beginning of your comment. However, anonymous comments will not be considered. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Jo Ann Lauterbach, (202) 208–7744.

Dated: July 3, 2003.

E.P. Danenberger,

Chief, Engineering and Operations Division.

[FR Doc. 03–17663 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigations Nos. 701–TA–435 and 731–TA–1036–1038 (Preliminary)]

Certain 4,4′-Diamino-2,2′-Stilbenedisulfonic Acid Chemistry from China, Germany, and India

Determinations

On the basis of the record [1] developed in the subject investigations, the United States International Trade Commission (Commission) determines, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a) and 1673b(a)) (the Act), that there is no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or that the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from China, Germany, and India of certain 4,4′-diamino-2,2′-stilbenedisulfonic acid chemistry, provided for in subheadings 2921.59.20 and 3204.20.80 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States,[2] that is alleged to be subsidized by the Government of India and that is alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV).[3]

Background

On May 14, 2003, a petition was filed with the Commission and Commerce by Ciba Specialty Chemicals Corp., Tarrytown, NY, alleging that an industry in the United States is materially injured and threatened with material injury by reason of subsidized imports from India and LTFV imports from China, Germany, and India of certain 4,4′-diamino-2,2′-stilbenedisulfonic acid chemistry. Accordingly, effective May 14, 2003, the Commission instituted countervailing duty and antidumping investigations Nos. 701–TA–435 and 731–TA–1036–1038 (Preliminary).

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the **Federal Register** of May 23, 2003 (68 FR 28252). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on June 4, 2003, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determinations in these investigations to the Secretary of Commerce on June 30, 2003. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3608 (July 2003), entitled Certain 4,4′-Diamino-2,2′-Stilbenedisulfonic Acid Chemistry from China, Germany, and India: Investigations Nos. 701–TA–435 and 731–TA–1036–1038 (Preliminary).

By order of the Commission.

Issued: July 8, 2003.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 03–17651 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to section 1301.33(a) of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this is notice that on March 28, 2003, Cambrex North Brunswick, Inc., Technology Centre of New Jersey, 661 Highway One, North Brunswick, New Jersey 08902, made application by renewal to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed below:

Drug	Schedule
Methamphetamine (1105)	I
N-Ethylamphetamine (1475)	I
Tetrahydrocannabinols (7370)	I
2,5-Dimethoxyamphetamine (7396).	I
3,4-Methylenedioxyamphetamine (7400).	I
4-Methoxyamphetamine (7411)	I
Amphetamine (1100)	II
Methylphenidate (1724)	II
Morphine (9300)	II
Fentanyl (9801)	II

The firm plans to manufacture the listed controlled substances for distribution to its customers.

Any other such applicant and any person who is presently registered with DEA to manufacture such substances may file comments or objections to the issuance of the proposed registration.

Any such comments or objections may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: Federal Register Representative, Office of Chief Counsel (CCD) and must filed no later than September 13, 2003.

Dated: June 25, 2003.

Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 03–17715 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importation of Controlled Substances; Notice of Application

Pursuant to section 1008 of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 958(1)), the Attorney General shall, prior to issuing a registration under this section to a bulk manufacturer of a controlled substance in Schedule I or II and prior to issuing a registration under section 1002(a) authorizing the importation of such a substance, provide manufacturers holding registrations for the bulk manufacture of the substance an opportunity for a hearing.

Therefore, in accordance with section 1301.34 of Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), notice is hereby given that on March 20, 2003, Cambrex North Brunswick, Inc., Technology

[1] The record is defined in sec. 207.2(f) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (19 CFR § 207.2(f)).

[2] 4,4′-Diamino-2,2′-stilbenedisulfonic acid is provided for in subheading 2921.59.20 and stilbenic fluorescent whitening agents are provided for in subheading 3204.20.80.

[3] Vice Chairman Jennifer A. Hillman and Commissioner Marcia E. Miller found two like products in these investigations: 4,4′-diamino-2,2′-stilbenedisulfonic acid and stilbenic fluorescent whitening agents. They found that imports of stilbenic fluorescent whitening agents from China and India are negligible and that there is no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or that the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports of stilbenic fluorescent whitening agents from Germany or 4,4′-diamino-2,2′-stilbenedisulfonic acid from China, Germany, and India that are allegedly subsidized by the Government of India and sold at LTFV.

Centre of New Jersey, 661 Highway One, North Brunwswick, New Jersey 08902, made application by renewal to the drug Enforcement Administration to be registered as an importer of Phenylacetone (8501), a basic class of controlled substance listed in Schedule II.

The firm plans to import the listed controlled substances to manufacture amphetamine.

Any manufacturer holding, or applying for, registration as a bulk manufacturer of this basic class of controlled substances may file written comments on or objections to the application described above and may, at the same time, file a written request for a hearing on such application in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.43 in such from as prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.47.

