

with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means.

Address all submissions to Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E St., SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

Issued: March 17, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-7186 Filed 3-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 332-227]

Annual Report on the Impact of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act on U.S. Industries and Consumers

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice of opportunity to submit comments in connection with 1998 annual report.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 17, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joanne Guth (202-205-3264), Country and Regional Analysis Division, Office of Economics, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC 20436.

Background

Section 215(a) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA) (19 U.S.C. 2704(a)) requires that the Commission submit annual reports to the Congress and the President regarding the economic impact of the Act on U.S. industries and consumers. Section 215(b)(1) requires that the reports include:

(1) The actual economic effect of CBERA on the U.S. economy generally as well as on specific industries which produce articles that are like, or directly competitive with, articles being imported under the Act; and

(2) The probable future effect of CBERA on the U.S. economy generally and on industries affected by the Act. In addition, in this year's report the Commission plans to examine the effectiveness of CBERA in promoting export-oriented growth and diversification of production in the beneficiary countries.

Notice of institution of the investigation and the schedule for such reports was published in the **Federal**

Register of May 14, 1986 (51 FR 17678). The fourteenth report, covering calendar year 1998, is to be submitted by September 30, 1999.

Written Submissions

The Commission does not plan to hold a public hearing in connection with the fourteenth annual report. However, interested persons are invited to submit written statements concerning the matters to be addressed in the report. Commercial or financial information that a party desires the Commission to treat as confidential must be submitted on separate sheets of paper, each clearly marked "Confidential Business Information" at the top. All submissions requesting confidential treatment must conform with the requirements of section 201.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 201.6). All written submissions, except for confidential information, will be made available for inspection by interested persons in the Office of the Secretary to the Commission. To be assured of consideration by the Commission, written statements relating to the Commission's report should be submitted at the earliest practical date and should be received no later than June 25, 1999. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means.

Address all submissions to the Secretary to the Commission, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E St., SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

Issued: March 17, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-7185 Filed 3-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Textiles From Columbia and Thailand [Invs. Nos. 701-TA-C and D (Review)], Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice From Brazil [Inv. No. 701-TA-184 (Review)], Calcium Hypochlorite From Japan [Inv. No. 731-TA-189 (Review)], Castor Oil Products From Brazil [Inv. No. 104-TAA-20 (Review)], Red Raspberries From Canada [Inv. No. 731-TA-196 (Review)]

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Termination of five-year reviews.

SUMMARY: The subject five-year reviews were initiated in December 1998 to determine whether revocation of the existing countervailing duty or antidumping duty orders or termination of the suspension agreements would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping or a countervailable subsidy and of material injury to a domestic industry. On February 26, 1999, the Department of Commerce published notice that it was revoking the orders because no domestic interested party responded to its notice of initiation by the applicable deadline (64 FR 9473, February 26, 1999). Accordingly, pursuant to section 207.69 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR 207.69), the subject reviews are terminated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vera Libeau (202-205-3176), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202-205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>).

Authority: These reviews are being terminated under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.69 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 207.69).

Issued: March 17, 1999.

By order of the Commission.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 99-7184 Filed 3-23-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 97-36]

Anthony D. Funches; Grant of Registration With Condition

On July 31, 1997, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued an Order to Show Cause to Anthony Delano Funches (Respondent) of Denver, Colorado, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his application for registration as a retail distributor of list I chemicals pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(h), for reason that his registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

Respondent filed a request for a hearing on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause. Following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Denver, Colorado on April 8, 1998, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing both parties called witnesses to testify and introduced documentary evidence. After the hearing, counsel for the Government submitted proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and argument. On September 9, 1998, Judge Bittner issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision, recommending that Respondent's application for registration be granted. Neither party filed exceptions to her recommended decision, and on October 13, 1998, Judge Bittner transmitted the record of these proceedings to the then-Acting Deputy Administrator.

The Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Deputy Administrator adopts, except as specifically noted, the Opinion and Recommended Ruling, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of the Administrative Law Judge, and his adoption is in no manner diminished by any recitation of facts, issues and conclusions herein, or of any failure to mention a matter of fact or law.

