44 FR 33878
June 13, 1979
Contact: Lyn Johnson at (202) 482–5287

Germany

Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, Except Synchronous & V belts

A–428–802
54 FR 25316
June 14, 1989
Contact: Ron Trentham at (202) 482–4793

Germany

Precipitated Barium Carbonate

A–428–061
46 FR 32884
June 25, 1981
Contact: Tom Futtner at (202) 482–3814

Germany

Sugar

A–428–082
44 FR 33878
June 13, 1979
Contact: Mark Ross at (202) 482–4852

Italy

Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured

A–475–802
54 FR 25313
June 14, 1989
Contact: Ron Trentham at (202) 482–4793

Japan

Nitrile Rubber

A–588–706
53 FR 22553
June 16, 1988
Contact: Sheila Forbes at (202) 482–5253

Sweden

Stainless Steel Plate

A–401–040
38 FR 15079
June 8, 1973
Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475

Taiwan

Carbon Steel Plate

A–583–080
44 FR 33877
June 13, 1979
Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475

Taiwan

Oil Country Tubular Goods

A–583–505
51 FR 22098
June 18, 1986
Contact: Michael Heaney at (202) 482–4475

If no interested party requests an administrative review in accordance with the Department's notice of opportunity to request administrative review, and no domestic interested party objects to the Department's intent to revoke or terminate pursuant to this notice, we shall conclude that the antidumping duty orders, findings, and suspended investigations are no longer of interest to interested parties and shall proceed with the revocation or termination.

Opportunity To Object

Domestic interested parties, as defined in § 353.2(k) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Department's regulations, may object to the Department's intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations by the last day of June 1996. Any submission to the Department must contain the name and case number of the proceeding and a statement that explains how the objecting party qualifies as a domestic interested party under § 353.2(k) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Department's regulations.

Seven copies of such objections should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B–099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. You must also include the pertinent certification(s) in accordance with § 353.31(g) and § 353.31(i) of the Department's regulations. In addition, the Department requests that a copy of the objection be sent to Michael F. Panfeld in Room 4203.

This notice is in accordance with 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(i).

Dated: May 29, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–14310 Filed 6–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–570–845, A–570–846]

Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Determinations: Antidumping Duty Investigations of Certain Brake Drums and Certain Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 7, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Beck or Magd Zalok, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–3464 or (202) 482–4162, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act.

Postponement of Preliminary Determinations

We have determined that these investigations are extraordinarily complicated within the meaning of section 733(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Act. The large number of potential respondents in both the brake drums and the brake rotors investigations will make it necessary to review the volume and value data from each one in order to determine the appropriate mandatory respondents. In addition, claims for separate rates will have to be analyzed individually.

Furthermore, we have determined that the parties concerned are cooperating, as required by section 733(c)(1)(B) of the Act, and that additional time is necessary to make these preliminary determinations in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act.

For these reasons, the deadline for issuing the preliminary determination in these cases is now no later than October 3, 1996.

This notice is published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act.

Dated: May 30, 1996.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Investigations, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–14313 Filed 6–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–570–815]

Sulfanilic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC) in response to requests by petitioner, Nation Ford Chemical Company (formerly known as R–M Industries, Inc.), by a respondent, Sinochem Hebei Import and Export Corporation (Sinochem Hebei), and by an importer, PHT International (PHT). This review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States during the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the differences between the United States price and NV.

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 7, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karin Price or Maureen Flannery, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4733.

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 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 1992, the Department published in the Federal Register (57 FR 37524) an antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the PRC. On August 1, 1995, we published in the Federal Register (60 FR 39150) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the PRC covering the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

