our declining balance methodology. We divided that portion of the benefit allocated to the POR by NHCI's total sales of Canadian-manufactured products. We preliminarily determine the net subsidy provided by this program to be 2.32 percent ad valorem.

II. Programs Preliminarily Found Not To be Used

We preliminarily find that NHCI did not apply for or receive benefits under the following programs during the POR:

St. Lawrence River Environment Technology Development Program
Program for Export Market Development
The Export Development Corporation
Canada-Québec Subsidiary Agreement on the Economic Development of the Regions of Québec
Opportunities to Stimulate Technology Programs
Development Assistance Program
Industrial Feasibility Study Assistance Program
Export Promotion Assistance Program
Creation of Scientific Jobs in Industries
Business Investment Assistance Program
Business Financing Program
Research and Innovation Activities Program
Export Assistance Program
Energy Technologies Development Program
Transportation Research and Development Assistance Program

Preliminary Results of Reviews

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4)(i) we calculated a subsidy rate for NHCI, the sole producer/exporter subject to these administrative reviews. For the period January 1, 1996, through December 31, 1996, we preliminarily determine the net subsidy to be 2.78 percent *ad valorem*. If the final results of these reviews remain the same as these preliminary results, the Department intends to instruct Customs to assess countervailing duties as indicated above. The Department also intends to instruct Customs to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties as indicated above of the F.O.B. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from NHCI entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of these administrative reviews.

Because the URAA replaced the general rule in favor of a country-wide rate with a general rule in favor of individual rates for investigated and reviewed companies, the procedures for establishing countervailing duty rates, including those for non-reviewed companies, are now essentially the same as those in antidumping cases, except as provided for in section 777A(e)(2)(B) of the Act. The requested reviews will normally cover only those companies specifically named. *See* 19 CFR 351.213(b). Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(c), for all companies for which a review was *not* requested, duties must be assessed at the cash deposit rate, and cash deposits must continue to be collected, at the rate previously ordered. As such, the countervailing duty cash deposit rate applicable to a company can no longer change, except pursuant to a request for a review of that company. *See Federal-Mogul Corporation and The Torrington Company* v. *United States*, 822 F.Supp. 782 (CIT 1993) and *Floral Trade Council* v. *United States*, 822 F.Supp. 766 (CIT 1993) (interpreting 19 CFR 353.22(e), the antidumping regulation on automatic assessment, which is identical to 19 CFR 355.22(g)). Therefore, the cash deposit rates for all companies except those covered by these reviews will be unchanged by the results of these reviews.

We will instruct Customs to continue to collect cash deposits for non-reviewed companies, except Timminco Limited (which was excluded from the orders during the investigation), at the most recent company-specific or country-wide rate applicable to the company. Accordingly, the cash deposit rates that will be applied to non-reviewed companies covered by these orders are those established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding, conducted pursuant to the statutory provisions that were in effect prior to the URAA amendments. *See* the *Final Results of the Second Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews: Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium from Canada*, 62 FR 48607 (September 16, 1997). These rates shall apply to all non-reviewed companies until a review of a company assigned these rates is requested. In addition, for the period January 1, 1996, through December 31, 1996, the assessment rates applicable to all non-reviewed companies covered by these orders are the cash deposit rates in effect at the time of entry, except for Timminco Limited (which was excluded from the orders during the original investigation).

Public Comment

Parties to these proceedings may request disclosure of the calculation methodology and interested parties may request a hearing not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, may be submitted five days after the time limit for filing the case brief. Parties who submit an argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f).

Representatives of parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date the case briefs, under 19 CFR § 351.309(c)(ii), are due.

The Department will publish the final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal briefs or at a hearing.

These administrative review results are published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR 351.213.

Dated: April 23, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–11527 Filed 4–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–357–404]

Certain Textile Mill Products From Argentina; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Review and Revocation of Order

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of changed circumstances countervailing duty review and revocation of order.

