

to an injury test pursuant to section 701 of the Act.

Comment 2: As in past administrative reviews, Ceramica Regiomontana contends that the Department incorrectly treated the benefit from the PITEX program as a grant. According to Ceramica Regiomontana, PITEX benefits should be calculated as interest-free loans similar to the Department's treatment of loan duty deferrals under a Peruvian program in *Cotton Sheetting and Sateen from Peru; Final Results of Administrative Review of Countervailing Duty Order* (49 FR 34542).

Ceramica Regiomontana contends that the Department provides no legal justification for refusing to treat PITEX as an interest-free loan rather than a grant in *Certain Textile Mill Products from Mexico; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (56 FR 50858). Furthermore, Ceramica Regiomontana argues that the Department bases its refusal to calculate PITEX as an interest-free loan on the difficulty of doing the calculation. Ceramica Regiomontana maintains that although there is no certainty whether a company will ultimately be exempt from payment of all or a portion of the duty, the deferral should be treated as a loan rather than a grant in accordance with legal requirements.

Department's Position: We fully addressed this issue in the previous administrative review of this case. See *Ceramic Tile from Mexico; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (60 FR 19022; April 14, 1995). We stated that, under PITEX, an exporter may temporarily import machinery for five years. At the end of five years, the exporter can renew the temporary stay on an annual basis indefinitely. Since payment of import duties upon conversion to permanent import status is based on the depreciated value of the equipment at the time it is converted to permanent import status, the exporter can on an annual basis continue the temporary import status after the initial five year period until the depreciated value of the equipment is zero and no import duties are owed. Therefore, duty exemptions under PITEX are properly treated as grants, and we expensed them in full at the time of importation, when the exporters otherwise would have paid duties on the imported machinery. Id.; *Final Negative Countervailing Duty Determination; Silicon Metal From Brazil* (56 FR 26988). Ceramica Regiomontana has presented us with no new evidence or arguments on this issue.

Comment 3: Ceramica Regiomontana argues that the calculation of the PITEX

net subsidy is incorrect because the Department improperly divided the PITEX benefit by each company's total exports. Ceramica Regiomontana contends that, since the machinery imported under the PITEX program may be used to produce products for both the export and domestic markets, the benefits from the program should be divided by total sales rather than by total exports. Furthermore, Ceramica Regiomontana argues that the program does not limit the use of imported machinery to production for export products only. According to Ceramica Regiomontana, machinery imported by the company is used for production of merchandise for both export and domestic markets.

Ceramica Regiomontana claims that the Department's allocation method in PITEX is incorrect because it does not measure the benefit of the subsidy to the recipient and the proper method of allocation would be based on total sales.

Department's Position: We disagree. In order to meet the eligibility criteria for the PITEX program, a company is required to have a proven export record, and to use the imported merchandise (both raw materials and equipment) in the production of goods for export. Since receipt of benefits under PITEX is tied to the company's exports, thereby making the program an export subsidy, the proper basis for allocation of these benefits is total exports, as opposed to total sales. See *Certain Textile Mill Products from Mexico; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (56 FR 12175, 12178; March 22, 1991).

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine the total bounty or grant to be 0.48 percent *ad valorem* for all companies. In accordance with 19 CFR § 355.7, any rate less than 0.5 percent *ad valorem* is *de minimis*.

Therefore, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, shipments of this merchandise from all companies on or after January 1, 1993, and on or before December 31, 1993.

The Department will instruct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties at a zero rate, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act, on shipments of this merchandise from all companies entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice. This deposit requirement shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR § 355.22 and 19 CFR 355.25.

Dated: July 28, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-19253 Filed 8-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[(C-428-812)]

Certain Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products From Germany; Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Termination of Countervailing Duty Administration Review (01/01/94-12/31/94).

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is terminating the countervailing administrative review of certain hot-rolled lead and bismuth carbon steel products from Germany initiated on April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19017).

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 4, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Morris or Robert Copyak, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 7, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 12540) a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" on the countervailing duty order (58 FR 15325; March 22, 1993) on certain lead and bismuth carbon steel products from Germany for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994. On March 31, 1995, Inland Steel Bar Co. and USS/Kobe Steel Co., domestic producers, requested an administrative review of the subject countervailing duty order. No other interested party requested the review.

