by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (1998).

Extension of Time Limits for Final Results

The Department of Commerce has received a request to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products and certain cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Canada. On September 25, 1997 (62 FR 50292), the Department initiated this antidumping administrative review covering the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997.

Because of the complexity of certain issues, 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 final results to December 17, 1998. This extension of time limits is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: November 3, 1998.

Roland L. MacDonald,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement III.

[FR Doc. 98–29996 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–557–805

Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the petitioner and three producers/exporters of the subject merchandise, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia. This review covers four manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States (Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd., Heveafil Sdn. Bhd./Filmax Sdn. Bhd., Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd., and Rubfil Sdn. Bhd.). The period of review is October 1, 1996, through September 30, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the normal value by each of the companies subject to this review. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who wish to submit comments in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shawn Thompson or Irina Itkin, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–1776 or (202) 482–0656, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 2, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia (62 FR 51628).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), on October 20, 1997, the petitioner, North American Rubber Thread, requested an administrative review of the antidumping order covering the period October 1, 1996, through September 30, 1997, for the following producers and exporters of extruded rubber thread: Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd. (Filati), Heveafil Sdn. Bhd./Filmax Sdn. Bhd. (Heveafil), Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd. (Rubberflex), and Rubfil Sdn. Bhd. (Rubfil). On October 31, 1997, Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex also requested an administrative review.

In November 1997, the Department initiated an administrative review for Filati, Heveafil, Rubberflex, and Rubfil (62 FR 63069 (Nov. 26, 1997)) and issued questionnaires to each of these companies.

In February 1998, we received responses from Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex. We received no response from Rubfil. Because Rubfil did not respond to the questionnaire, we have assigned a margin to Rubfil based on facts available. For further discussion, see the ''Facts Available'' section, below.

In June and July 1998, we issued supplemental questionnaires to Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex. We received responses to these questionnaires in July, August, and September 1998.

From September through November 1998, the Department conducted verifications of the data submitted by Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.307(b)(iv).

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this review is extruded rubber thread. Extruded rubber thread is defined as vulcanized rubber thread obtained by extrusion of stable or concentrated natural rubber latex of any cross sectional shape, measuring from 0.18 mm, which is 0.007 inch or 140 gauge, to 1.42 mm, which is 0.056 inch or 18 gauge, in diameter. Extruded rubber thread is currently classifiable under subheading 4007.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).

Facts Available

A. Use of Facts Available for Rubfil

In accordance with section 776(a)(2)(A) of the Act, we preliminarily determine that the use of facts available is appropriate as the basis for Rubfil's dumping margin. Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that if an interested party: (1) Withholds information that has been requested by the Department; (2) fails to provide such information in a timely manner or in the form or manner requested, subject to subsections 782(c)(1) and (e); (3) significantly impedes a determination under the antidumping statute; or (4) provides such information but the information cannot be verified, the Department shall, subject to subsection 782(d) of the Act, use facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. Specifically, Rubfil failed to respond to the Department's questionnaire, issued in November 1997. Because Rubfil did not respond to the Department's questionnaire, we must use facts otherwise available to determine Rubfil's dumping margin.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that adverse inferences may be used with respect to a party that has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with requests for information. *See* Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, H.R. Rep. No. 316, 103rd Cong., 2d Sess. 870 (SAA). The failure of Rubfil to reply to the Department's questionnaire demonstrates that it has failed to act to the best of its ability in this review and, therefore, an adverse inference is warranted.

As adverse facts available for Rubfil, we have used the highest rate calculated for any respondent in any segment of this proceeding. This rate is 54.31 percent. We find that the rate of 54.31 percent, which was assigned in the prior administrative review, is sufficiently high as to effectuate the purpose of the facts available rule.

B. Corroboration of Secondary Information

As facts available in this case, the Department has used information derived from a prior administrative review, which constitutes secondary information within the meaning of the SAA. *See* SAA at 870. Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The SAA provides that ''corroborate'' means that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. *See* SAA at 870.

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike for other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from the same or a prior segment of this proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin may not be appropriate, the Department will attempt to find a more appropriate basis for facts available. *See, e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812, 6814 (February 22, 1996) (*Fresh Cut Flowers*) (where the Department disregarded the highest margin as adverse best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin).

For Rubfil, we examined the rate applicable to extruded rubber thread from Malaysia throughout the course of the proceeding. With regard to its probative value, the rate specified above is reliable and relevant because it is a calculated rate from the 1994–1995 administrative review. There is no information on the record that demonstrates that the rate selected is not an appropriate total adverse facts available rate for Rubfil. Thus, the Department considers this rate to be appropriate adverse facts available.

Normal Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia to the United States were made at less than normal value (NV), we compared the constructed export price (CEP) to the NV for Filati, Heveafil and Rubberflex, as specified in the ''Constructed Export Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice.