SUMMARY: On April 2, 1996, the Department of Commerce initiated changed circumstances reviews of the countervailing duty orders on *Leather from Argentina* (55 FR 40212), *Wool from Argentina* (48 FR 14423), *Oil Country Tubular Goods from Argentina* (49 FR 46564), and *Carbon Steel Cold-Rolled Flat Products from Argentina* (49 FR 18006). The Department of Commerce initiated these reviews in

order to determine whether, in light of the decision in *Ceramica Regiomontana* v. *United States*, 64 F.3d 1579, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1995), the agency had the authority to assess countervailing duties on entries of merchandise covered by these orders occurring after September 20, 1991—the date on which Argentina became a ''country under the Agreement'' within the meaning of former section 303(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) (19 U.S.C. 1303(a)(1) (1988; repealed 1994)). In the final results of these reviews, the Department of Commerce determined that, based upon the ruling in the *Ceramica* case, it lacked the authority to assess countervailing duties on unliquidated entries of merchandise covered by the four Argentine orders occurring on or after September 20, 1991. *See Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Reviews and Revocation and Amended Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders*, (62 FR 41361).

As a result of the *Ceramica* decision and the changed circumstances reviews, the Department of Commerce published an initiation and preliminary results of changed circumstances review of the countervailing duty order on *Certain Textile Mill Products from Argentina* (63 FR 7125; February 12, 1998) in which it preliminarily determined that it does not have the authority to assess countervailing duties on unliquidated entries of merchandise covered by the order occurring on or after September 20, 1991. The notice also announced the Department's intention to revoke this order with respect to all unliquidated entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period May 18, 1992 through December 31, 1994. (The order has been revoked on two previous occasions. For a further discussion of these revocations and the resulting period affected by this determination, see the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below).

We invited interested parties to comment on our preliminary results, consideration of revocation, and intent to revoke the order. We received no comments. Accordingly, our final results of changed circumstance review remain the same as our preliminary results and the Department is revoking this order with respect to unliquidated entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period May 18, 1992 through December 31, 1994.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 30, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Anne D'Alauro or Maria MacKay, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 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 published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 1997 (62 FR 27296).

History of the Countervailing Duty Order on Textile Mill Products From Argentina

The countervailing duty order on *Certain Textile Mill Products from Argentina* was issued on March 12, 1985 pursuant to former section 303(a)(1) of the Act. Under former section 303, the Department of Commerce (the Department) could assess (or ''levy'') countervailing duties without an injury determination on two types of imports: (i) dutiable merchandise from countries that were not signatories of the 1979 Subsidies Code or ''substantially equivalent'' agreements (otherwise known as ''countries under the Agreement''), and (ii) duty-free merchandise from countries that were not signatories of the 1947 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. *See* S. Rep. 249, 96th Cong. 1st Sess. 103–06 (1979); H. Rep. No. 317, 96th Cong.; 1st Sess. 43, 49–50 (1979). At the time this order was issued, textile mill products from Argentina were dutiable. Also at that time, Argentina was not a ''country under the Agreement.'' In short, U.S. law did not require an injury determination as a prerequisite to the issuance of the order, and none was provided.

On August 13, 1990, the Department revoked the countervailing duty order on *Certain Textile Mill Products from Argentina* pursuant to section 355.25(d)(4)(iii) of the Department's then-current regulations. *See Certain Textile Mill Products from Argentina* (55 FR 32940). The Department's decision to revoke the order was challenged before the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT). On March 24, 1992, the CIT reversed the Department's decision, holding that a domestic interested party had properly objected to the Department's intent to revoke the countervailing duty order. *See Belton Industries Inc.* v. *United States*, CIT Slip Op. 92–39 (March 24, 1992). In accordance with that decision, on May 7, 1992, the CIT ordered the Department to rescind the revocation and reinstate the countervailing duty order on certain textile mill products from Argentina. Subsequently, two related appeals were filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, *Belton Industries, Inc.* v. *United States, et al.*, CAFC Nos. 92–1419,–1421, and –1451, and *Belton Industries, Inc.* v. *United States, et al.*, CAFC Nos. 92–1452, and –1483. Because the United States withdrew its appeal (No. 92–1421), and Argentina was not a party to the appeals, the CIT decision became final and binding with respect to the order on certain textile mill products from Argentina. Consequently, the Department rescinded its revocation of the countervailing duty order on certain textile mill products from Argentina and reinstated the order on November 18, 1992, effective May 18, 1992. *See Certain Textile Mill Products from Argentina; Notice of Final Court Decision and Rescission of Revocation of Countervailing Duty Order* (57 FR 54368).

