(19 U.S.C. 1675(c)) (the Act), that revocation of the countervailing duty order on sugar from the European Union would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. The Commission also determines[3] that revocation of the antidumping findings on sugar from Belgium, France, and Germany would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. Further, the Commission determines that revocation of the antidumping duty order on sugar and syrups from Canada would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.

Background

The Commission instituted these reviews on October 1, 1998 (63 FR 52759), and determined on January 7, 1999, that it would conduct full reviews (64 FR 4901, February 1, 1999). Notice of the scheduling of the Commission's reviews and of a public hearing 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** on March 11, 1999 (64 FR 12178). The hearing was held in Washington, DC, on July 15, 1999, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

The Commission transmitted its determination in this investigation to the Secretary of Commerce on September 28, 1999. The views of the Commission are contained in USITC Publication 3238 (September 1999), entitled Sugar from the European Union; Sugar from Belgium, France, and Germany; and Sugar and Syrups from Canada: Investigation Nos. 104–TAA–7 (Review); AA1921–198–200 (Review); and 731–TA–3 (Review).

Issued: September 29, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99–26042 Filed 10–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

[3] Commissioners Crawford and Askey dissenting.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Importation of Controlled Substances; Notice of Withdrawal

As set forth in the **Federal Register** (FR Doc. 99–20435) Vol. 64, No. 152 at page 43224, dated August 9, 1999, ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals, Inc., 238 South Main Street, Assonet, Massachusetts 02702 made application to the Drug Enforcement Administration for registration as an importer of 2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine (7396).

A registered bulk manufacturer of 2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine requested a hearing to deny the proposed registration of ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals. ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals has requested by letter that its application be withdrawn. Therefore, ISP Freetown Fine Chemicals application to import 2,5-dimethoxyamphetamine is hereby withdrawn.

Dated: September 24, 1999.

John H. King,

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

[FR Doc. 99–25903 Filed 10–5–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 96–32]

Pettigrew Rexall Drugs Reinstatement of Registration

On February 16, 1999, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued a final order revoking DEA Certificate of Registration AP0406911 issued to Pettigrew Rexall Drugs (Respondent), effective March 25, 1999. See 64 FR 8855 (February 23, 1999). The Deputy Administrator further ordered that the revocation be stayed for six months from the effective date of the order ''during which time Respondent must present evidence to the Deputy Administrator of Mr. Pettigrew's completion of a training course regarding the proper handling of controlled substances and must submit to random unannounced inspections by DEA personnel without requiring an administrative inspection warrant.'' *Id.*

The Deputy Administrator noted that should Respondent not comply with these conditions or if it is determined that further violations have occurred, an order would be issued lifting the stay and Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration would be revoked. The Deputy Administrator further noted that should Respondent submit the required information in a timely manner and it is determined that no violations have occurred, a subsequent order would be issued reinstating Respondent's DEA Certificate of Registration and renewing it without limitations.

By letter dated June 4, 1999, Respondent's counsel forwarded a copy of a document entitled, ''Certification of Continuing Pharmaceutical Education Participation'' from the University of Tennessee College of Pharmacy dated May 28, 1999. The document seemed to indicate that Jimmie Max Pettigrew completed the course entitled Tennessee Pharmacy and Drug Law. In addition, the document had handwritten notations of grades allegedly received for the eight assignments of the course. In the letter forwarding this document, Respondent's counsel stated that ''[w]e are submitting this certification of continuing pharmaceutical education participation copy as evidence of Mr. Pettigrew's compliance with your order of February 16, 1999.''

By letter dated June 8, 1999, the Deputy Administrator's office notified Respondent's counsel that based upon the information provided, the Deputy Administrator was unable to determine whether Mr. Pettigrew has successfully completed a course regarding the proper handling of controlled substances. The certification was not signed and there was no indication who wrote the grades listed on the certification.

Thereafter on July 20, 1999, Respondent's counsel forwarded affidavits from the Assistant Dean for Continuing Education and Public Service for the University of Tennessee College of Pharmacy and from Jimmie Max Pettigrew, Respondent's owner and pharmacist, which indicate that Mr. Pettigrew has successfully completed a course in the proper handling of controlled substances.

No evidence has been presented to the Deputy Administrator that any inspections by DEA have revealed any further violations relating to the handling of controlled substances.

The Deputy Administrator concludes that Respondent has met the conditions set forth in the February 16, 1999 final order, and as a result, DEA Certificate of Registration AP0406911 shall be reinstated and renewed. Respondent is reminded that it is required to indicate that there has been action taken against its DEA Certificate of Registration in response to the liability question on any future applications.