

machinery and equipment from its Seoul plant, installed new pickling lines, enlarged the building, and scrapped machinery and equipment purchased from Sammi. In our examination of information on the record we find that production quantity also changed. SeAH stated in its November 20, 1997 letter that ninety of the factory employees were sent to the Changwon facility from former PSP plants, while other employees were hired. During verification we found that one of these new hires had worked for Sammi prior to 1989, and for an unaffiliated entity between 1989 and 1996. After PSP's name change to SeAH, only minimal changes occurred with respect to the number of people employed at Changwon plant. For further details, see the proprietary "Memorandum to Robert LaRussa, Successorship: Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea, Changed Circumstances Review," January 23, 1998.

(3) Suppliers

Information on the record indicates that there have been some changes in suppliers between 1994 and 1996. An examination of PSP's 1994 supplier list and SeAH's 1996 supplier list show some changes in suppliers. An examination of Sammi's 1994 supplier list (which SeAH stated was an informal list compiled by them from basic knowledge of the Korean Stainless Steel Pipe market) and SeAH's 1996 supplier list also show changes in suppliers. However, we believe these changes are not significant, see the proprietary "Memorandum to Robert LaRussa, Successorship: Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea, Changed Circumstances Review," January 23, 1998.

(4) Customer Base

SeAH states that it does not have Sammi's 1994 customer list; therefore, we are not able to compare SeAH's customer base to Sammi's. SeAH states that there are six other producers of WSSP in Korea, two of which are new companies, and that Sammi's former customers could go to any one of these companies to purchase WSSP. An analysis of the information submitted by SeAH indicates that PSP did not have a significant increase in its large-customer base due to the acquisition of the Changwon facility. With respect to SeAH's smaller-customer base, SeAH notes that it is likely that some of its new customers are due to the closure of Sammi's operations, but that without Sammi's lists, it cannot prove this. We found at verification that PSP used their

own marketing strategies and knowledge of the market to obtain their own customers. See "Report of Verification of SeAH Steel Corporation, Ltd. (SeAH) in the Changed Circumstances Review for Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea," page 7. A comparison of the customer lists submitted by SeAH indicates that there have been some small changes in the customer base between PSP in 1994 and SeAH in 1996.

We preliminarily find that SeAH is not the successor to Sammi as suggested by the petitioner. While the plant is a former Sammi facility, the plant was overhauled and redesigned. Further, none of Sammi's former managers work for SeAH, with the exception of two plant managers, who ceased working for Sammi long before the plant acquisition, and, therefore, were not hired as a result of that acquisition. PSP's suppliers did not change in a way that would be attributed to PSP's acquisition of the Changwon plant, and PSP did not acquire a significant number of new customers or substantial new business from such customers as a result of the Changwon acquisition.

With PSP's name change to SeAH, no major changes occurred with respect to PSP's management, plant facilities, customer base or supplier base. Therefore, we find that PSP was not the successor to Sammi and that SeAH is the successor to PSP.

These issues are more fully discussed in "Memorandum to Robert LaRussa: Successorship: Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe from Korea, Changed Circumstances Review," January 23, 1998.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily conclude that, for antidumping duty cash deposit purposes, SeAH is the successor to PSP. SeAH will, therefore, be assigned the PSP antidumping deposit rate of 2.67 percent.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days. Interested parties may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results, which will be due on February 12, 1998. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, are due on February 17, 1998. Case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(e). A hearing, if requested, will be held on February 19, 1998. The Department will publish the final results of the changed circumstances review including the results of any such comment. This changed circumstances review and notice are in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(f).

Dated: January 29, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-3077 Filed 2-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-489-501]

Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube From Turkey

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by Allied Tube & Conduit and Wheatland Tube Company, the petitioners in this case, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube from Turkey. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter.¹ The period of review is May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997.

We preliminarily determine that, for the one company that had shipments during the review period, sales have not been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results, we will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on the subject merchandise exported by this company.

Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results. Parties that submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 6, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Riggle or Kris Campbell, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0650 or (202) 482-3813, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to

¹ As noted below, we initiated a review of three companies. However, two of these companies did not have shipments during the period of review. Accordingly, we have not reviewed any shipments by these companies.

the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations last codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1, 1997).

Background

On May 15, 1986, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube from Turkey (51 FR 17784). On May 2, 1997 (62 FR 24081), we published in the **Federal Register** the notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of this order for the period May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1), on May 30, 1997, the petitioners requested a review of the following producers and exporters of certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube: (1) The Borusan Group² (Borusan); (2) Yucelboru Ihracat, Ithalat ve Pazarlama A.S./Cayirova Boru Sanayii ve Ticaret A.S. (Yucelboru); and (3) Erbosan Erviyas Boru Sanayii ve Ticaret A.S. (Erbosan). On June 30, 1997, we published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review (62 FR 35154).