On March 1, 1994, the Department again published in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 9727) its intent to revoke the countervailing duty order on certain textile mill products from Argentina pursuant to 19 CFR 355.25(d)(4)(i)(1994) because no interested party had requested an administrative review for at least four consecutive review periods. The Department received a timely objection to the intended revocation from the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI) and its member companies as well as the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union (ACTWU).

The Department requested clarifying information from ATMI and ACTWU regarding the like products their members produced. The Department determined that ATMI and ACTWU did not qualify as interested parties with respect to one like product category, ''Other Miscellaneous Categories.'' Therefore, the Department revoked the order with respect to that like product. *See Certain Textile Mill Products from Argentina; Determination to Amend Revocation, in Part, of the Countervailing Duty Order* (62 FR 41365).

As explained above, the countervailing duty order on certain textile mill products from Argentina was issued pursuant to former section 303. In the URAA, which amended the Act, section 303 was repealed partly because the new Agreement on

Subsidies and Countervailing Measures prohibits the assessment of countervailing duties on imports from a member of the World Trade Organization without an affirmative injury determination. The URAA added section 753 to the Act, which provided domestic interested parties with an opportunity to request an injury investigation for orders that had been issued pursuant to former section 303.

Because no domestic interested parties exercised their right under section 753(a) of the Act to request an injury investigation on certain textile mill products from Argentina, the U.S. International Trade Commission made a negative injury determination with respect to this order, pursuant to section 753(b)(4) of the Act. As a result, the Department revoked this countervailing duty order, effective January 1, 1995, pursuant to section 753(b)(3)(B) of the Act. *See Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders* (60 FR 40,568).

The Ceramica Regiomontana v. United States (Ceramica) Decision

On September 6, 1995, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) held, in a case involving imports of dutiable ceramic tile from Mexico, that once Mexico became a ''country under the Agreement'' on April 23, 1985 pursuant to the Understanding between the United States and Mexico Regarding Subsidies and Countervailing Duties (the Mexican MOU), the Department could not assess countervailing duties on tile from that country under former section 303(a)(1) of the Act. *Ceramica,* 64 F.3d at 1582. ''After Mexico became a 'country under the Agreement,' the only provision under which ITA could continue to impose countervailing duties was section 1671.'' *Id.* One of the prerequisites to the assessment of countervailing duties under 19 U.S.C. § 1671 (1988), according to the Federal Circuit, is an affirmative injury determination. *See also Id.* at § 1671e. However, at the time the countervailing duty order on ceramic tile was issued, the requirement of an affirmative injury determination under U.S. law was not applicable. Therefore, the Federal Circuit looked to see whether the statute contained any transition rules when Mexico became a country under the Agreement which might provide the order on tile with the required injury test. Specifically, the court looked at section 104(b) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, Pub. L. No. 96–39 (July 20, 1979) (1979 Act).

Section 104(b) was designed to provide an injury test for certain countervailing duty orders issued under former section 303 prior to the effective date of the 1979 Act (which established Title VII and, in particular, section 701 of the Act). However, in order to induce other countries to accede to the 1979 Subsidies Code (or substantially equivalent agreements), the window of opportunity was intentionally limited. In order to qualify (i) the exporting nation had to be a country under the Agreement (*e.g.,* a signatory of the Subsidies Code) by January 1, 1980, (ii) the order had to be in existence on January 1, 1980 (*i.e.,* the effective date of Title VII), and (iii) the exporting country (or in some instances its exporters) had to request the injury test on or before January 2, 1983.

In *Ceramica,* the countervailing duty order on ceramic tile was issued in 1982 and Mexico did not become a country under the Agreement until April 23, 1985. Therefore, in the absence of an injury test and the statutory means (under section 104 or some other provision) to provide an injury test, the Federal Circuit held that the Department could not assess countervailing duties on ceramic tile and would have to revoke the order effective April 23, 1985 (*i.e.,* the date Mexico became a ''country under the Agreement''). *Ceramica,* 64 F.3d at 1583.