The Deputy Administrator finds that in 1991 Respondent moved back to

Colorado and renewed his acquaintance with a married couple who owned and operated a store called "The Connection" located at 4811 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, Colorado.

Approximately three years later, the husband died and his widow inherited The Connection. Respondent assisted her in the management of the business and at some point, they married. They eventually separated and his wife abandoned the store at 4811 East Colfax. Respondent obtained a retail business license and registered the store under the trade name "The Other Connection." The Other Connection sells ephedrine products, as well as items such as sunglasses and jewelry, and also provides services such as fax machines and notary.

On August 25, 1995, Respondent applied for a DEA registration as a retail distributor of ephedrine and pseudoephedrine¹ and listed 4811 East Colfax as the proposed registered location. However in light of his divorce settlement, Respondent ultimately moved the business to 4815 East Colfax.² In his application, Respondent answered "no" to the question which asks, "Has the applicant ever been convicted of a crime in connection with controlled substances/listed chemicals under State or Federal law, or ever surrendered or had a Federal registration revoked, suspended, restricted or denied, or ever had a State professional license or registration revoked, suspended, denied, restricted or placed on probation?"

On February 6, 1996, a DEA investigator visited The Other Connection as part of a preregistration investigation. The investigator testified at the hearing in this matter that his inspection revealed that Respondent's recordkeeping and security procedures were adequate and that Respondent's transactions were "well documented." In addition to the on-site visit, the investigator conducted a criminal history of Respondent which revealed that on June 1, 1978, Respondent and a co-defendant were charged in the District Court in the County of Denver,

Colorado, with Conspiracy to Sell Narcotic Drugs, Sale of Narcotic Drugs, and Possession of a Dangerous Drug in violation of Colorado law. On January 17, 1979, Respondent pled guilty to the misdemeanor charge of possession of marijuana and the other counts against him were dismissed. Respondent was sentenced to 12 months imprisonment with the sentence suspended provided that he not be "convicted of any state or Federal law, city ordinance other than traffic" and was fined \$250.00.

The investigator testified that further investigation of Respondent's conviction revealed a report of a DEA task force officer which stated that in August 1977, Respondent and his co-defendant made arrangements to sell 56.65 grams of cocaine for \$4,000.00 to the undercover officer. According to the report, the three met at a designated location; the undercover officer presented the other two with \$4,000.00 in exchange for a package; Respondent opened the package so that the undercover officer could sample its contents; and respondent requested that he and the co-defendant be allowed to keep the remnants of the sample for their own use. According to a laboratory analysis report the substance was cocaine and was purchased by the undercover officer from the co-defendant on August 4, 1977. Respondent's name is not mentioned anywhere in this laboratory analysis report.

Respondent admitted at the hearing in this matter that he was present during the alleged cocaine transaction in 1977, but denied handling either the money or the package of cocaine. He explained that at the time of the transaction he was a professional bodyguard and was present during the transaction to provide protection for the co-defendant. Regarding the marijuana, Respondent conceded that although he cannot recall specifically having marijuana in his possession on that occasion over 20 years ago, it was possible since "[i]n those years, I was known to have a drink here and there, or a smoke." However, Respondent testified that he no longer uses illegal drugs.

In explaining why he indicated on his DEA application that he had never been convicted of a crime related to controlled substances, Respondent testified that he did not believe that he still had a marijuana conviction on his record. It was his understanding that the misdemeanor marijuana charge to which he pled guilty would be "erased" from his record after one year. Respondent testified that in the 20 years since his conviction, he has undergone the screening processes required to

¹ The parties stipulated that a DEA registration is not required for the retail distribution of pseudoephedrine, and therefore the only chemical relevant to this application is ephedrine.

² The Order to Show Cause listed the proposed registered location as 4811 East Colfax Avenue, however by letter dated July 16, 1996, Respondent submitted a request to modify the address on his application to reflect 4815 East Colfax Avenue. Since Respondent's request to modify his application was submitted prior to the issuance of the Order to Show Cause in this matter, Respondent was not required to obtain permission from DEA to modify his application. See 21 CFR 1309.36(a).