

surface of the hinge. The petitioner contends that the country of origin marking on the container in which hinges are imported is not sufficient. Public comment is solicited regarding the application of the marking requirements to imported metal hinges.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before November 27, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments (preferably in triplicate) may be submitted to the U.S. Customs Service, Regulations Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, 1301 Constitution Avenue, NW. (Franklin Court), Washington, DC. 20229. Comments may be viewed at the Office of Regulations and Rulings, Franklin Court, 1099 14th Street, NW., Suite 4000, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Monika Rice, Special Classification and Marking Branch, Office of Regulations and Rulings, U.S. Customs Service, (202-482-6980).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to section 516, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1516) and part 175, Customs Regulations (19 CFR part 175), a domestic interested party may challenge certain decisions made by Customs regarding imported merchandise which is claimed to be similar to the class or kind of merchandise manufactured, produced or wholesaled by the domestic interested party. This document provides notice that a domestic interested party is challenging the marking requirements of imported metal hinges.

The petitioner is Hager Hinge Company, a domestic manufacturer of hinges. This entity qualifies as a domestic interested party within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. 1516(a)(2).

Section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1304), provides that, unless excepted, every article of foreign origin shall be marked in a conspicuous place with the English name of the country of origin. The country of origin marking requirements and exceptions of 19 U.S.C. 1304 are implemented by part 134, Customs Regulations (19 CFR part 134).

The hinges at issue are classifiable under subheading 8302.10.60 or subheading 8302.10.90, Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), depending on the material of construction which basically is brass, aluminum, steel, or stainless steel. Hinges are stamped from dies with knuckles rolled, milled or reamed; assembled with bearings, if required; polished to remove impurities on the

face or knuckle; and electroplated. Steel hinges are described as having great strength, which can be electroplated with various finishes, and are most commonly used in controlled environments, such as the interior of a building. Stainless steel hinges are also described as having great strength, are non-corrosive, and can be polished to either bright or satin finishes, but may not be electroplated in the same manner as steel. Brass hinges are described as having less strength than steel or stainless steel, and may not be used on fire rated door applications, but may be electroplated with many finishes. Additionally, there are four basic types of hinges: Full Mortise (the most common, comprising 90 percent of all hinges used), Full Surface, Half Mortise, and Half Surface. A Full Mortise hinge is mortised to both the door and the frame; the Full Surface hinge is affixed to the surface (not recessed) of the door and the frame; the Half Mortise hinge is mortised to the door (recessed) and surface applied to the frame; and the Half Surface hinge is surface applied to the door and mortised to the frame (recessed). The hinges described above are stated to be sold through distributors for sale in hardware stores and home centers, and are also sold in bulk to general and sub-contractors for use in building construction.

The petitioner contends that the country of origin marking on these imported metal hinges be placed onto each individual hinge by a die sunk, molding or etching process in a conspicuous place such as the exposed surface of the hinge. The petitioner contends that the country of origin marking on the container in which the hinges are imported is not sufficient because, in practice, the hinges are often removed from their container before reaching the ultimate purchaser. In a retail setting, hinges may be removed from their container and sold from bulk bins for easy access and examination. Furthermore, in building construction, the petitioner contends that the building purchaser has less likelihood of ascertaining the country of origin which is important in determining the quality of a building's construction. The petitioner contends that despite the certification requirements imposed by 19 CFR 134.26 for repackaged articles, and the demand for liquidated damages under 19 CFR 134.54(a) for failure to adhere to the certification, anything less than individual marking on each metal hinge is statutorily insufficient. Consequently, the petitioner proposes that Customs require imported metal hinges to be marked individually by a

die sunk, molding or etching process in a conspicuous place because as stated in 19 CFR 134.41, as a general rule, marking requirements are best met by marking worked into the article at the time of manufacture and it is suggested that the country of origin on metal articles be die sunk, molded, or etched.

Comments

Pursuant to § 175.21(a), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 175.21(a)), before making a determination on this matter, Customs invites written comments from interested parties. The petition of the domestic interested party, as well as all comments received in response to this notice, will be available for public inspection in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), § 1.4, Treasury Department Regulations (31 CFR 1.4), and § 103.11(b), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 103.11(b)), on regular business days between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. at the Regulations Branch, Suite 4000, Franklin Court, 1099 14th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

AUTHORITY

This notice is published in accordance with § 175.21(a), Customs Regulations (19 CFR 175.21(a)).

Drafting Information

The principal drafter of this document was Monika Rice, Special Classification and Marking Branch, United States Customs Service. Personnel from other Customs offices participated in its development.

George J. Weise,

Commissioner of Customs.

Approved: August 28, 1995.

John P. Simpson

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury
[FR Doc. 95-23953 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-P

Geographic Boundaries of Customs Brokerage, Cartage, and Ligherage Districts

AGENCY: Customs Service, Treasury.

ACTION: General notice.