On September 20, 1991, the United States and Argentina signed the Understanding Between the United States of America and the Republic of Argentina Regarding Subsidies and Countervailing Duties (Argentine MOU). Section III of that agreement contains provisions substantially equivalent to the provisions in the Mexican MOU that were before the Federal Circuit in the *Ceramica* case. Therefore, on April 2, 1996, the Department initiated changed circumstances reviews of the countervailing duty orders on *Leather from Argentina* (55 FR 40212), *Wool from Argentina* (48 FR 14423), *Oil Country Tubular Goods from Argentina* (49 FR 46564), and *Carbon Steel Cold-Rolled Flat Products from Argentina* (49 FR 18006). Each of these orders had been issued without an injury determination. The purpose of these reviews was to determine whether the Department had the authority, in light of the *Ceramica* decision, to assess countervailing duties on entries of merchandise covered by the orders occurring on or after September 20, 1991—the date on which Argentina became a ''country under the Agreement'' within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. § 1303(a)(1) (1988; repealed 1994). In the *Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Reviews and Revocation and Amended Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders,* (62 FR 41361) (*Argentine Changed Circumstances*), published in the **Federal Register** on August 1, 1997, the Department determined that, based upon the ruling in the *Ceramica* case, it lacked the authority to assess countervailing duties on entries of merchandise covered by the four Argentine orders occurring on or after September 20, 1991.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain textile mill products from Argentina. The Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) item numbers covered by the order are identified in Attachment A of this notice.

Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Review and Revocation of the Order

In accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 751(d) of the Act, and sections 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3) of the Department's regulations, we initiated this changed circumstances review on February 12, 1998. Because we determined that expedited action was warranted, our preliminary results were combined with the February 12, 1998 notice of initiation. Based upon our analysis of the *Ceramica* decision and the *Argentine Changed Circumstances* reviews, our preliminary results determined that the order on *Certain Textile Mill Products from Argentina* became entitled to an injury test as of September 20, 1991—the date on which Argentina became a ''country under the Agreement'' within the meaning of 19 U.S.C. § 1303(a)(1) (1988; repealed 1994). Moreover, in the absence of an injury determination or the statutory authority to provide an injury test, we further determined the Department does not have the authority to assess countervailing duties on unliquidated entries of certain textile mill products from Argentina occurring on or after September 20, 1991. For these reasons, we announced our intention to revoke this order with respect to all unliquidated entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period May 18, 1992 (the date on which the order was reinstated pursuant to the *Belton* decision) through December 31, 1994. The Department has previously revoked the countervailing duty order on textile mill products from Argentina for all entries occurring on or after January 1, 1995. *See Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders* (60 FR 40568).

Because we received no comments following our preliminary results of

changed circumstances review and intent to revoke the order, our final results remain unchanged. The revocation of this order applies to all unliquidated entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period May 18, 1992 through December 31, 1994.

Therefore, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate all unliquidated entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after May 18, 1992 and on or before December 31, 1994, without regard to countervailing duties. We also will instruct U.S. Customs to refund with interest any estimated countervailing duties collected with respect to those unliquidated entries.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. section 1675(b)(1)).

Dated: April 21, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

Appendix A—C–357–404 HTS List for Certain Textile Mill Products From Argentina

HTS Number

5111.1170; 5111.1960;[1] 5111.2090; 5111.3090; 5111.9090; 5112.1120; 5112.1990; 5112.2030; 5112.3030; 5112.9090; 5205.1110; 5205.1210; 5205.1310; 5205.1410; 5205.2400;[2] 5205.3100; 5205.3200; 5205.3300; 5207.1000; 5207.9000; 5407.9105; 5407.9205; 5407.9305; 5407.9405; 5515.1305; 5515.1310; 5801.3600; 6302.600010; 6302.600020; 6302.910005; 6302.910050; 6305.2000; 6305.9000

[FR Doc. 98–11430 Filed 4–29–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] Coverage limited to fabric, value not over $19.84/kg.

[2] Coverage limited to yarn, not exceeding 68 nm.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 042098E]

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) will convene public meetings.