No Shipments

Yucelboru and Erbosan notified us that they had no shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR). We have confirmed this with the Customs Service.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain welded carbon steel pipe and tube products with an outside diameter of 0.375 inch or more but not over 16 inches, of any wall thickness. Imports of subject merchandise are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 7306.30.10.00, 7306.30.50.25, 7306.30.50.32, 7306.30.50.40, 7306.30.50.55, 7306.30.50.85, 7306.30.50.90. These products, commonly referred to in the industry as standard pipe and tube, are produced to various American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) specifications, most notably A-120, A-53 or A-135. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for

convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Fair Value Comparisons

We compared the export price (EP) to the normal value (NV), as described in the *Export Price* and *Normal Value* sections of this notice. Because Turkey's economy experienced high inflation during the POR (over 70 percent), we limited our comparisons to home market sales made during the same month in which the U.S. sale occurred. This methodology minimizes the extent to which calculated dumping margins are overstated or understated due solely to price inflation that occurred in the intervening time period between the U.S. and home market sales. We first attempted to compare products sold in the U.S. and home markets that were identical with respect to the following characteristics: grade, diameter, wall thickness, finish, and end finish. We did not find any appropriate home market sales of merchandise that was identical in these respects to the merchandise sold in the United States. Accordingly, we compared U.S. products with the most similar merchandise sold in the home market based on the characteristics listed above, in that order of priority. Where there were no appropriate home market sales of comparable merchandise, we compared the merchandise sold in the United States to constructed value (CV).

Export Price

Because Borusan sold subject merchandise directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation, and a constructed export price (CEP) methodology was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of this review, we used an EP analysis for all of Borusan's U.S. sales, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act.

We calculated EP based on the packed, delivered price to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, we deducted post-sale price adjustments, domestic inland freight, domestic brokerage and handling, and international freight. In accordance with sections 772(c)(1)(B) and (C) of the Act, respectively, we added countervailing duties imposed on the subject merchandise to offset export subsidies, and we added duty drawback.

Normal Value

A. Selection of Comparison Market

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the

home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared Borusan's volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of its U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Pursuant to sections 773(a)(1)(B) and (C) of the Act, because Borusan's aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, we determined that the home market was viable.

B. Cost of Production Analysis

Because the Department disregarded sales below the cost of production (COP) in the last completed review of Borusan (1993-94 POR), we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of NV in this review may have been made at prices below the COP, as provided at section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. See Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Welded Carbon Steel Pipe and Tube From Turkey, 62 FR 51629 (October 2, 1997). Therefore, we considered whether any home market sales by Borusan should be disregarded from our analysis as below-cost sales within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act.

1. Calculation of COP

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of Borusan's costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, plus general and administrative expenses (G&A) and finance expenses.

As noted above, we determined that the Turkish economy experienced high inflation during the POR. Therefore, in order to avoid the distortive effect of inflation on our comparison of prices and costs, we requested that Borusan submit the product-specific cost of manufacturing (COM) incurred during each month of the POR. We calculated a POR-average COM for each product after indexing the reported monthly costs during the POR to an equivalent currency level using the Turkish wholesale price index from International Financial Statistics published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). We then restated the POR-average COM in the currency value of each respective month. We multiplied Borusan's G&A and finance rates by the monthly COMs and added these amounts to derive product-specific monthly COPs.

² Borusan Birlesik Boru Fabrikalari A.S., Kartal Boru Sanayii ve Ticaret A.S., Bosas Boru Sanayii ve Ticaret A.S., and Borusan Ihracat Ithalat ve Dagitim A.S.

2. Test of Home Market Prices

We compared the product-specific monthly COPs to home market sales of the foreign like product in order to determine whether these sales had been made at prices below the COP. We determined the net home market prices for the below-cost test by subtracting from the gross unit price any applicable movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct and indirect selling expenses, and packing expenses.

3. Results of COP Test

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of Borusan's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because the below-cost sales were not made in "substantial quantities." Pursuant to sections 773(b)(2)(B)-(D) of the Act, where 20 percent or more of Borusan's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales from our analysis because they (1) were made over an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and (2) were at prices which would not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, based on comparisons of prices to POR-average COPs.³ We used the remaining sales in our margin analysis, in accordance with section 773(b)(1).

