441a(e), I hereby give notice that the estimates of the voting age population for July 1, 1998, for each state and the District of Columbia are as shown in the following table.

ESTIMATE OF THE POPULATION OF VOTING AGE FOR EACH STATE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: JULY 1, 1998

[In thousands]

Area	Population 18 and over
United States	200,426
Alabama	3,268
Alaska	422
Arizona	3,405
Arkansas	1,885
California	23,755
Colorado	2,930
Connecticut	2,483
Delaware	565
District of Columbia	420
Florida	11,376
Georgia	5,620
Hawaii	895
Idaho	878
Illinois	8,858
Indiana	4,382
Iowa	2,140
Kansas	1,932
Kentucky	2,948
Louisiana	3,178
Maine	953
Maryland	3,848
Massachusetts	4,689
Michigan	7,266
Minnesota	3,466
Mississippi	1,995
Missouri	4,032
Montana	656
Nebraska	1,217
Nevada	1,280
New Hampshire	886
New Jersey	6,125
New Mexico	1,233
New York	13,673
North Carolina	5,627
North Dakota	476
Ohio	8,365
Oklahoma	2,467
Oregon	2,457
Pennsylvania	9,142
Rhode Island	751
South Carolina	2,877
South Dakota	537
Tennessee	4,099
Texas	14,130
Utah	1,398
Vermont	450
Virginia	5,147
Washington	4,217
West Virginia	1,407
Wisconsin	3,872
Wyoming	352

I have certified these counts to the Federal Election Commission.

Dated: March 31, 1999.

William M. Daley,

Secretary, Department of Commerce.

[FR Doc. 99–8723 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Kiyoyuki Yasutomi

On Tuesday, December 8, 1998, **Federal Register** published an Order issued by the Bureau of Export Administration (BXA) on December 1, 1998 (63 FR 67644). The Order identifies Kiyoyuki Yasutomi, with an address at M.E.I. Japan, 6F Sanyo Bldg, 1 Maitocho, Shinjuku ku, Tokyo 160 Japan, as a person denied all U.S. export privileges. The reference to ''M.E.I. Japan'' has caused some confusion in the export community as to the identity of the company listed in Yasutomi's address. To eliminate that confusion, BXA is amending the Order to identify the abbreviation ''M.E.I. Japan'' listed in the address in both the caption and the text of that Order. Under the Order, Kiyoyuki Yasutomi is the person denied export privileges. The acronyn ''M.E.I.'' stands for ''Micro Electronics International.''

Amendment

In the address in the caption and in paragraph I of the text of the Order of December 1, 1998, ''M.E.I. Japan'' should read ''M.E.I. Japan, also known as Micro Electronics International Japan''.

Dated: March 26, 1999.

Eileen M. Albanese,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 99–8540 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–357–405]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Barbed Wire and Barbless Fencing Wire from Argentina

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Barbed Wire and Barbless Fencing Wire from Argentina

SUMMARY: On December 2, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on barbed wire and barbless fencing wire from Argentina (63 FR 66527) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic industry and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott E. Smith or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) (''*Sunset Regulations*''). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3'' *Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) (''*Sunset Policy Bulletin*'').

Scope

The merchandise subject to this antidumping order is barbed wire and barbless fencing wire from Argentina, which is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item number 7313.00.00. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and U.S. Customs purposes. The written product description remains dispositive.

This review covers imports from all manufacturers and exporters of barbed wire and barbless fencing wire from Argentina.

Background

On December 2, 1998, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on barbed wire and barbless fencing wire from Argentina (63 FR 66527), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate on behalf of Davis Wire Corporation, Keystone Steel & Wire Company and Oklahoma Steel & Wire Company, Inc. (''domestic interested parties'') on December 16, 1998, within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Sunset Regulations. Each company claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a domestic producer of barbed wire. In addition, Keystone Steel & Wire Company indicated that it is the successor-in-interest to the original petitioner, Forbes Steel & Wire Corporation, and Davis Wire Corporation indicated that it is the successor-in-interest to one of the companies that supported the original petition in this case, CF&I Steel Corporation. Further, Oklahoma Steel & Wire Company, Inc. indicated that it supported the original petition filed by Forbes Steel & Wire Corporation in 1984. We received a complete substantive response from the domestic interested parties on January 4, 1999, within the 30-day deadline specified in the Sunset Regulations under section 351.218(d)(3)(i). We did not receive a substantive response from any respondent interested party to this proceeding. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), the Department determined to conduct an expedited, 120-day, review of this order.

Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted this review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping order, and shall provide to the International Trade Commission (''the Commission'') the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order is revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are discussed below. In addition, parties' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are addressed within the respective sections below.

Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action (''the SAA''), H.R. Doc. No. 103–316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103–826, pt.1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103–412 (1994), the Department issued its *Sunset Policy Bulletin* providing guidance on methodological and analytical issues, including the bases for likelihood determinations. In its *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department indicated that determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis (*see* section II.A.3). In addition, the Department indicated that normally it will determine that revocation of an antidumping order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (*see* section II.A.3).

In addition to guidance on likelihood provided in the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* and legislative history, section 751(c)(4)(B) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine that revocation of an order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In the instant review, the Department did not receive a response from any respondent interested party. Pursuant to section 351.218(d)(2)(iii) of the *Sunset Regulations*, this constitutes a waiver of participation.

