets, in accordance with sections 751(b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Act, and 19 CFR 353.25(d)(1)(i). This partial revocation applies to all entries of the merchandise subject to this changed circumstances review entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 1, 1994.

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to proceed with liquidation, without regard to antidumping duties, of all unliquidated entries of homeopathic sugar pellets from France entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 1, 1994. The Department will further instruct Customs to refund with interest any estimated duties collected with respect to unliquidated entries of homeopathic sugar pellets from France entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after June 1, 1994, in accordance with Section 778 of the Act.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protection orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This changed circumstances administrative review, partial revocation of the antidumping duty finding and notice are in accordance with sections 751(b) and (d) and 782(h) of the Act and sections 353.22(f) and 353.25(d) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: July 29, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96–19863 Filed 8–2–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

---

**[A–570–601]**

## Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from the People's Republic of China and Intent to Revoke Antidumping Duty Order in Part.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request by the petitioner, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished (TRBs), from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The period of review (POR) is June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995. The review indicates the existence of dumping margins during this period.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between United States price (USP) and NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** August 5, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Charles Riggle, Hermes Pinilla, Andrea Chu or Kris Campbell, 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.

### Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

### Background

On June 6, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 29821) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from the PRC (52 FR 19748 (May 27, 1987)). In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a), the petitioner, The Timken Company, requested that we conduct an administrative review. In addition, respondent Shanghai General Bearing Company (Shanghai) requested revocation pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(b) (revocation based on not selling subject merchandise at less than normal value for three consecutive years). Shanghai stated that it was making this request solely because the Department had not yet ruled on its revocation request made with respect to the 1993–1994 review (the 7th review period). We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on August 16, 1995 (60 FR 42500), covering the period June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995 (the 8th review period).

On September 18, 1995, we sent questionnaires directly to the PRC companies for which we had addresses on the record. We also sent questionnaires to the Hong Kong companies listed in our initiation notice, using addresses supplied in the petitioner's initiation request as well as information from the Hong Kong branch of the U.S. & Foreign Commercial Service.

On the same date, we sent a questionnaire to the Secretary General of the Basic Machinery Division of the Chamber of Commerce for Import & Export of Machinery and Electronics (CCCME) and requested that the questionnaire be forwarded to all PRC companies identified in our initiation notice for which we did not have addresses. We also requested information relevant to the issue of whether the companies named in the initiation request are independent from government control. *See Separate Rates, infra.* Finally, we notified the PRC government, through its embassy in Washington, that we were conducting this review and requested that the PRC government notify us if it did not wish to have the Secretary General of the Basic Machinery Division of CCCME act as the contact person for this review.

We received responses to our questionnaire from thirteen of the companies named in the initiation notice: China National Machinery Import & Export Corporation (CMC), Liaoning Machinery Import & Export Corporation (Liaoning), China National Automotive Industry Import & Export Guizhou Corporation (Guizhou Automotive), Luoyang Bearing Factory (Luoyang), Jilin Province Machinery Import & Export Corporation (Jilin), Tianshui Hailin Import & Export Corporation, also known as Tianshui Hailin Bearing Factory (Tianshui), Wafangdian Bearing Industry Import & Export Corporation (Wafangdian), Guizhou Machinery Import & Export Corporation (Guizhou), Zhejiang Machinery Import & Export Corporation (Zhejiang), Xiangfan International Trade Corporation (Xiangfan), East Sea Bearing Co., Ltd., also know as Zhejiang East Sea