On April 14, 1995, the Department published a notice of initiation of a review of the order (60 FR 19017). On May 31, 1995, Inland Steel Bar Co. and USS/Kobe Steel Co. withdrew their requests for an administrative review. Because the requests for withdrawal were timely pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(a)(3), the Department is terminating this review.

This notice is published in accordance with 19 CFR 355.22(a)(3).

Dated: July 26, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95-19254 Filed 8-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[C-533-807]

Sulfanilic Acid From India; Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review (01/01/94-12/31/94).

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is terminating the countervailing duty administrative review of the order on sulfanilic acid from India initiated on April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19017).

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 4, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Morris or Lorenza Olivas, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 7, 1995 the Department published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 12540) a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" of the countervailing duty order (58 FR 12026; March 2, 1993) on sulfanilic acid from India for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994. On March 29, 1995, Kokan Synthetics and M/S Kay International From India requested that the Department conduct a review of the subject countervailing duty order. No other interested party requested a review.

On April 14, 1995, the Department published a notice of initiation of a review of the order (60 FR 19017). On June 26, 1995, Kokan Synthetics and M/S Kay International withdrew their request for an administrative review. Because the request for withdrawal was timely pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(a)(3), the Department is terminating this review.

This notice is published in accordance with 19 CFR 355.22(a)(5).

Dated: July 28, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95-19256 Filed 8-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[C-357-002]

Wool From Argentina; Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Termination of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review (01/01/94-12/31/94).

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is terminating the countervailing duty administrative review of wool from Argentina initiated on May 15, 1995 (60 FR 25885).

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 4, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Morris or Lorenza Olivas, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On March 31, 1995, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 16620) a notice of intent to revoke the countervailing duty order on wool from Argentina (48 FR 14423; April 4, 1983). On April 4, 1995, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" (60 FR 17052) of the countervailing duty order on wool from Argentina for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994. On April 21, 1995, the American Sheep Industry Association (ASIA), petitioner, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on wool from Argentina in response to the Department's notice of intent to revoke the order pursuant to section 355.25(d)(4)(iii) of the Department regulations. No other interested party requested the review. On May 15, 1995, the Department published a notice of initiation of a review of the order (60 FR 19017). On July 3, 1995, the Department published a notice of "Determination Not to Revoke Countervailing Duty Orders" on wool from Argentina (60 FR 34518).

On June 30, 1995, the ASIA clarified its April 21, 1995 request for an administrative review. ASIA asked that its April 21, 1995 request be considered an objection to the Department's notice

of intent to revoke the order, and withdrew its request for an administrative review. For this reason and because the request for withdrawal was timely pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(a)(3)(a), the Department is terminating this review.

The notice is published in accordance with 19 CFR 355.22(a)(3).

Dated: July 28, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95-19255 Filed 8-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904; Binational Panel Reviews; Request for Panel Review

AGENCY: NAFTA Secretariat, United States Section, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of first request for panel review.

SUMMARY: On July 26, 1995 Tubos de Acero de Mexico, S.A. (TAMSA) filed a First Request for Panel Review with the U.S. Section of the NAFTA Secretariat pursuant to Article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Panel review was requested of the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value made by the International Trade Administration respecting Oil Country Tubular Goods from Mexico. This determination was published in the **Federal Register** on June 28, 1995 (60 FR 33567). The NAFTA Secretariat has assigned Case Number USA-95-1904-04 to this request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James R. Holbein, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Suite 2061, 14th and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230, (202) 482-5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of the North American Free-Trade Agreement ("Agreement") establishes a mechanism to replace domestic judicial review of final determinations in antidumping and countervailing duty cases involving imports from a NAFTA country with review by independent binational panels. When a Request for Panel Review is filed, a panel is established to act in place of national courts to review expeditiously the final determination to determine whether it conforms with the antidumping or countervailing duty law of the country that made the determination.

Under Article 1904 of the Agreement, which came into force on January 1, 1994, the Government of the United