SUMMARY: This document informs the public of the geographic areas covered for purposes of Customs broker permits and for certain cartage and ligherage purposes where the word "district" appears in the Customs Regulations.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 30, 1995 at 11:59 p.m. EST.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jerry Laderberg, Office of Field Operations (202)927-0415.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In Treasury Decisions 95-77 and 95-78, both published in this issue of the Federal Register, Customs amended its regulations to reflect its new organizational structure. Concerning this reorganization, Customs stated that, although the concepts of districts and regions would, for the most part, be eliminated, they would still exist for certain limited purposes concerning broker permits and cartage and lighterage licensing. Accordingly, in § 111.1, definitions of "district" and "district director" were added to enable the current statutory Customs broker licensing and permit schemes to operate, and in § 112.1, a definition of "district" was added for certain purposes regarding the cartage and lighterage of merchandise by parties excepted from obtaining a license to do so. Both of these sections provided that Customs would publish a listing of each district, and the ports thereunder, on or before October 1, 1995, and whenever updated. This document constitutes the referenced publication.

In the table below, arranged alphabetically by State or other geographic location, each of the service ports listed in the left column represents a "district" for purposes of §§ 111.1 and 112.1, and the ports of entry listed to the right of each service port represent the ports within that "district."

Service ports	Ports of entry
Alabama	
Mobile	Birmingham Gulfport, MS Huntsville Mobile Pascagoula, MS
Alaska	
Anchorage	Alcan Anchorage Dalton Cache Fairbanks Juneau Ketchikan Sitka Skagway Valdez Wrangell

Service ports	Ports of entry
Arizona	
Nogales	Douglas Lukeville Naco Nogales Phoenix San Luis Sasabe Tucson
California	
Los Angeles	Los Angeles-Long Beach LAX Las Vegas, NV Port Hueneme Port San Luis
San Diego	Andrade Calexico Tecate
San Francisco	Eureka Fresno Reno, NV San Francisco-Oakland
District of Columbia	
Dulles	Alexandria, VA Dulles, VA
Florida	
Miami	Key West Miami Port Everglades West Palm Beach
Tampa	Boca Grande Fernandina Beach Jacksonville Orlando Panama City Pensacola Port Canaveral Port Manatee St. Petersburg Tampa
Georgia	
Savannah	Atlanta Brunswick Savannah
Hawaii	
Honolulu	Hilo Honolulu Kahului Nawiliwili-Port Allen

Service ports	Ports of entry
Illinois	
Chicago	Chicago Davenport, IA-Moline and Rock Island Des Moines, IA Omaha, NE Peoria Rockford
Louisiana	
New Orleans	Baton Rouge Chattanooga, TN Gramercy Greenville, MS Knoxville, TN Lake Charles Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR Memphis, TN Morgan City Nashville, TN New Orleans Shreveport-Bossier City Vicksburg, MS
Maine	
Portland	Bangor Bar Harbor Bath Belfast Bridgewater Calais Eastport Fort Fairfield Fort Kent Houlton Jackman Jonesport Limestone Madawaska Portland Portsmouth, NH Rockland Van Buren Vanceboro
Maryland	
Baltimore	Annapolis Baltimore Cambridge

Service ports	Ports of entry	Service ports	Ports of entry	Service ports	Ports of entry
Massachusetts		New York		Ohio	
Boston	Boston Bridgeport, CT Fall River Gloucester Hartford, CT Lawrence New Bedford New Haven, CT New London, CT Plymouth Salem Springfield Worcester	Buffalo	Buffalo-Niagara Falls Oswego Rochester Sodus Point Syracuse Utica	Cleveland	Ashtabula/Conneaut Cincinnati- Lawrenceburg, IN Cleveland Columbus Dayton Erie, PA Indianapolis, IN Louisville, KY Owensboro, KY- Evansville, IN Toledo-Sandusky
Michigan		Champlain	Alexandria Bay Cape Vincent Champlain-Rouses Point Clayton Massena Ogdensburg Trout River	Oregon	
Detroit	Battle Creek Detroit Grand Rapids Muskegon Port Huron Saginaw-Bay City- Flint Sault Ste. Marie	JFK/New York/New- ark.	Albany New York/Newark, NJ JFK Perth Amboy, NJ	Portland	Astoria Boise, ID Coos Bay Longview Newport Portland
Minnesota		North Carolina		Pennsylvania	
Duluth	Ashland, WI Duluth and Superior, WI Grand Portage International Falls- Ranier	Charlotte	Beaufort-Morehead City Charlotte Durham Reidsville Wilmington Winston-Salem	Philadelphia	Harrisburg Lehigh Valley Philadelphia-Chester, PA and Wilmington, DE Pittsburgh Wilkes-Barre/Scranton
Minneapolis	Minneapolis-St. Paul	North Dakota		Puerto Rico	
Missouri		Pembina	Ambrose Antler Baudette, MN Carbury Dunseith Fortuna Hannah Hansboro Maida Neche Noonan Northgate Noyes, MN Pembina Pinecreek, MN Portal Roseau, MN Sarles Sherwood St. John Walhalla Warroad, MN Westhope	San Juan	Aquadilla Fajardo Guanica Humacao Jobos Mayaguez Ponce San Juan
St. Louis	Kansas City Springfield St. Joseph St. Louis Wichita, KS	Montana		Rhode Island	
Great Falls	Butte Del Bonita Denver, CO Eastport, ID Great Falls Morgan Opheim Piegan Porthill, ID Raymond Roosville Salt Lake City, UT Scobey Sweetgrass Turner Whitetail Whitlash	Texas		Providence	Newport Providence
South Carolina		Texas		Charleston	Charleston Columbia Georgetown Greenville- Spartenburg
Texas		Texas		Dallas	Amarillo Austin Dallas/Fort Worth Lubbock Oklahoma City, OK San Antonio Tulsa, OK