C. Arm's-Length Test

Borusan made home-market sales to affiliated resellers during the POR. In accordance with our questionnaire, Borusan reported these sales to affiliated parties because the merchandise was not resold. We included in our analysis Borusan's home market sales to affiliated customers only where we determined that such sales were made at arm's-length prices, *i.e.*, at prices comparable to prices at which Borusan sold identical merchandise to unaffiliated customers. See section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.45. In order to determine the arm's-length nature of Borusan's home market sales to affiliated customers, we compared the prices, on a product-specific basis, of sales to affiliated and unaffiliated customers net of all movement charges, discounts, rebates, direct expenses, and packing. We added interest revenue for late payments. See Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products from the United Kingdom; Preliminary Results of

Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 64803, 64804 (December 9, 1997).

D. Calculation of NV Based on Home Market Prices

For those comparison products for which there were above-cost sales in the same month as the U.S. sale, we based NV on home market prices. We calculated NV based on FOB mill/warehouse or delivered prices. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for inland freight, pre-sale warehouse expenses, discounts, and rebates. We added interest revenue for late payments. In accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs.

In accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, we adjusted for differences in the circumstances of sale. These circumstances included differences in imputed credit expenses, advertising, warranty, and bank charges. We recalculated credit expenses to correct for missing payment dates on sales for which Borusan had not received payment as of the date of its supplemental response.

We also made adjustments, when comparing U.S. sales with home market sales of similar, but not identical, merchandise, for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. We based this adjustment on the difference in the variable costs of manufacturing the foreign like product and subject merchandise, using POR-average costs as adjusted for inflation for each month of the POR, as described in *Calculation of COP*, above. We used a 20-percent difference-in-merchandise (difmer) cost deviation cap, which we calculated as the absolute value of the difference between the U.S. and the home market monthly variable costs of manufacturing divided by the U.S. total cost of manufacturing, as the maximum difference in cost allowable for similar merchandise. We note that Borusan reported its home market and U.S. variable costs of manufacturing based on the month of the date of shipment. For certain U.S. sales, the shipment date occurred in the month following the sale date. For these observations, we have adjusted the U.S. variable cost of manufacturing by deflating it to the month of the U.S. date of sale. This did not occur for any home market observations.

E. Calculation of NV Based on CV

For those comparison products for which there were no sales in the same month as the U.S. sale, made in the ordinary course of trade at prices above

the COP, we based NV on CV. On January 8, 1998, the Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit issued a decision in *Cemex v. United States*, 1998 WL 3626 (Fed. Cir.). In that case, based on the pre-URAA version of the Act, the Court discussed the appropriateness of using CV as the basis for foreign market value (normal value) when the Department finds home market sales to be outside the ordinary course of trade. This issue was not raised by any party in this review. However, the URAA amended the definition of sales outside the "ordinary course of trade" to include sales below cost. See Section 771(15) of the Act. Because the Court's decision was issued so close to the deadline for completing these preliminary results, we have not had sufficient time to evaluate and apply (if appropriate and if there are adequate facts on the record) the decision to the facts of this "post-URAA" case. For these reasons, we have determined to continue to apply our policy regarding the use of CV when we have disregarded below-cost sales from the calculation of normal value; however, we invite interested parties to comment, in their case briefs, on the applicability of the *Cemex* decision to this review.

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of Borusan's costs of materials, fabrication, SG&A, finance expenses, profit and U.S. packing costs. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A), we based SG&A and profit on the actual amounts incurred and realized by Borusan in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in Turkey. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses. We calculated monthly CVs based on the indexing methodology described in *Calculation of COP*, above.

In comparing CV to export price, we deducted from CV the weighted-average home market direct selling expenses and added the U.S. product-specific direct selling expenses. See section 773(a)(8) of the Act.

Level of Trade

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we calculate NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale. The NV level of trade is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP sales, such as those made by Borusan in this review, the U.S. level of trade is also the level of the starting-

³ As noted in *Calculation of COP*, above, although we used monthly COPs in our analysis, these were based on POR-average costs, as adjusted for inflation.

price sale, *i.e.*, the price from Borusan to the unaffiliated U.S. importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different level of trade than that of the U.S. sale, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at a different level of trade, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the level of trade of the export transaction, we make a level-of-trade adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

In implementing these principles in this review, we obtained information from Borusan about the marketing stage involved in the reported U.S. and home market sales, including a description of the selling activities performed by Borusan for each channel of distribution. In identifying levels of trade for EP and home market sales, we considered the selling functions reflected in the starting price before any adjustments. We expect that, if claimed levels of trade are the same, the functions and activities of the seller should be similar. Conversely, if a party claims that levels of trade are different for different groups of sales, the functions and activities of the seller should be dissimilar.

