SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Declaration of Disaster #2995]

State of Washington

Kitsap County and the contiguous Counties of Island, Jefferson, King, Mason and Pierce in the State of Washington constitute a disaster area as a result of damages caused by a fire which occurred on November 13, 1997 in the Kona Village Apartments in the City of Bremerton. Applications for loans for physical damages may be filed until the close of business on January 30, 1998 and for economic injury until the close of business on September 1, 1998 at the address listed below or other locally announced locations: U.S. Small Business Administration, Disaster Area 4 Office, P.O. Box 13795, Sacramento, CA 95853–4795.

The interest rates are:

For Physical Damage:

Homeowners with credit available elsewhere—7.625%

Homeowners without credit available elsewhere—3.812%

Businesses with credit available elsewhere—8.000%

Businesses and non-profit organizations without credit available elsewhere—4.000%

Others (including non-profit organizations) with credit available elsewhere—7.125%

For Economic Injury

Businesses and small agricultural cooperatives without credit available elsewhere—4.000%

The number assigned to this disaster for physical damage is 299505 and for economic injury the number is 967500.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008.)

Dated: December 1, 1997.

Ginger Lew,

Acting Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97–32724 Filed 12–15–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

[Docket No. WTO/D–22]

WTO Dispute Settlement Proceeding—U.S. Anti-Dumping Duties on Color Televisions From Korea

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 127(b)(1) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) (19 U.S.C. 3537(b)(1)), the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice that the Government of Korea has requested the establishment of a dispute settlement panel under the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO) to examine the continuing maintenance by the United States with respect to Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (Samsung) of an antidumping order on color television receivers (CTVs) from the Republic of Korea (Korea). According to the Government of Korea, Samsung's dumping margins for CTVs exported from Korea to the United States from 1985–1991 were *de minimis,* and Samsung has not exported CTVs from Korea to the United States since 1991. The Department of Commerce has initiated a changed circumstances review to determine whether the antidumping order should be revoked in part, i.e., with respect to Samsung. The Department of Commerce has also initiated anti-circumvention inquiries to determine whether Samsung is circumventing the antidumping order by exporting CTVs assembled in Mexico and Thailand to the United States. The Government of Korea is challenging the Department of Commerce's failure to revoke with respect to Samsung the antidumping order on CTVs from Korea, as well as its initiation of the circumvention inquiries.

DATES: Although USTR will accept any comments received during the course of the dispute settlement proceedings, comments should be submitted on or before January 12, 1998 to be assured of timely consideration by USTR in preparing its first written submission to the panel.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to Litigation Assistant, Office of Monitoring and Enforcement, Room 501, Attn: Korea Color Televisions Dispute, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Audrey Winter, Office of the General Counsel, (202) 395–7305.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: By letter dated November 6, 1997, the government of Korea requested the establishment of a panel to examine the continued imposition of anti-dumping measures on color television receivers from Korea. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body is likely to establish the panel no later than December 1997. Under normal circumstances, the panel, which will hold its meetings in Geneva, Switzerland, would be expected to issue a report detailing its findings and recommendations within six to nine months after it is established.

Major Issues Raised by the Government of Korea and Legal Basis of Complaint

In its request for the establishment of a panel, the Government of Korea challenges the Department of Commerce's continuing imposition of antidumping duties on Samsung's CTV exports from Korea pursuant to the Department's April 30, 1984 antidumping order. The Government of Korea also challenges the Department's initiation and conduct of the anti-circumvention inquiries. The Government of Korea alleges that these actions are inconsistent with several provisions of the WTO agreements, including the following specific allegations:

—The failure of the United States to review, on its own initiative, dumping and injury respectively and to revoke the order constitutes a violation of Article 11.1 combined with Article 11.2, as well as Article 5.8 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (Antidumping Agreement).

—The United States' rejection of Samsung's request for revocation review on the ground of the U.S. concern about lack of current data as a result of ''no shipment'' violates Article 11.2 of the Antidumping Agreement, which does not provide such a standard.

—The failure of the United States to revoke the order, coupled with the U.S. position that the outcome of the revocation review is dependent on the outcome of the anti-circumvention investigation, is in violation of Article 11.1 combined with Article 11.2 and Article 11.4 of the Antidumping Agreement because it introduces considerations not mentioned in Articles 11.1 and 11.2, and because the review exceeds the Article 11.4 time limit and the requirement that review investigations must be carried out expeditiously.

—The United States' requirement (19 C.F.R. 353.25(b)) that applicants file revocation requests only in ''the third and subsequent anniversary months'' is in violation of Article 11.2, which stipulates no time limit whatsoever for such requests.

—The conduct of the United States of the anti-circumvention inquiries violates Article VI of GATT 1994 and several provisions of the Antidumping Agreement.

—The initiation of the anti-circumvention inquiries violates Article VI of GATT 1994 and Articles