Any such comments, objections, or requests for a hearing may be addressed, in quintuplicate, to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20537, Attention: Federal Register Representative, Office of Chief Counsel (CCD) and must be filed no later than September 13, 2003.

This procedure is to be conducted simultaneously with an independent of the procedures described in 21 CFR 1301.34(b), (c), (d), (e), and (f). As noted in a previous notice at 40 FR 43745–46 (September 23, 1975), all applicants for registration to import a basic class of any controlled substance in Schedule I or II are and will continue to be required to demonstrate to the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration that the requirements for such registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 958(a), 21 U.S.C. 823(a), and 21 CFR 1311.42(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) are satisfied.

Dated: June 25, 2003.

Laura M. Nagel,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. 03–17716 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Deanwood Pharmacy: Denial of Application for Registration

I. Background

On September 5, 2001, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Deanwood Pharmacy (Respondent) of Washington, DC, notifying Respondent of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny its application for DEA registration as a pharmacy pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(2) and (3) and 823(f), on the ground that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. As a basis for revocation, the Order to Show Cause alleged that (1) Respondent's employee, Mr. Watson, was hired in violation of 21 CFR 1301.76, since the Respondent did not seek a waiver of this provision prior to hiring him; (2) that Mr. Watson had used Deanwood Pharmacy's previous DEA Certificate of Registration to purchase various controlled substances for his personal use; (3) that in April 1999, DEA investigators performed an accountability audit of controlled substances, resulting in a finding of overages and shortages of the audited drugs; and (4) that an October 22, 1999, Mr. Watson was convicted, upon entry of a guilty pleas, of an offense related to this handling of controlled substances.

By letter filed on October 12, 2001, the Respondent's owner requested a hearing in this matter. On November 6, 2001, Administrative Law Judge Gail A. Randall (the ALJ) issued an Order for Prehearing Statements. On November 15, 2001, the Government filed a Motion for Summary Disposition (Motion).

The Government attached to its Motion an affidavit from Antoinette J. Williams, the Chief of DEA's registration had been surrendered on April 2, 1999, and that the Respondent had submitted a new application for a DEA Certificate of Registration for a retail pharmacy on or around April 12, 1999. The Government also attached a letter dated August 1, 2001, from the Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Health, asserting that Deanwood Pharmacy did not have a current pharmacy license or DC Controlled Substance Registration.

Based on the attachments, the Government argued that the Respondent did not have a valid license to operate a pharmacy or to handle controlled substances in the jurisdiction of his requested DEA certificate. Accordingly, the Government asserted that the Respondent's pending DEA application must be denied.

After numerous extensions of time and motions to stay proceedings, the ALJ issued an Order on January 30, 2002, giving the respondent until February 22, 2002, to respond to the Government's Motion. On that date, the Respondent filed an Opposition to Government's Motion for Summary Disposition, asserting that the Respondent had a pending application filed on January 11, 2002, before the Department of Health for the District of Columbia, (Department of Health) for a controlled substances registration. The Respondent also noted that the Government contacted the Department of Health on or about January 18, 2002, and provided that office the information in the show cause order in this matter. As a result of the exchange of information, the Respondent now believed that the Department of Health's decision regarding the application for authority to handle controlled substances would not be resolved for several months. Accordingly, the Respondent asked that this matter be stayed until a decision was rendered by the Department of Health, in order to avoid further delay in DEA's processing of Respondent's application. The Respondent did not disagree with the Government's assertions that the Respondent was currently not authorized to handle controlled substances in the District of Columbia, the business address of the Respondent-pharmacy, or that the Respondent lacked a pharmacy license.

By order of March 7, 2002, the ALJ granted the Government's Motion, on the ground that DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to grant a registration if the applicant has no state authority to dispense controlled substances.

II. Final Order

The Acting Administrator adopts the ALJ's decision granting the Government's Motion, and all of the ALJ's prior decisions on motions in this matter. The Acting Administrator has carefully reviewed the entire record in this matter, as defined above, and hereby issues this final rule and final order prescribed by 21 CFR 1316.67 and 21 CFR 1301.46, based upon the following findings of fact and conclusions.

As stated by the ALJ in her order granting the Government's motion, DEA has no authority to grant a registration if the registrant is without state authority to dispense controlled substances in the state in which the Respondent's business is located. 21 U.S.C. 823(f) and 824(a)(3): *See* Graham Travers Schuler, M.D., 65 FR 50,570 (DEA 2000); *see also* Saihb S. Halil, M.D., 64 FR 33,319 (DEA 1999); Greenbelt Professional Pharmacy, 57 FR 55,000 (DEA 1992).

Moreover, when there is not material questions of fact involved, or when the facts are agreed upon, there is no need