In conclusion, Milliken argues that the Department should determine that there is a likelihood that dumping would continue or recur were the order revoked because (1) dumping margins above *de minimis* levels continued after the issuance of the order and (2) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the imposition of the order (for some companies).

We agree with Milliken that dumping margins continued above *de minimis* levels after the issuance of the order. The Department, after examining the final results of the four administrative reviews, finds that dumping margins above *de minimis* levels continue for at least two of the six known Bangladeshi producers/exporters. As discussed in section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin,* the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63–64, if companies continue dumping with the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue if the discipline were removed.

The Department, utilizing U.S. Census Bureau IM146 Reports and U.S. Department of Commerce trade statistics, finds that imports of the subject merchandise have continued, and generally increased, over the life of the order. With respect to Milliken's assertion that imports from Sonar and Eagle Star have ceased, although the Department agrees that Eagle Star had no shipments during the 1993/1994 administrative review (61 FR 5377 (February 12, 1996)), the Department cannot conclude from the **Federal Register** notices of results of administrative reviews that Sonar ceased exporting or that there continue to be no shipments from these two companies.

Based on this analysis, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. Deposit rates above *de minimis* levels continue in effect for exports of the subject merchandise by two of the six known Bangladeshi producers/exporters. Therefore, given that dumping has continued over the life of the order and respondent interested parties have waived their right to participate in this review before the Department, and absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department determines that dumping is likely to continue 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 weighted-average dumping margins for two producers/exporters of cotton shop towels from Bangladesh (57 FR 3996, February 3, 1992). The Department also published an ''all others'' rate in this determination. We note that, to date, the Department has not issued any duty absorption findings in this case.

In its substantive response, Milliken, citing the *Sunset Policy Bulletin,* suggests that the Department report to the Commission the two company-specific margins and the ''all others'' rates established in the investigation because those are the only calculated rates that reflect the behavior of exporters without the discipline of the order in place.

The Department agrees with Milliken. Absent argument and evidence to the contrary, the Department finds that the margins calculated in the original investigation are probative of the behavior of Bangladeshi producers/exporters if the order were revoked as they are the only margins which reflect their actions absent the discipline of the order. As such, the Department will report to the Commission the company-specific and all others rates from the original investigation as 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 duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margins listed below:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Eagle Star Textile Mills, Ltd.	42.31
Sonar Cotton Mills, Ltd.	2.72
All Others	4.60

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: July 30, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–20223 Filed 8–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–605]

Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order: Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice From Brazil.

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

ACTION: Notice of continuation of antidumping duty order: frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil.

SUMMARY: On April 7, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department''), pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act from 1930, as amended (''the Act''), determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping (64 FR 16901 (April 7, 1999)). On May 21, 1999, the International Trade Commission (''the Commission''), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (64 FR 27806 (May 21, 1999)). Therefore, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department is publishing notice of the continuation of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil.

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 and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 28, 1999.

Background

On December 2, 1998, the Department initiated, and the Commission instituted, a sunset review (63 FR 66527 and 63 FR 66527, respectively) of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. As a result of this review, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the Commission of the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order to be revoked (*see Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil, 64 FR 16901 (April 7, 1999)).*

On May 21, 1999, the Commission determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (*see Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil,* 64 FR 27806 (May 21, 1999) and USITC Pub. 3195, Inv. No. 731–TA–326 (Review) (May 1999)).

Scope

The merchandise covered by this antidumping duty orders is frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil. The merchandise is currently classifiable under subheading 2009.11.00 of the Harmonized Tarriff Schedule (HTS). The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Determination

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the Commission that revocation of this antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice from Brazil. The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to continue to collect antidumping duty deposits at the rate in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. Pursuant to section 751(c)(6)(A)(iii) of the Act, any subsequent five-year review of this order will be initiated not later than the fifth anniversary of the effective date of continuation of this order.

Normally, the effective date of continuation of a finding, order, or suspension agreement will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Notice of Continuation. As provided in 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department normally will issue its determination to continue a finding, order, or suspended investigation not later than seven days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Commission's determination concluding the sunset review and immediately thereafter will publish its notice of continuation in the **Federal Register**. In the instant case, however, the Department's publication of the Notice of Continuation was delayed. The Department has explicitly indicated that the effective date of continuation of this order is May 28, 1999, seven days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the Commission's determination. As a result, pursuant to sections 751(c)(2) and 751(c)(6)(A) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of this order not later than April 2004.

Dated: July 30, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–20213 Filed 8–4–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–101]

Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order: Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth From the People's Republic of China

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

ACTION: Notice of continuation of antidumping duty order: Greige polyester cotton printcloth from the People's Republic of China.

SUMMARY: On March 18, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department''), pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Tariff Act from 1930, as amended (''the Act''), determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from the People's Republic of China (''China'') would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping (64 FR 13399 (March 18, 1999)). On April 19, 1999, the International Trade Commission (''the Commission''), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, determined that revocation of the antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (64 FR 19195 (April 19, 1999)). Therefore, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4), the Department is publishing notice of the continuation of the antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from China.

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 and Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6397 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 26, 1999.

Background

On November 2, 1998, the Department initiated, and the Commission instituted, a sunset review (63 FR 58709 and 63 FR 58763, respectively) of the antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from China pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. As a result of this review, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the Commission of the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail were the order to be revoked (*see Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth from China,* 64 FR 13399 (March 18, 1999)).

On April 19, 1999, the Commission determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on greige polyester cotton printcloth from China would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time (*see Greige Polyester Cotton Printcloth from China,* (64 FR 19195 (April 19, 1999) and USITC Pub. 3184, Inv. No. 731–TA–101 (Review) (April 1999)).

Scope

The merchandise covered by this antidumping duty order is shipments of greige greige polyester/cotton printcloth, other than 80 x 80 type, from China. Greige polyester/cotton printcloth is unbleached and uncolored printcloth.