DATES: The meetings will be held on May 11–15, 1998.

ADDRESSES: These meetings will be held at the Sandestin Beach Hilton, 4000 Sandestin Boulevard South, Destin, FL; telephone: 850–267–9500.

Council address: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3018 U.S. Highway 301 North, Suite 1000, Tampa, FL 33619.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Wayne E. Swingle, Executive Director, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; telephone: (813) 228–2815.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Council

May 13

8:30 a.m.—Convene.

8:45 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.—Receive public testimony on: (1) Mackerel Total Allocable Catch (TAC) (2) Draft Mackerel Amendment 9; and, (3) Draft Reef Fish Amendment 16B.

Draft Mackerel Amendment 9 contains the following alternatives: (1) Possible changes to the fishing year for Gulf group king mackerel; (2) Possible prohibitions of sale of Gulf mackerel caught under the recreational allocation; (3) Possible reallocations of TAC for the commercial fishery for Gulf group king mackerel in the Eastern Zone; (4) Possible reallocations of TAC for Gulf group king mackerel between the recreational and commercial sectors to 70 percent recreational and 30 percent commercial; (5) Possible establishment of two subdivisions of TAC for the commercial, hook-and-line allocation of Gulf group king mackerel by area for the Florida west coast; (6) Possible subdivisions of TAC for commercial Gulf group king mackerel in the Western Zone (Alabama through Texas) by area, season, or a combination of area and season; (7) Possible trip limits for vessels fishing for Gulf group king mackerel in the Western Zone; (8) Possible additional restrictions on the use of net gear to harvest Gulf group king mackerel off the Florida west coast; including a phase-out, a moratorium on additional net endorsements with requirements for continuing existing net endorsements, restrictions on the transferability of net endorsements, and restriction of the use of nets to primarily the waters off Monroe and Collier Counties; (9) Possible increase in the minimum size limit for Gulf group king mackerel to 24 or 26 inches fork length; (10) Possible re-establishment of an annual allocation or a TAC percentage of Gulf group Spanish mackerel for the purse seine fishery with consideration of trip limits and area restrictions; (11) Possible retention and sale of cut-off (damaged) legal-sized king and Spanish mackerel within established trip limits.

Draft Reef Fish Amendment 16B contains the following alternatives: (1) Possible establishment of a slot limit, of 14 inches and 20 (or 22) inches fork length, for banded rudderfish and lesser amberjack; and possible prohibition on the sale of minor amberjack species that are smaller than 36 inches fork length; (2) Possible 5–fish bag limit for lesser amberjack and banded rudderfish; (3) Possible removal from the fishery management plan (FMP) or management of sand perch, dwarf sand perch, Queen triggerfish, and hogfish; (4) Possible minimum size limits of 20 inches for scamp and yellowmouth grouper; 16 inches for mutton snapper; and 12 inches for blackfin snapper, cubera snapper, dog snapper, mahogany snapper, schoolmaster, silk snapper, mutton snapper, queen snapper, gray triggerfish, and hogfish; (5) Possible inclusion of the 5–fish red snapper bag limit as part of the 10–snapper aggregate snapper limit, and a 5–fish bag limit for hogfish, and 2 fish per vessel of cubera snapper over 30 inches total length; (6) Possible establishment of a 1–fish bag limit and commercial quotas for speckled hind and warsaw grouper, or a prohibition on harvest of these species.

3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.—Receive a report of the Mackerel Management Committee.

5:00 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.—(CLOSED SESSION) Receive reports of the Advisory Panel Selection Committee and Marine Reserves Committee.

May 14 8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.—Continue report of the Mackerel Management Committee.

10:00 a.m. - 3:15 p.m.—Receive a report of the Reef Fish Management Committee.

3:15 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.—Receive a report of the Shrimp Management Committee.

3:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.—Receive a presentation on the Barataria/Terrebonne Estuary Program.

4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.—Receive a report of the Habitat Protection Committee.

May 15

8:30 a.m. - 9:15 a.m.—Continue report of the Habitat Protection Committee.

9:15 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.—Receive a report of the AP Selection Committee.

9:30 a.m. - 9:45 a.m.—Receive a report of the Marine Reserves Committee.