Service ports	Ports of entry
El Paso	Albuquerque, NM Columbus, NM El Paso Fabens Presidio Santa Teresa, NM
Houston	Houston-Galveston
* Port Arthur	Port Arthur
Laredo	Brownsville Del Rio Eagle Pass Hidalgo Laredo Progreso Rio Grande City Roma

Vermont

St. Albans	Beecher Falls Burlington Derby Line Highgate Springs- Alburg Norton Richford St. Albans
------------------	--

Virginia

Norfolk	Charleston, WV Front Royal Norfolk-Newport News Richmond-Petersburg
---------------	---

Virgin Islands, U.S.

Charlotte Amalie	Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas Christiansted, St. Croix Coral Bay, St. John Cruz Bay, St. John Frederiksted, St. Croix
------------------------	---

Washington

Seattle	Aberdeen Blaine Boundary Danville Ferry Frontier Laurier Lynden Metaline Falls Nighthawk Oroville Point Roberts Puget Sound Spokane Sumas
---------------	---

Service ports	Ports of entry
Wisconsin	
Milwaukee	Green Bay Manitowoc Marinette Milwaukee Racine Sheboygan

* Not a Service Port.

Dated: September 22, 1995.

Samuel H. Banks,

Assistant Commissioner, Office of Field Operations.

[FR Doc. 95-24011 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Tariff-rate Quota for Refined Sugar (Other Than Specialty Sugar)

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative; 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice that the in-quota quantity of the tariff-rate quota for imported refined sugar (other than specialty sugars) will be available on a globalized basis, the certificate of quota eligibility requirements for this sugar are being suspended, and the quota quantity reserved for the importation of specialty sugars will be allocated among supplying countries as provided in this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Inquiries may be mailed or delivered to Tom Perkins, Senior Economist, Office of Agricultural Affairs (Room 421), Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Perkins, Office of Agricultural Affairs, 202-395-6127.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Additional U.S. Note 5 to Chapter 17 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS), the United States maintains a tariff-rate quota for imports of refined sugar (sugars, syrups and molasses provided for under subheadings 1701.12.10, 1701.91.10, 1701.99.10, 1702.90.10, and 2106.90.44 of the HTS). The Secretary of Agriculture, by notice in the Federal Register of August 15, 1995 (60 FR 42142), established the in-quota quantity of the tariff-rate quota for refined sugar for the period October 1,

1995-September 30, 1996, at 22,000 metric tons, raw value, and reserve 1,656 metric tons, raw value, of this amount of the importation of specialty sugars.

Section 404(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3601(d)(3)) authorizes the President to determine the allocation of the in-quota quantity of a tariff-rate quota for any agricultural product among supplying countries or customs areas. The President delegated this authority to the United States Trade Representative under President Proclamation No. 6763 (60 FR 1007).

Pursuant to section 404(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and Additional U.S. Note 5 to chapter 17 of the HTS, I have determined that the quantity of the 1995-96 tariff-rate quota for refined sugar that is reserved for the importation of specialty sugars (1,656 metric tons, raw value) shall be allowed to each of the following countries and areas, in the amount of 72 metric tons, raw value: Belgium, Burma, Cameroon, People's Republic of China, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Netherlands Antilles, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, Venezuela and Republic of Yemen.

I have also determined not to allocate the in-quota quantity of the tariff-rate quota for refined sugar, as provided for in Additional U.S. Note 5 to chapter 17 of the HTS and established by the Secretary of Agriculture, among supplying countries, except for the allocation of the quantity reserved for the importation of specialty sugars.

In addition, I have determined that suspension of the certificate of quota eligibility (CQE) requirements for sugar entering under the tariff-rate quota for refined sugar gives due consideration to the interests in the U.S. sugar market of domestic producers and materially affected contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Accordingly, pursuant to 15 CFR 2011.110(a), effective October 1, 1995, the provisions of subpart A of part 2011 of 15 CFR are suspended with respect to imports of sugar under the refined sugar tariff-rate quota. The CQE system will remain in place for imports of raw cane sugar.

Michael Kantor,

United States Trade Representative.

[FR Doc. 95-23937 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190-01-M