present case, where there is a contrary trend. Finally, unlike this case, where the petitioners have made several arguments concerning the likelihood of resumption of dumping, in *AFBs/Italy* the petitioner's only other argument on likelihood was the fact that SKF-Italy was part of a multinational corporation.

In *FCOJB*, the Department examined the evolution of product prices, current and projected production trends, potential increases in demand by third country markets, and present U.S. market conditions, but determined that each of these factors either represented evidence against the likelihood of a resumption of dumping, or did not correlate with a trend of dumping by Brazilian producers. These facts differentiate *FCOJB* from the present case. As discussed above, market and currency pressures have made it harder, and are continuing to make it harder, for Wieland to sell at or above fair value.

Wieland is correct that it and the respondent in *TVs/Taiwan* sold merchandise in the United States at fair value despite a strengthening home market currency; but, again, other facts in that case, as described above, provided more convincing evidence of no likelihood of resumption of dumping. Wieland does concede that the strengthening of the Deutsche mark, which continues to date, has affected its ability to sell at fair value (rebuttal brief, p. 24).

Thus, the determinations to revoke in *TVs/Taiwan* and *AFBs/Italy* were reached in light of different factors, and there was less evidence of likelihood of resumption of LTFV sales. *TVs/Taiwan*, *Tatung* and *AFBs/Italy* do not stand for a reliance on three years of no dumping as conclusive evidence of no likelihood of a resumption of dumping. Accordingly, we disagree with Wieland's suggestion that these cases show that the Department should rely solely on Wieland's history of three years with no margins as a sufficient indicator of its future behavior.

To recapitulate, the available evidence concerning market and economic factors does not support a conclusion that there is no likelihood of Wieland's resuming sales at LTFV. Indeed, multiple factors argue against such a conclusion: the drop in demand for these products in Europe, especially in Germany, which gives Wieland an incentive to export these products in order to prevent a diminishing capacity utilization rate; Wieland's severe decreases in shipments of BSS to the United States since the imposition of the order, and its recent complete withdrawal from the strip segment of the market; Wieland's ownership in the United States of a re-rolling facility, built since the order, which requires subject merchandise as feedstock, notably for lower-valued strip; and the difficulties of competing for sales of strip in light of a strengthened Deutsche mark, both in the home market and the U.S. market, all argue against a conclusion that there is no likelihood of a resumption of LTFV sales by Wieland.

Having considered the industry conditions and the case facts, the Department is not satisfied that there is no likelihood of a resumption of dumping of covered merchandise by Wieland; therefore, we are not granting revocation in part.

Comment 4: The petitioners argue that the Department failed to take into account the revisions made by Wieland with respect to its home market packing expenses in its January 11, 1996, submission. The respondent did not contest this point.

Department's Position: We agree with the petitioners and have amended our analysis to reflect the revised expense amount for these final results.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our analysis of the comments received, we determine that the following margin exists for Wieland:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Percent margin
Wieland-Werke AG	3/1/94–2/28/95	0

Individual differences between the US price and normal value may vary from the above percentage. The Department shall instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act.

(1) Because the rate for Wieland is zero, the Department shall not require cash deposits on shipments from Wieland;

(2) For previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, 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, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and

(4) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be 8.87 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR § 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during the review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (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 violation which is subject to sanction. This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR § 353.22.

Dated: September 17, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–24352 Filed 9–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–122–814]

Pure Magnesium From Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 23, 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 July 31, 1996, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from Canada (61 FR 39947). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with 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 review covers one Canadian manufacturer/exporter, Norsk Hydro Canada Inc. (''NHCI''), and the period February 20, 1992, through July 31, 1993.

Final Results of Review

In its preliminary results of administrative review, the Department stated that there were no appropriate U.S. sales to analyze which were associated with the entries covered by this review and hence, there was no basis for assessing antidumping duties on these entries. The Department received no comments regarding this finding. Therefore, as stated in the preliminary results, we will liquidate these entries without regard to antidumping duties.

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 NHCI will be 0.00 percent, the rate established in the third administrative review of this order (61 FR 41772, August 12, 1996); (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 investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review, the cash deposit rate will be 21 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in Pure Magnesium from Canada: Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value and Order in Accordance with Decision on Remand, 58 FR 62643 (November 29, 1993).

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (''APO'') of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: September 16, 1996.

Robert S. La Russa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–24353 Filed 9–20–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–122–506]

Oil Country Tubular Goods From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation in Part of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review and revocation in part of the antidumping duty order.

SUMMARY: On July 19, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and intent to revoke order (in part) on oil country tubular goods (OCTG) from Canada (51 FR 21782; June 16, 1986). The review covers one manufacturer, IPSCO Inc. (IPSCO), and the period June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review and intent to revoke order (in part). Since the Department received no comments, the final results remain unchanged from the preliminary results and we revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to IPSCO.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 23, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Genovese or Zev Primor, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–5254.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

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

Background

On June 21, 1995, IPSCO requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on OCTG from Canada. The Department initiated the review on July 14, 1995 (60 FR 36260), covering the period June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995. On July 19, 1996, the Department published the preliminary results of review (61 FR 37720). The Department has now completed this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review include shipments of OCTG from Canada. This includes American Petroleum Institute (API) specification OCTG and all other pipe with the