

all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Background

The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received a request from petitioner and from respondent Ningbo Nanlian Frozen Foods Company, Ltd. to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China. On October 26, 1998, the Department initiated this antidumping administrative review covering the period of March 26, 1997 through August 31, 1998 (see 63 FR 58010 dated October 29, 1998).

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

The Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results to July 17, 1999. This extension of time limits is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 5, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 99-6537 Filed 3-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[A-570-848]

International Trade Administration

Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limits for preliminary results of new shipper review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 18, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew Nulman, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4052.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Background

On September 29, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received requests from Lianyungang Haiwang Aquatic Products Co., Ltd. and Qingdao Rirong Foodstuff Co., Ltd. for a new shipper antidumping administrative review of freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China. On October 30, 1998, the Department initiated this new shipper review covering the period of March 26, 1997 through August 31, 1998 (see 63 FR 59762 dated November 5, 1999).

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

The Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results to July 17, 1999. This extension of time limits is in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act.

Dated: March 5, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 99-6539 Filed 3-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-101]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth From the People's Republic of China

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: Greige polyester cotton printcloth from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On November 2, 1998, the Department of Commerce ("the

Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from The People's Republic of China (63 FR 58709) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic industry and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scott E. Smith or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-6397 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 18, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("Sunset Regulations"). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("Sunset Policy Bulletin").

Scope

The merchandise subject to this antidumping order is greige polyester cotton printcloth, other than 80 x 80 type. Greige polyester cotton printcloth is of chief weight cotton,¹ unbleached and uncolored printcloth. The term "printcloth" refers to plain woven fabric, not napped, not fancy or figured,

¹ In the scope from the original investigation, the Department defined the subject merchandise by chief value (*i.e.*, the subject merchandise was of chief value cotton). For the purposes of this review, we have incorporated Custom's conversion to chief weight (*i.e.*, the subject merchandise is of chief weight cotton). See *Memorandum, RE: Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth—Scope*, February 25, 1999.

of singles yarn, not combed, of average yarn number 43 to 68,² weighing not more than 6 ounces per square yard, of a total count of more than 85 yarns per square inch, of which the total count of the warp yarns per inch and the total count of the filling yarns per inch are each less than 62 percent of the total count of the warp and filling yarns per square inch. This merchandise is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTSUS) item 5210.11.6060. The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

This review covers imports from all manufacturers and exporters of Chinese printcloth.

Background

On November 2, 1998, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from The People's Republic of China (63 FR 58709), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate on behalf of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute ("ATMI") and its member companies on November 16, 1998,³ within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. The member companies of ATMI claimed interested party status under 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)(C) as U.S. producers of greige polyester cotton printcloth. In addition, ATMI indicated that the following member companies were the original petitioners in this case: CMI Industries, Inc., Alice Manufacturing Co., Mayfair Mills, Inc., Greenwood Mills, Inc., and Mount Vernon Mills, Inc. We received a complete substantive response from ATMI on December 2, 1998, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under section 351.218(d)(3)(i). We did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party to this proceeding. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), the Department

determined to conduct an expedited, 120-day review of this order.

Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted this review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping order, and shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("the Commission") the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order is revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are discussed below. In addition, parties' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are addressed within the respective sections below.

Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action ("the SAA"), H.R. Doc. No. 103-316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103-826, pt. 1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103-412 (1994), the Department issued its *Sunset Policy Bulletin* providing guidance on methodological and analytical issues, including the bases for likelihood determinations. In its *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department indicated that determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis (see section II.A.3). In addition, the Department indicated that normally it will determine that revocation of an antidumping order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (see section II.A.3).

In addition to guidance on likelihood provided in the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* and legislative history, section 751(c)(4)(B) of the Act provides that the

Department shall determine that revocation of an order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In the instant review, the Department did not receive a response from any interested party. Pursuant to section 351.218(d)(2)(iii) of the *Sunset Regulations*, this constitutes a waiver of participation.

The antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from the People's Republic of China was published in the **Federal Register** on September 16, 1983 (48 FR 41614). Since this time, the Department has conducted three administrative reviews.⁴ The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise.

In its substantive response, ATMI argues that the Department should determine that there is a likelihood that dumping would recur if the order were revoked because a dumping margin above a *de minimis* level has been in place since the imposition of the order, and dumping of subject merchandise has continued since the issuance of the order.

ATMI notes that a dumping margin of 22.4 percent has existed throughout the life of the order (see December 2, 1998 Substantive Response of ATMI at 5-7). Furthermore, ATMI argues that, although the Department has not conducted a review since the 1988/89 administrative review (57 FR 31353, July 15, 1992), the existence of imports since that time, and the fact that a 22.4 percent deposit rate has been continuously in effect for all imports of the subject merchandise, suggests that imports of greige polyester cotton printcloth must have been exported to the United States at prices below cost since 1990.