On August 11, 1995, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1)(1995), petitioner, Nation Ford Chemical Company (formerly known as R–M Industry, Inc.), requested that we conduct an administrative review of Sinochem Hebei, China National Chemical Construction Corporation, Beijing Branch (CNCCC), China National Chemical Construction Corporation, Qingdao Branch (CNCCC Qingdao), Sinochem Qingdao, Sinochem Shandong, Baoding No. 3 Chemical Factory (Baoding), Jinxing Chemical Factory (Jinxing), Zhenxing Chemical Industry Company (Zhenxing), Mancheng Xinyu Chemical Factory, Shijiazhuang (Xinyu Shijiazhuang), Mancheng Xinyu Chemical Factory, Beijing (Xinyu Beijing), Hainan Garden Trading Company (Hainan Garden), Yude Chemical Industry Company (Yude), and Shunping Lile (Shunping). Petitioner also requested an administrative review of Mancheng Xinyu Chemical Factory, Baoding, but as this company changed its name to Yude when it formed its joint venture with PHT, we have considered them to be one respondent. *See File Memorandum from Karin Price, Case Analyst,* dated February 6, 1996, ''The questionnaire for Mancheng Xinyu Chemical Factory, Baoding in the 1994/1995 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China,'' which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building). On August 25, 1995, with a clarification on October 5, 1995, PHT, a U.S. importer of sulfanilic acid from the PRC, requested that we conduct a review of its two related Chinese exporters, Yude and Zhenxing. On August 25, 1995, Sinochem Hebei requested that we conduct a review of its sales. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on September 15, 1995 (60 FR 47930). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are all grades of sulfanilic acid, which include technical (or crude) sulfanilic acid, refined (or purified) sulfanilic acid and sodium salt of sulfanilic acid.

Sulfanilic acid is a synthetic organic chemical produced from the direct sulfonation of aniline with sulfuric acid. Sulfanilic acid is used as a raw material in the production of optical brighteners, food colors, specialty dyes, and concrete additives. The principal differences between the grades are the undesirable quantities of residual aniline and alkali insoluble materials present in the sulfanilic acid. All grades are available as dry, free flowing powders.

Technical sulfanilic acid contains 96 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 1.0 percent maximum aniline, and 1.0 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Refined sulfanilic acid contains 98 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials.

Sodium salt is a powder, granular or crystalline material which contains 75 percent minimum equivalent sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content, and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content.

This merchandise is classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings 2921.42.22 and 2921.42.90. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers 13 manufacturers/exporters of sulfanilic acid from the PRC, and the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

Verification

We conducted verification of Yude's and Zhenxing's sales questionnaire responses at PHT's facility in Charlotte, North Carolina on April 16 and 17, 1995. We conducted the verification using standard verification procedures, including the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public version of the verification report.

Use of Facts Otherwise Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for CNCCC, CNCCC Qingdao, Jinxing, Shunping, Sinochem Hebei, Sinochem Qingdao, Sinochem Shandong, Xinyu Beijing, and Xinyu Shijiazhuang, because these companies did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire.

Where the Department must base the entire dumping margin for a respondent in an administrative review on the facts available because that respondent failed to cooperate, section 776(b) authorizes the Department to use an inference adverse to the interests of that respondent in choosing the facts available. Section 776(b) also authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the

petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record. Because information from prior proceedings constitutes secondary information, section 776(c) provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value.

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for margins is administrative determinations. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the 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 is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin (*see, e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* (60 FR 49567), where the Department disregarded the highest margin in that case as adverse best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin). In this case, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 85.20 percent, the PRC rate established during the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of this case. *See Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sulfanilic Acid from the People's Republic of China* (57 FR 29705, July 6, 1992). We have no reason to believe this rate is not relevant.

Separate Rates

To establish whether a company operating in a state-controlled economy is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified in *Silicon Carbide*. Under this policy, exporters in non-market-economy (NME) countries are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law (*de jure*) and in fact (*de facto*), with respect to exports. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) an absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control with respect to exports is based on four criteria: (1) whether the export prices are set by or subject to the approval of a government authority; (2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits and financing of losses; (3) whether each exporter has autonomy in making decisions regarding the selection of management; and (4) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements.

Yude and Zhenxing have responded to the Department's request for information regarding separate rates. We have found that the evidence on the record demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to Yude's and Zhenxing's exports according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide* for this period of review, and have assigned a separate rate to each of these companies. For further discussion of this finding, *see Decision Memorandum to Holly A. Kuga, Director, Office of Antidumping Compliance*, dated May 21, 1996, ''Separate rates in the 1994/1995 administrative review of sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China,'' which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building).

In the LTFV investigation of this case, we found that Sinochem Hebei was eligible for a separate rate under the criteria set forth in *Sparklers*. However, since *Sparklers* does not address the additional information required by *Silicon Carbide* for making a determination of separate rates (*i.e.*, whether each exporter has autonomy in making decisions regarding the selection of management and whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements), we need to analyze information on the record of this review to determine whether Sinochem Hebei merits a separate rate with respect to the additional criteria. *See Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review* (60 FR 42519, August 16, 1995). Since Sinochem Hebei did not respond to our separate rates questionnaire, we are not able to make this determination. Therefore, we have found that Sinochem Hebei is not eligible for a separate rate in this review.

