margins have declined in the two most recent reviews. The Department finds the same trend for Zheijiang Machinery and Waxiang, which shows that each of these exporters are likely to continue dumping at the lower rates found in more recent reviews. Thus, the Department, in accordance with section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, preliminarily intends to report to the Commission the company-specific margin of 0.03 percent for CMC, 3.20 percent for Luoyang, and 0.11 percent for Zheijiang Machinery, each from the 1996/97 period of review; and 0.03 percent for Waxiang from the 1995/96 review.

(4) Because three respondent interested parties—Xiangyiang, Xibei and ZCCBC (a participant in the current new shipper review)—have never been determined eligible for a company-specific rate, the Department preliminarily intends to assign the PRC-wide rate of 29.40 percent to these companies.

(5) The margins for Premier, a company subject to the original investigation, have generally increased throughout the history of the order. Premier's original margin of 0.97 percent peaked at 25.56 percent in the 1993/94 review, and then decreased to 7.22 percent in the most recent 1996/97 review. Absent comments or information regarding the margin and import volumes for Premier from domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department, in accordance with section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, preliminarily intends to report to the Commission a more recent rate of 5.43 percent for Premier. This rate is from the 1995/96 period of review, in which the overall volume of imports peaked and then began to decline.

(6) With respect to the PRC ''all others'' rate, the Department agrees with domestic interested parties' argument that, as import volumes generally increased, with the highest volumes in the years with the highest margins, companies have increased dumping in order to maintain or increase market share. We note that the total volume of imports less imports of those companies with separate rates increased from fiscal years 1994 through 1996, then declined in fiscal years 1997 through 1998. During this five-year period, the PRC rate increased approximately 30 percent, reaching a peak of 33.18 percent in FY 1997. Following this margin increase, imports declined approximately 60 percent. Because overall imports increased through 1996 and then began to decline, the Department preliminarily intends to report to the Commission a rate of 29.40 percent for ''all others'', in accordance with section II.B.2 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*. This is the PRC-wide rate from the 1995/96 administrative review.

Preliminary Results of Review

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

Producer/exporter	Margin (percent)
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp.(''CMC'')	0.03
Zheijiang Wanxiang Group	0.03
Zheijiang Machinery Import & Export Corp	0.11
Luoyang	3.20
Premier	5.43
Liaoning	9.72
Guizhou Machinery	21.79
Wafangdian	29.40
Jilin	29.40
China National Machinery Import & Export Corp.(''CMEC'')	29.40
Guizhou Automotive	29.40
Tianshui Hailin	29.40
Xiangyiang	29.40
Xibei	29.40
Zheijiang Changshan Changhe Bearing Co. (''ZCCBC'')	29.40
All Others	29.40

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held on December 14, 1999, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.310(d). Interested parties may submit case briefs no later than December 7, 1999, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(i). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than December 13, 1999. The Department will issue a notice of final results of this sunset review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such *Policy Bulletin*.

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

Dated: October 18, 1999.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–27686 Filed 10–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–401–401]

Certain Carbon Steel Products From Sweden: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On July 12, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain carbon steel products (''Certain Steel Products'') from Sweden for the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997. The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). For information on the net subsidy for each reviewed company, and for all non-reviewed companies, please see the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (''Customs'') to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 22, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tipten Troidl or Gayle Longest, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(b), this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. Accordingly, this review covers SSAB Svenskt Stal AB (''SSAB''). This review also covers the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997 and seven programs.

