producer of the subject merchandise. Petitioners also stated that the Department selected India as the preferred surrogate in the 1994–95 antidumping investigation of honey from China. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Honey from the People's Republic of China,* 60 FR 14725, 14729 (March 20, 1995) (''*Honey from China*''). Based on the information provided by petitioners and Department practice, we believe that petitioners' use of India as a surrogate country is appropriate for purposes of initiation of this investigation.

In accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act, petitioners valued factors of production, where possible, on reasonably available, public surrogate country data. For the normal value calculation, petitioners obtained surrogate value information on the cost of producing natural honey in India, including direct costs (*i.e.,* raw honey), indirect costs (*i.e.,* factory overhead and SG&A), and profit. Raw honey was valued using Indian domestic prices as reported in the Mahabaleshwar Honey Producers Cooperative Society Ltd. (''MHPC'') 1998–99 Annual Report. The number of labor hours was derived from the Chinese producer's February 28, 1995 questionnaire response in *Honey from China,* and labor was valued using the Department's regression-based wage rate in accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3). Factory overhead, SG&A, and profit were valued using financial data reported in MHPC's 1998–99 Annual Report. Additional amounts for export packing were based on an offer for sale from an Indian manufacturer of steel drums and on the consumption rate for packing labor as reported by the Chinese producers in *Honey from China.* As necessary, petitioners inflated non-contemporaneous surrogate values to the period of investigation using IMF International Financial Statistics. Petitioners converted the Indian Rupee prices to U.S. dollars using the exchange rates published in the *Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.10* for the period April 2000 through August 2000. Based on the information provided by petitioners, we believe that their surrogate values represent information reasonably available to petitioners and are acceptable for purposes of initiation of this investigation.

Based on comparisons of EP to NV, the calculated dumping margins for natural honey from China range from 169.40 to 183.80 percent.

Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

The petition alleges that the U.S. industry producing the domestic like product is being materially injured, and is threatened with material injury, by reason of the individual and cumulated imports of the subject merchandise sold at less than NV. Petitioners explained that the industry's injured condition is evident in the declining trends in (1) U.S. market share, (2) average unit sales values, (3) share of domestic consumption, (4) operating income, (5) output, and (6) sales.

The allegations of injury and causation are supported by relevant evidence including U.S. Customs import data, lost sales, and pricing information. The Department assessed the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation and determined that these allegations are supported by accurate and adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation (see Attachments to Initiation Checklist, Re: Material Injury, October 26, 2000).

Initiation of Antidumping Investigations

Based upon our examination of the petition, our discussions on October 12, 2000, with the author of the foreign market research report supporting the petition, measures to confirm the information contained in this report (see Memorandum to the File; Re: Foreign Market Research, dated October 26, 2000), and all other information on the record regarding industry support, we have found that the petition meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating antidumping duty investigations to determine whether imports of honey from Argentina and China, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless this deadline is extended, we will make our preliminary determinations no later than 140 days after the date of this initiation.

Distribution of Copies of the Petitions

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of each petition has been provided to the representatives of the governments of Argentina and China. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of each petition to each exporter named in the petition, as appropriate.

International Trade Commission Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiations, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determinations by the ITC

The ITC will determine, by no later than November 20, 2000, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of honey from Argentina and China are causing material injury, or threatening to cause material injury, to a U.S. industry. A negative ITC determination for any country will result in the investigation being terminated with respect to that country; otherwise, these investigations will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to section 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: October 26, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00–28041 Filed 11–1–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–806]

Silicon Metal From Brazil: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 2, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nova Daly or Ron Trentham, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; (202) 482–0989 and (202) 482–6320, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Statutory Time Limits

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department of Commerce (the Department) to make a preliminary determination within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested and a final determination within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary determination is published. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary determination to a maximum of 365 days and for the final determination to 180 days (or 300 days

if the Department does not extend the time limit for the preliminary determination) from the date of publication of the preliminary determination.

Background

On August 30, 1999, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Silicon Metal from Brazil covering the period July 1, 1998, through June 30, 1999, (64 FR 47167). On August 4, 2000, (65 FR 47960), we published the preliminary results of review. In our notice of preliminary results, we stated our intention to issue the final results of this review no later than 120 days after the date of publication of the preliminary results, December 2, 2000.

Extension of Final Results of Review

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the final results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results until no later than January 31, 2000. See Decision Memorandum from Thomas F. Futtner to Holly A. Kuga, dated concurrently with this notice, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the main Commerce Building.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: October 20, 2000.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group II.

[FR Doc. 00–28191 Filed 11–1–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–809]

Certain Stainless Steel Flanges From India; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 2, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Killiam or Robert James, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5222, or (202) 482–0649, respectively.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute refer 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. In addition, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1999).

Extensions of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Based on requests by interested parties, on March 24, 2000, the Department initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel flanges from India, covering the period February 1, 1999 through January 31, 2000 (65 FR 16875, March 30, 2000). The preliminary results are currently due no later than October 31, 2000. The respondents are Echjay Forgings Ltd. (with affiliate Pushpaman), Isibars, Ltd., Panchmahal Steel Ltd., Patheja Forgings & Auto Parts, Ltd., and Viraj Forgings, Ltd. The Department has determined that it is not practicable to issue the preliminary results of review within the original time limit mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(1) of the Department's regulations. *See* Memorandum from Richard A. Weible to Joseph A. Spetrini, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III, October 20, 2000. Accordingly, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until February 28, 2001, in accordance with section 351.213(h)(2). The deadline for the final results of this review will continue to be 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results are published in the **Federal Register**, in accordance with section 351.213(h)(1).

Dated: October 24, 2000.

Edward C. Yang,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 00–28193 Filed 11–1–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–357–813]

Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation: Honey From Argentina

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 2, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dana S. Mermelstein at (202) 482–1391 or Doug Campau at (202) 482–1395, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VII, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

Initiation of Investigation

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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 regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

The Petition

On September 29, 2000, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a countervailing duty petition filed in proper form on behalf of the American Honey Producers Association and the Sioux Honey Association (the petitioners). Supplements to the petitions were filed on October 5, 11, 17 and 19, 2000. In addition, we received submissions from the parties with regard to industry support on October 16, 18, and 24.

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, petitioners allege that manufacturers, producers, or exporters of honey from Argentina received countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Act.

Pursuant to section 702(C)(1)(b), the Department extended the deadline for initiation to no later than October 27, 2000.

The Department finds that petitioners filed the petition on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined under sections 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act. The petitioners have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to this countervailing duty investigation, which they are requesting the Department to initiate. *See Determination of Industry Support for the Petition* below.

Scope of the Investigation

For purposes of these investigations, the products covered are natural honey, artificial honey containing more than 50 percent natural honey by weight, preparations of natural honey containing more than 50 percent natural