When making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the ''Scope of the Review'' section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the characteristics listed in sections B and C of our antidumping questionnaire.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade as export price (EP) or CEP. 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 selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A) and profit. For EP, the U.S. level of trade is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from the exporter to importer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different level of trade than EP or CEP sales, 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. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). *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 (Nov. 19, 1997).

Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex claimed that they made home market sales at only one level of trade (*i.e.*, sales to original equipment manufacturers). Based on the information on the record, no level of trade adjustment was warranted for any respondent. Although Filati claimed that the home market level was different, and more remote, than the level of trade of the CEP, we have found the levels of trade to be the same.

In order to determine whether NV was established at a level of trade which constituted a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP, we compared the selling functions performed for home market sales with those performed with respect to the CEP transaction, which excludes economic activities occurring in the United States. We found that Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex performed essentially the same selling functions in its sales offices in Malaysia for both home market and U.S. sales. Therefore, the respondents' sales in Malaysia were not at a more advanced stage of marketing and distribution than the constructed U.S. level of trade, which represents an F.O.B. foreign port price after the deduction of expenses associated with U.S. selling activities. Because we find that no difference in level of trade exists between markets, we have not granted a CEP offset to any of the respondents. For a detailed explanation of this analysis, see the concurrence memorandum

issued for the preliminary results of this review, dated November 2, 1998.

Constructed Export Price

For all U.S. sales by Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex, we used CEP, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act. For Filati, we have treated sales shipped directly to the U.S. customer as CEP sales because we find that the extent of the affiliate's activities performed in the United States in connection with these sales is significant. *See* the Filati USA verification report at 4.

A. Filati

We calculated CEP based on the starting price to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we added an amount for uncollected import duties in Malaysia. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for rebates. In addition, where appropriate, we made deductions for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duty, U.S. brokerage and handling expenses, and U.S. inland freight, and U.S. warehousing expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

We made additional deductions from CEP, where appropriate, for commissions, credit expenses, U.S. indirect selling expenses, and U.S. inventory carrying costs, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act. We disallowed an offset claimed by Filati relating to imputed costs associated with financing antidumping and countervailing duty deposits, in accordance with the Department's practice. *See Extruded Rubber Thread from Malaysia; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 12752,12758 (March 16, 1998) (*Thread Fourth Review*); and *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden and the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 62 FR 54043, 54079 (Oct. 17, 1997) (*AFBs*).

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we further reduced the starting price by an amount for profit, to arrive at CEP. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by Filati and its affiliate on their sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the foreign like product in the home market and the profit associated with those sales.

B. Heveafil

In cases where Heveafil shipped merchandise directly from Malaysia to U.S. customers, we used the bill of lading date as the date of sale for these shipments, rather than the date of the U.S. invoice as reported. For these shipments, we find that there is a long lag time between the date of shipment to the customer and the date of invoice.

We calculated CEP based on the starting price to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we added an amount for uncollected import duties in Malaysia. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for rebates. We also made deductions for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duty, U.S. brokerage and handling expenses, U.S. inland freight, and U.S. warehousing expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

We made additional deductions to CEP, where appropriate, for credit expenses, repacking expenses, U.S. indirect selling expenses, and U.S. inventory carrying costs, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act. Regarding indirect selling expenses, we disallowed an offset claimed by Heveafil relating to imputed costs associated with financing antidumping and countervailing duty deposits, in accordance the Department's practice. *See Thread Fourth Review* (63 FR 12758) and *AFBs* (62 FR 54079).

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we further reduced the starting price by an amount for profit, to arrive at CEP. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by Heveafil and its affiliate on their sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the foreign like product in the home market and the profit associated with those sales.

C. Rubberflex

We calculated CEP based on the starting price to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States. We made deductions from the starting price, where appropriate, for rebates. We also made deductions for foreign inland freight, foreign brokerage and handling expenses, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duty, U.S. inland freight, and U.S. warehousing expenses, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

We made additional deductions to CEP, where appropriate, for credit expenses, U.S. indirect selling expenses, and U.S. inventory carrying costs, in accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act.

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we further reduced the starting price by an amount for profit, to arrive at CEP. In accordance with section 772(f) of the Act, we calculated the CEP profit rate using the expenses incurred by Rubberflex and its affiliate on their sales of the subject merchandise in the United States and the foreign like product in the home market and the profit associated with those sales.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the volume of each respondent's home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Based on this comparison, we determined that each respondent had a viable home market during the period of review (POR). Consequently, we based NV on home market sales.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Filati, Heveafil, and Rubberflex had made home market sales at prices below their costs of production (COP)s in this review because the Department had disregarded sales below the COP for these companies in a previous administrative review. *See Thread Fourth Review*. As a result, the Department initiated an investigation to determine whether the respondents made home market sales during the POR at prices below their respective COPs.

We calculated the COP based on the sum of each respondent's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for SG&A and packing costs, in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act.