In making its decision, the Department considered the existence of dumping margins and the volume of imports before and after the issuance of the order. As discussed in section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63-64, if companies continue dumping with the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue if the

² Under the English system, this average yarn number count translates to 26 to 40. The average yarn number counts reported in previous scope descriptions by the Department are based on the English system of yarn number counts. Per phone conversations with U.S. Customs officials, the Customs Service now relies on the metric system to establish average yarn number counts. Thus, the 26 to 40 average yarn number count under the English system translates to a 43 to 68 average yarn number count under the metric system. See Memorandum, RE: Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth—Scope, February 19, 1999.

³ CMI Industries, Inc. (formerly Clinton Mills, Inc.), Alice Manufacturing Co., Mayfair Mills, Inc., Greenwood Mills, Inc., Inman Mills, Inc., Spartan Mills, Inc., and Mount Vernon Mills, Inc.

⁴ See *Greige Polyester cotton Printcloth From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Order*; 50 FR 5805, February 12, 1985; *Greige Polyester cotton Printcloth From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Order*; 57 FR 1254, January 13, 1992; and *Greige Polyester cotton Printcloth From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Order*; 57 FR 31353, July 15, 1992.

discipline were removed. In the instant proceeding, a dumping margin above a *de minimis* level continues to exist for shipments of the subject merchandise from all Chinese producers/exporters.⁵

The Department also considered the volume of imports before and after issuance of the order, consistent with section 752(c) of the Act. The Department examined U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports and data from our original investigation and subsequent administrative reviews and finds that imports of the subject merchandise have existed throughout most of the life of the order.⁶

For the period from 1984 through 1987, the Department can, as noted in *Griege Polyester Cotton Printcloth: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Determination Not to Revoke*, 57 FR 1254 (January 13, 1992), confirm two shipments of subject merchandise to the United States. From 1988 through 1989, the Department knows of no shipments of the subject merchandise to the United States. Lastly, U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports show annual imports of merchandise within the covered HTSUS item number have existed almost continuously from 1990 through 1998.

Upon consideration of the argument and evidence on the record, the Department determines that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. Specifically, a deposit rate above a *de minimis* level continues in effect for exports of the subject merchandise by all known Chinese manufacturers/exporters. Given that dumping has continued over the life of the order, respondent interested parties waived participation in the sunset review, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue if the order were revoked.

Magnitude of the Margin

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department stated that it will normally provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the final determination in the original investigation. Further, for companies not specifically investigated or for

companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the "all others" rate from the investigation. (See section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.) Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty absorption determinations. (See sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.)

The Department, in its final determination of sales at less than fair value, published a weighted-average dumping margin for all imports of greige polyester cotton printcloth from the People's Republic of China (48 FR 34312, July 28, 1983). We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

In its substantive response, ATMI, citing the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, argues that the Department should report to the Commission the weighted-averaged dumping margin from the original investigation for China National Textiles Import and Export Corporation ("Chinatex"). Chinatex was the only producer/exporter of the subject merchandise identified in the original investigation. Quoting the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, ATMI argues that the Department should report this margin to the Commission as it is "* * * the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters * * * without the discipline of an order or suspension agreement in place".

The Department agrees with ATMI's argument concerning the choice of the margin rate to report to the Commission. In the original investigation, the Department calculated a country-wide weighted-averaged margin for all companies, including Chinatex. Therefore, the Department finds that the country-wide weighted-averaged margin calculated in the original investigation is probative of how Chinese producers and exporters of greige polyester cotton printcloth would act if the order were revoked. As such, the Department will report to the Commission as the dumping margin for all companies, the country-wide rate from the original investigation as contained in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margin listed below:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
All Chinese Manufacturers/Exporters	22.4

This notice 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 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 11, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99-6536 Filed 3-17-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-822]

Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain helical spring lock washers from the People's Republic of China in the *Federal Register* on November 9, 1998 (63 FR 60299). This review covers sales of this merchandise to the United States during the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based upon our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes to the margin calculations presented in the preliminary results of the review. The final weighted-average dumping margins are listed below in the section entitled *Final Results of Review*.

⁵ See *Griege Polyester cotton Printcloth From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Administrative Review of Antidumping Order*; 57 FR 31353, July 15, 1992.

⁶ From the Department's original investigation and its subsequent administrative reviews, the Department can confirm that shipments of the subject merchandise occurred in 1982, the year prior to the imposition of the order, and 1983, the year of the issuance of the antidumping duty order.