We published the preliminary results on July 12, 1999 (64 FR 37507). We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. We received no comments from any of the parties.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to

the provisions of the Act as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA'') effective January 1, 1995. The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act. All citations to the Department's regulations reference 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998) unless otherwise indicated. Because the request for this administrative review was filed before January 1, 1999, the Department's substantive countervailing duty regulations, which were published in the **Federal Register** on November 25, 1998 (63 FR 65348), do not govern this review.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of certain carbon steel products from Sweden. These products include cold-rolled carbon steel, flat-rolled products, whether or not corrugated, or crimped: whether or not pickled, not cut, not pressed and not stamped to non-rectangular shape; not coated or pleated with metal and not clad; over 12 inches in width and of any thickness; whether or not in coils. During the review period, such merchandise was classifiable under the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (''HTS'') item numbers 7209.11.0000, 7209.12.0000, 7209.13.0000, 7209.21.0000, 7209.22.0000, 7209.23.0000, 7209.24.5000, 7209.31.0000, 7209.32.0000, 7209.33.0000, 7209.34.0000, 7209.41.0000, 7209.43.0000, 7209.44.0000, 7209.90.0000, 7211.30.5000, 7211.41.7000 and 7211.49.5000. The written description remains dispositive.

Subsidies Value Information

Privatization and Sale of Assets to Other Companies

SSAB is the only Swedish company that produces and exports the subject merchandise. SSAB has sold several productive units and the company was partially privatized in 1987 and in 1989. In 1994, SSAB was completely privatized by the Government of Sweden. Under the Department's current practice, to the extent that a portion of the sales price paid for a privatized company can be reasonably attributed to prior subsidies, that portion of those subsidies will be extinguished. Accordingly, in these final results, the Department continues to apply its repayment methodology in the calculation of SSAB's net subsidy rate. No comments were filed regarding this issue.

To calculate the benefit provided to SSAB in the POR, where appropriate, we multiplied the benefit calculated for 1997, adjusted for sales of productive units, by the ratio representing the amount of subsidies remaining with SSAB after privatization. We then divided the results by the company's total sales in 1997.

Allocation Methodology

In the current review, there are no new subsidies. All of the non-recurring grants under review were provided prior to the POR; allocation periods for these grants were established during prior segments of this proceeding. Therefore, for purposes of these final results, the Department is using the original allocation period assigned to each grant. *See Certain Carbon Steel Products from Sweden; Final Results of Administrative Review,* 66 FR 16549–16550 (April 7, 1997) (''1994 Final Results'').

Analysis of Programs

There were no comments submitted to the Department with respect to our preliminary results of review; therefore, based upon the responses to our questionnaire we determine the following:

I. Programs Conferring Subsidies

A. Programs Previously Determined to Confer Subsidies

1. Structural Loans

In the preliminary results we found that this program conferred countervailable subsidies on the subject merchandise. Our review of the record has not led us to change any findings or calculations. Accordingly, the net subsidy for this program is 0.12 percent *ad valorem,* which remains unchanged from the preliminary results.

2. Forgiven Reconstruction Loans

In the preliminary results we found that this program conferred countervailable subsidies on the subject merchandise. Our review of the record has not led us to change any findings or calculations. Accordingly, the net subsidy for this program is 0.59 percent *ad valorem,* which remains unchanged from the preliminary results.

II. Other Programs Examined

A. Research and Development Loans and Grants

In the preliminary results, we found that the Swedish National Board for Industrial & Technical Development (''NUTEK'') program provides loans and grants for R & D purposes to Swedish industries. Under this program benefits from outstanding loans during the POR would result in a rate of less than 0.005 percent *ad valorem* which would have no impact on the countervailing duty rate. The grants provided did not exceed 0.5 percent of SSAB's total sales for the year in which they were received, and were expensed during the year of receipt *See Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Italy* 64 FR 30624, 30631 (June 8, 1999). Therefore, it is not necessary to determine if the loans and the grants under NUTEK are specific. Our review of the record has not led us to change any findings or calculations. Therefore, our determination for these programs remains unchanged.

Final Results of Review

In accordance with section 705(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we calculated an individual subsidy rate for the producer/exporter subject to this administrative review. For the period January 1, 1997 through December 31, 1997, we determine the net subsidy for SSAB to be 0.72 percent *ad valorem.*

We will instruct Customs to assess countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise from SSAB during the POR at 0.72 percent *ad valorem.* The Department will also instruct Customs to collect a cash deposit of estimated countervailing duties of 0.72 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from SSAB entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this review.