Except as follows, we used the respondents' reported COP amounts to compute weighted-average COPs during the POR. Regarding the COP data reported by Filati, we found that, in certain instances, Filati reported multiple costs for a single control number. In those cases, we used the higher of the costs for purposes of the preliminary results.

We compared the COP figures to home market prices of the foreign like product, as required under section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether these sales had been made at

prices below the COP. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to home market prices, less any applicable movement charges and discounts.

In determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below the COP, we examined whether such sales were made: (1) In substantial quantities within an extended period of time; and (2) at prices which permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. *See* § 773(b)(1) of the Act.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(c)(i) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent'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 we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices below the COP, we found that sales of that model were made in ''substantial quantities'' within an extended period of time (as defined in section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act), in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(C)(i) of the Act. In such cases, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, we disregarded the below-cost sales. Where all sales of a specific product were at prices below the COP, we disregarded all sales of that product.

We found that, for certain models of extruded rubber thread, more than 20 percent of each respondent's home market sales within an extended period of time were at prices less than COP. Further, the prices did not provide for the recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time. We therefore disregarded the below-cost sales and used the remaining above-cost sales as the basis for determining NV, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act. For those U.S. sales of extruded rubber thread for which there were no comparable home market sales in the ordinary course of trade, we compared CEP to CV, in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act.

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of each respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, SG&A, profit, and U.S. packing costs. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by each respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country.

Company-specific calculations are discussed below.

A. Filati

In all instances, NV for Filati was based on home market sales. Accordingly, we based NV on the starting price to unaffiliated customers. For all price-to-price comparisons, we made deductions from the starting price for rebates, where appropriate. We also made deductions, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, we also made deductions for home market credit expenses and bank charges. Where applicable, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.410(e), we offset any commission paid on a U.S. sale by reducing the NV by the amount of home market indirect selling expenses and inventory carrying costs, up to the amount of the U.S. commission.

In addition, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to NV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411.

B. Heveafil

Where NV was based on home market sales, we based NV on the starting price to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions from the starting price for discounts. We also made deductions for foreign inland freight and foreign inland insurance, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, we also made deductions for home market credit expenses and bank charges.

In addition, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to NV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(c)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411.

For CV-to-CEP comparisons, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments, where appropriate, for differences in credit expenses and bank charges, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) and 773(a)(8) of the Act.

C. Rubberflex

In all instances, NV for Rubberflex was based on home market sales. Accordingly, we based NV on the starting price to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions from the starting price for foreign inland freight and foreign inland insurance, pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(B) of the Act. Pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act, we also made deductions for home market credit expenses.

In addition, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs, in accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to NV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(c)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Section 773A of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars unless the daily rate involves a fluctuation. It is the Department's practice to find that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the moving average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation to have existed, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate, in accordance with established practice.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period October 1, 1996, through September 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Percent margin
Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd.	8.31
Heveafil Sdn. Bhd.	.....
Filmax Sdn. Bhd.	3.91
Rubberflex Sdn. Bhd	1.15
Rubfil Sdn. Bhd	54.31

Interested parties may request a hearing within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 days after the date of publication, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 35 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 case briefs.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated an importer-specific assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total entered value of the examined sales. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Further, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for Filati, Heveafil, Rubberflex, and Rubfil will be the rates established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, de minimis within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106, 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 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) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 15.16 percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These 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 351.402(f) 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 351.213.

Dated: November 2, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29850 Filed 11–6–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–802]

Notice of Postponement of Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review: Gray Portland Cement and Clinker from Mexico

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Diane Krawczun, William Zapf or Richard Rimlinger, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0198, (202) 482–0180 or (202) 482–4477, respectively.

Postponement of Final Results of Review

On September 25, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an antidumping administrative review of the antidumping duty order on gray portland cement and clinker from Mexico (62 FR 50292). On September 10, 1998, we issued our preliminary results of review (63 FR 48471). The final results of review are currently due January 8, 1998. Due to an increase in case assignments, we transferred this case, on October 1, 1998, to another team of Department personnel for calculation of the final results. This transfer requires time for the newly assigned team to become familiar with the case. Also, the current final due date conflicts with several existing deadlines of the new team. For these reasons, we have determined that completion of the review within 120 days from the publication of our preliminary results of review is not currently practicable and, therefore, we are postponing the deadline for issuing these final results of review until no later than March 9, 1999.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2).

Dated: November 2, 1998.

Susan Kuhbach,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29997 Filed 11–6–98; 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; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that sales of certain helical spring lock washers from the People's Republic of China were made below normal value during the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 9, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally Hastings or Vincent Kane, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3464 or 482–2815, respectively.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (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 19 CFR part 351 et. seq. *Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).

Background

On October 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain helical spring lock washers (HSLWs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) (58 FR 53914). The Department notified interested parties of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order on October 2, 1997 (62 FR 51628). The