We determined that for Borusan there were two home market levels of trade and one U.S. level of trade (*i.e.*, the EP level of trade). We also determined that Borusan's EP level of trade was equivalent to one of its levels of trade in the home market. See Memorandum from Analyst to File: Preliminary Results of 1996-97 Administrative Review of Pipe and Tube from Turkey (February 2, 1998). We first attempted to compare sales at the U.S. level of trade to sales at the identical home market level of trade. If no match was available at the same level of trade, we attempted to compare sales at the U.S. level of trade to sales at the second home market level of trade. We examined whether a level of trade adjustment was appropriate for Borusan when comparing sales at its U.S. level of trade to sales at the second, non-identical, home market level of trade.

To determine whether a level-of-trade adjustment was warranted, we examined, on a monthly and product-specific basis, the prices, net of all

adjustments, between sales at the two home market levels of trade. We found that the monthly average prices were higher at one level of trade for virtually all models and months as well as for virtually all sales based on quantities sold. We determined that this demonstrated a pattern of consistent price differences. Therefore, when comparing U.S. sales to home market sales at the non-identical level-of-trade, we adjusted NV for the difference in level of trade.

With respect to the level of trade for comparisons involving CV, it is the Department's practice to calculate, to the extent possible, a CV by level of trade, using the selling expenses and profit determined for each level of trade in the comparison market. See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Thailand and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews, 62 FR 54043, 54055 (October 17, 1997). Accordingly, we have calculated CV using the level-of-trade specific selling expenses and profit at the home market level of trade that is identical to the single U.S. level of trade.

Currency Conversion

Because this proceeding involves a high-inflation economy, we limited our comparison of U.S. and home market sales to those occurring in the same month (as described above) and only used daily exchange rates. See Certain Porcelain on Steel Cookware from Mexico: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 42496, 42503-03 (August 7, 1997) and Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Turkey, 61 FR 30309 (June 14, 1996).

The Department's preferred source for daily exchange rates is the Federal Reserve Bank. However, the Federal Reserve Bank does not track or publish exchange rates for the Turkish Lira. Therefore, we made currency conversions based on the daily exchange rates from the Dow Jones Service, as published in the Wall Street Journal.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period May 1, 1996 through April 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Borusan	0.04

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of the date of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the Customs Service not to assess antidumping duties on the merchandise subject to review. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of pipe and tube from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Borusan will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.5 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit will be zero; (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 less-than-fair-value (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 14.74 percent, the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation.

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

This notice serves as a preliminary 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 administrative review and 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: February 2, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-3078 Filed 2-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Announcement of Import Restraint Limits for Certain Cotton, Wool, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textiles and Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in the Republic of Korea; Correction

January 26, 1998.

On page 67834 of the document published in the Federal Register on December 30, 1997 (62 FR 67833), correct the HTS numbers in footnote 3 for Category 369pt. and footnote 15 for Category 659pt., as follows:

Category 369pt.: change HTS number 5602.99.1090 to 5702.99.1090.

Category 659pt.: change HTS number 6504.00.91015 to 6504.00.9015; change HTS number 6505.90.606090 to 6505.90.6090.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 98-3111 Filed 2-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Announcement of Import Restraint Limits for Certain Cotton, Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textiles and Textile Products and Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Apparel Produced or Manufactured in Malaysia; Correction

January 26, 1998.

In the **Federal Register** document published on December 30, 1997, on page 67835, column 3, footnote 6, correct the HTS numbers for Category 369pt. from 5701.10.9020 (line 3) to 5702.10.9020 and from 5602.99.1090 (line 5) to 5702.99.1090.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 98-3110 Filed 2-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Pakistan

January 26, 1998.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 2, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ross Arnold, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of of each Customs port or call (202) 927-5850. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482-3715.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854); Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended.

The current limits for certain categories are being adjusted, variously, for carryforward applied in 1997.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the **CORRELATION:** Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see

Federal Register notice 62 FR 66057, published on December 17, 1997). Also see 62 FR 63524, published on December 1, 1997.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

January 26, 1998.

Commissioner of Customs,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on November 25, 1997, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton and man-made fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in Pakistan and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 1998 and extends through December 31, 1998.

Effective on February 2, 1998, you are directed to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing:

Category	Adjusted limit ¹
334/634	232,600 dozen.
338	4,839,115 dozen.
339	1,349,895 dozen
340/640	630,214 dozen.
347/348	784,844 dozen.
363	43,559,989 numbers.
369-F/369-P ²	2,333,694 kilograms.
369-S ³	704,293 kilograms.

¹ The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1997.

² Category 369-F: only HTS number 6302.91.0045; Category 369-P: only HTS numbers 6302.60.0010 and 6302.91.0005.

³ Category 369-S: only HTS number 6307.10.2005.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 98-3112 Filed 2-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

New Export Visa Stamp for Certain Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Hungary

January 26, 1998.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).