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 review 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 cannot change, except pursuant to a request and subsequent 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). Therefore, the cash deposit rates for all companies except the firm

covered by this review will be unchanged by the results of this review.

We will instruct Customs to continue to collect cash deposits for non-reviewed companies 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 this order will be the rate for that company established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding conducted under the URAA. If such a review has not been conducted, the rate established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding pursuant to the statutory provisions that were in effect prior to the URAA amendments is applicable. *See, Certain Carbon Steel Products from Sweden; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review,* 62 FR 16549 (April 7, 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, 1997 through December 31, 1997, the assessment rates applicable to all non-reviewed companies covered by this order are the cash deposit rates in effect at the time of entry.

This notice serves as a 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(a)(3). Timely written 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 administrative review and notice are issued and published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1) and 19 U.S.C. 1677f(i)(1)).

Dated: October 18, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–27685 Filed 10–21–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–122–834]

Final Negative Countervailing Duty Determination; Live Cattle From Canada

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 22, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zak Smith, Stephanie Hoffman, James Breeden, or Melani Miller, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group I, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0189, 482–4198, 482–1174, or 482–0116, respectively.

Final Determination

The Department of Commerce determines that countervailable subsidies are not being provided to producers or exporters of live cattle in Canada.

Petitioner

The petition in this investigation was filed on November 12, 1998, by the Ranchers-Cattlemen Action Legal Foundation (R-Calf, referred to hereafter as ''the petitioner'').

Case History

Since the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1999 (64 FR 25278) (''*Preliminary Determination*''), the following events have occurred:

We conducted verification in Canada of the questionnaire responses from the Government of Canada (''GOC''), Government of Alberta (''GOA''), Government of Manitoba (''GOM''), Government of Ontario (''GOO'') and Government of Saskatchewan (''GOS'') from June 16 through June 28 and August 5 through August 13, 1999. We aligned the final determination in this investigation with the final determination in the companion antidumping investigation (*see Countervailing Duty Investigation of Live Cattle From Canada; Notice of Alignment With Final Antidumping Duty Determination,* 64 FR 35127 (June 30, 1999)) and we postponed the final determination of this investigation until October 4, 1999 (*see Notice of Postponement of Final Antidumping Determination: Live Cattle from Canada,* 64 FR 40351 (July 26, 1999)). On October 4, 1999, the deadline for this final determination was set for October 12, 1999. See Memorandum to Richard W. Moreland from Valerie Ellis, ''Clarification and Correction of Extension of Final Determination in the Antidumping Investigation of Live Cattle from Canada.'' The petitioner and the respondents filed case briefs on September 3 and we received rebuttal briefs from the petitioner and the respondents on September 10, 1999. In addition, we invited parties to submit factual information and/or argumentation regarding the role and amount of compensation received by cattlemen leasing public grazing lands in Alberta from energy companies leasing oil and gas rights on these lands. We received submissions from both the petitioner and the GOA on September 17, 1999, and rebuttal comments from each party on September 22, 1999.

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA'') effective January 1, 1995 (''the Act''). In addition, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (''the Department's'') regulations are to the current regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998). Although Subpart E of 19 CFR Part 351, published on November 25, 1998 (63 FR 65348)(''*New CVD Regulations*'') does not apply to this investigation, Subpart E represents the Department's interpretation of the requirements of the Act. *See* 19 CFR 351.702(b).

Scope of Investigation

The scope of this investigation covers live cattle from Canada. For purposes of this investigation, the product covered is all live cattle except imports of (1) bison, (2) dairy cows for the production of milk for human consumption, and (3) purebred cattle and other cattle specially imported for breeding purposes.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is classifiable as statistical reporting numbers under 0102.90.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''), with the exception of 0102.90.40.10, 0102.90.40.72 and 0102.90.40.74. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

Injury Test

Because Canada is a ''Subsidies Agreement Country'' within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, the