Yude and Zhenxing: Affiliation and Collapsing

Yude and Zhenxing are each joint venture partners with PHT. Due to PHT's ownership interest in both joint ventures and the fact that some of the same people sit on the boards of directors of each joint venture, and especially because PHT is legally and operationally in a position to exercise restraint or direction over both joint ventures, we consider Yude and Zhenxing to be affiliated pursuant to section 771(33)(F) of the Act.

The Department ''collapses'' affiliated firms (*i.e.*, treats them as a single entity for review purposes and assigns them a single dumping margin) where the type and degree of relationship is so significant that we find that there is a strong possibility of manipulation of prices or production. *See 19 CFR Parts 351, 353, and 355 Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Proposed Rule* (61 FR 7381, February 27, 1996) (*Proposed Rule*). *See* also *Nihon Cement Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 17 CIT 400 (1993). Because Yude and Zhenxing are each joint venture partners with PHT, we have considered whether Yude and Zhenxing should be collapsed for purposes of this administrative review as a result of their relationships with PHT.

The Department's current policy is to treat two or more affiliated producers as a single entity where those producers have production facilities that would not require substantial retooling of either facility in order to restructure manufacturing priorities and the Department concludes that there is a significant potential for the manipulation of prices or production. In identifying a significant potential for the manipulation of prices or production, the Department considers the following:

- The level of common ownership;

• Whether managerial employees or board members of one of the affiliated producers sit on the board of directors of the other affiliated person; and

• Whether operations are intertwined, such as through the sharing of sales information, information on production and pricing decisions, the sharing of facilities or employees, or significant transactions between the affiliated producers.

See Proposed Rule

Based on our analysis of these criteria, we have determined that there is a strong possibility of manipulation of prices or production between Yude and Zhenxing. In addition to PHT's ownership percentage in each joint venture, we have found that some of the same people sit on Yude's and Zhenxing's boards of directors, and that PHT makes sales and pricing decisions for each of the joint ventures. We have also found that Yude and Zhenxing have similar production processes such that substantial retooling of either facility would not be necessary to restructure manufacturing priorities. Therefore, we have determined that Yude and Zhenxing should be collapsed as a result of their relationships with PHT. For a further discussion of this issue, *see Decision Memorandum to Holly A. Kuga, Director, Office of Antidumping Compliance*, dated May 20, 1996, ''Collapsing in the 1994/1995 administrative review of sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China,'' which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building).

We are collapsing Yude and Zhenxing for the purposes of calculating margins, and we are collapsing their factor data for use in calculating NV. We have calculated one NV for Yude and Zhenxing by weight averaging Yude's and Zhenxing's factors based on the quantities of sulfanilic acid each produced during the period of review.

United States Price

For sales made by Yude and Zhenxing, we calculated constructed export price based on FOB, CIF, or CIP prices to unrelated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions for foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, U.S. duties, U.S. transportation, credit, commissions, warehousing, repacking in the United States, indirect selling expenses, and constructed export price profit, as appropriate, in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

Normal Value

For companies located in NME countries, section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine NV using a factors of production methodology if (1) the merchandise is exported from a NME country, and (2) the available information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market prices, third-country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act.

In every case conducted by the Department involving the PRC, the PRC has been treated as an NME country. Pursuant to section 771(18)(C)(i), any determination that a foreign country is a NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Accordingly, we treated the PRC as a NME country for purposes of this review and calculated NV by valuing the factors of production as set forth in section 773(c)(3) of the Act in a comparable market economy country which is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. Pursuant to section 773(c)(4) and section 353.52(2) of the Department's regulations, we determined that India is comparable to the PRC in terms of per capita gross national product (GNP), the growth rate in per capita GNP, and the national distribution of labor, and that India is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. For further discussion of the Department's selection of India as the primary surrogate country, *see Memorandum from David Mueller, Director, Office of Policy, to Maureen Flannery*, dated March 28, 1996, ''Sulfanilic Acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC): Nonmarket Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection,'' and *File Memorandum*, dated May 23, 1996, ''India as a significant producer of comparable merchandise in the 1994/1995 administrative review of sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China,'' which are on file in the Central Records Unit (room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building).