The antidumping duty order on barbed wire and barbless fencing wire from Argentina was published in the **Federal Register** on November 13, 1985 (50 FR 46808). No administrative reviews of this case have been conducted by the Department.[1] The order remains in effect for all manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise.

In its substantive response, the domestic interested parties argue that the likely effect of revocation of the order against barbed wire from Argentina is that dumping would recur (*see* January 4, 1999 Substantive Response of the Domestic Interested Parties at 2). With respect to whether imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, the domestic interested parties, citing American Iron and Steel Institute data, state that imports of barbed wire from Argentina disappeared from the U.S. market during the course of the original antidumping investigation, and that there have been no imports at all since 1986 (*see* January 4, 1999 Substantive Response of the Domestic Interested Parties at 2). Further, with respect to whether dumping continued at any level above *de minimis* after the issuance of the order, the domestic interested parties state that the dumping margin has remained at 69.02 percent *ad valorem* during the life of the order (*see* January 4, 1999 Substantive Response of the Domestic Interested Parties at 2).

In conclusion, the domestic interested parties argued that the Department should determine that there is a likelihood that dumping would resume if the order were to be revoked because (1) shipments of subject merchandise ceased following the imposition of the order and have not resumed, (2) dumping margins have existed for all known exporters of the subject merchandise during the entire life of the order, and (3) there are no significant barriers for new or former suppliers to enter the market.

Consistent with section 752(c) of the Act, the Department considered the volume of imports of the subject merchandise before and after issuance of the order. The statistics on imports of the subject merchandise between 1980 and 1997, provided by the domestic interested parties and confirmed by U.S. Census Bureau IM146 reports, indicate that imports of the subject merchandise ceased after 1986 and have not resumed.

As discussed in section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63–64, ''[i]f imports cease after the order is issued, it is reasonable to assume that exporters could not sell in the United States without dumping and that, to reenter the U.S. market, they would have to resume dumping.'' Imports of barbed wire and barbless fencing wire from Argentina ceased soon after the issuance of the order. The Department finds that the cessation of imports after the

[1] The Department did publish the following notice prior to the establishment of the antidumping duty order. *See Barbed Wire and Barbless Fencing Wire from Argentina: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*; 50 FR 38563, September 23, 1985.)

issuance of the order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. Furthermore, deposit rates above *de minimis* levels continue in effect for all shipments of the subject merchandise from Argentina.[2] Therefore, absent argument and evidence to the contrary, given that shipments of the subject merchandise ceased soon after the issuance of the order, that dumping margins continue to exist, and that respondent interested parties have waived their right to participate in this review before the Department, we determine that, consistent with Section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked.

Magnitude of the Margin

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department stated that it will normally provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the final determination in the original investigation. Further, for companies not specifically investigated or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the ''all others'' rate from the investigation. (*See* section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.) Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty absorption determinations. (*See* sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.)

The Department, in its final determination of sales at less than fair value, published a weighted-average dumping margin for one Argentine manufacturer/exporter, Acindar Industria Argentina de Aceros S.A. (''Acindar'') (50 FR 38563, September 23, 1985). The Department also published an ''all others'' rate in this same **Federal Register** notice. With respect to duty absorption findings, because there have been no completed administrative reviews of the order, the Department has not had the opportunity to address the issue of duty absorption.

In its substantive response, the domestic interested parties state that the weighted-average dumping margin calculated by the Department for Acindar in the original investigation is the dumping margin likely to prevail if the order were revoked (*see* January 4, 1999 Substantive Response of the Domestic Interested Parties at 4). The domestic interested parties make this statement because this order has never undergone an administrative review and the dumping margin from the original investigation provides the best evidence of the likely dumping margin in the absence of the order.

The Department agrees with the domestic interested parties' argument concerning the choice of the margin rate to report to the Commission. An examination of the margin history of the order as well as an examination of import statistics of the subject merchandise, as provided in U.S. Department of Commerce Trade Statistics data, confirms that dumping margins have existed throughout the life of the order and that imports of the subject merchandise ceased soon after its imposition.

The Department finds the margin from the original investigation is the only calculated rate that reflects the behavior of exporters without the discipline of the order. Therefore, consistent with the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, we determine that the margin calculated in the Department's original investigation is probative of the behavior of Argentine producers and exporters of barbed wire and barbless fencing wire if the order were revoked. We will report to the Commission the company-specific and ''all others'' rate from the original investigation contained in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping order would likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margins listed below:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Acindar	69.02
All Others	69.02

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This five-year (''sunset'') review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 1, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–8625 Filed 4–6–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[2] *See Barbed wire and Barbless Fencing Wire from Argentina: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 50 FR 38563 (September 23, 1985) and *Antidumping Duty Order: Barbed Wire and Barbless Fencing Wire from Argentina*, 50 FR 46808 (November 13, 1985).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–605]

Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice (FCOJ) from Brazil.

SUMMARY: On December 2, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil (63 FR 66527) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and substantive comments filed on behalf of the domestic interested parties and inadequate response (in this case, no response) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of the Review section of this notice.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Darla D. Brown or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3207 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 7, 1999.

Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) (''*Sunset Regulations*''). Guidance on methodological or analytical issues