For purposes of calculating NV, we valued PRC factors of production as follows, in accordance with section 773(c)(1) of the Act:

• To value aniline used in the production of sulfanilic acid, we used the rupee per kilogram value of imports into India during April 1994–April 1995, obtained from the February 1995 and April 1995 *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India, Volume II—Imports (Indian Import Statistics)*. Using wholesale price indices (WPI) obtained from the *International Financial Statistics*, published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), we adjusted this value to reflect inflation through the period of review. We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

• To value sulfuric acid used in the production of sulfanilic acid, we used the rupee per kilogram value reported in *Chemical Weekly*. We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

• To value activated carbon used in the production of sulfanilic acid, we used the rupee per kilogram value reported in *Chemical Weekly*. We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

• For direct labor, we used the labor rates reported in the Economist Intelligence Unit's *Investing, Licensing and Trading Conditions Abroad: India*, released November 1994. This source breaks out labor rates between skilled and unskilled labor for 1994 and provides information on the number of labor hours worked per week. Using WPI obtained from the *International Financial Statistics*, we adjusted the labor rates to reflect inflation through the period of review.

• For factory overhead, we used information reported in the April 1995 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. From this information, we were able to determine factory overhead as a percentage of total cost of manufacture.

• For selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, we used information obtained from the April 1995 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. We calculated an SG&A rate by dividing SG&A expenses by the cost of manufacture.

• To calculate a profit rate, we used information obtained from the April 1995 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. We calculated a profit rate by dividing the before-tax profit by the sum of those components pertaining to the cost of manufacturing plus SG&A.

• To value the inner and outer bags used as packing materials, we used import statistics for India obtained from the *Indian Import Statistics*. Using WPI obtained from the *International Financial Statistics*, we adjusted these values to reflect inflation through the period of review. We adjusted these values to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

• To value coal, we used the price of steam coal reported in *The Gazette of India*, June 16, 1994. We adjusted the value of coal to reflect inflation through the period of review using WPI published by the IMF.

• To value electricity, we used the price of electricity on March 1, 1995 reported in *Current Energy Scene in India*, July 1995, by the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy.

• To value truck freight, we used the rate reported in an August 1993 cable from the U.S. Embassy in India submitted for the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China* (58 FR 48833, September 20, 1993). We adjusted the truck freight rates to reflect inflation through the period of review using WPI published by the IMF.

• To value rail freight, we used the price reported in a December 1989 cable from the U.S. Embassy in India submitted for the *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Shop Towels of Cotton from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 4040, February 1, 1991). We adjusted the rail freight rates to reflect inflation through the period of review using WPI published by the IMF.

Non-shippers

Baoding and Hainan Garden stated that they did not have shipments during the period of review, and we confirmed this with the United States Customs Service. Therefore, we are treating them as non-shippers for this review, and are rescinding this review with respect to these companies. *See Proposed Rule,* section 351.213(d)(3) (61 FR 7365). The cash deposit rates for these firms will continue to be the rates established in the most recently completed final determination.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Yude Chemical Industry Company ...	8/1/94–7/31/95	20.78 *
Zhenxing Chemical Industry Company ...	8/1/94–7/31/95	20.78 *
PRC Rate [1]	8/1/94–7/31/95	85.20

[1] This rate will be applied to all firms which have not demonstrated that they are separate from the PRC government, including, but not limited to, the following firms for which a review was requested: China National Chemical Construction Corporation, Beijing Branch; China National Chemical Construction Corporation, Qingdao Branch; Jinxing Chemical Factory; Mancheng Xinyu Chemical Factory, Beijing; Mancheng Xinyu Chemical Factory, Shijiazhuang; Shunping Lile; Sinochem Hebei Import and Export Corporation; Sinochem Qingdao; and Sinochem Shandong.

* Yude and Zhenxing have been collapsed for the purposes of this administrative review. However, we have listed them separately on this chart for Customs purposes.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be 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 final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and NV may vary from the percentage stated above. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of sulfanilic acid from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for reviewed companies named above which have separate rates will be the rates for those firms established in the final results of this review; (2) for the companies named above which were not found to have a separate rate, as well as for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the highest margin ever in the LTFV investigation or in this or prior administrative reviews, the PRC rate; and (3) the cash deposit rate for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. These deposit rates, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also 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: May 29, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–14309 Filed 6–6–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–122–825]

Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Laminated Hardwood Flooring From Canada

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 7, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Boyland or Daniel Lessard, Office of Countervailing Duty Investigations, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482- 4198, or (202) 482–1778, respectively.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act effective January 1, 1995 (the Act).

Postponement

On March 27, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated a countervailing duty investigation of certain laminated hardwood flooring (LHF) from Canada (*see Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation: Certain Laminated*