

**CERTAIN UNFINISHED MIRRORS FROM BELGIUM,  
THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, ITALY,  
JAPAN, PORTUGAL, TURKEY,  
AND THE UNITED KINGDOM**

**Determination of the Commission in  
Investigation No. 701-TA-273  
(Preliminary) Under the Tariff Act of  
1930, Together With the Information  
Obtained in the Investigation**

**USITC PUBLICATION 1850**

**MAY 1986**

**Determinations of the Commission in  
Investigations Nos. 731-TA-320  
through 325 (Preliminary) Under the  
Tariff Act of 1930, Together With the  
Information Obtained in the  
Investigations**

# **UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**

## **COMMISSIONERS**

**Paula Stern, Chairwoman**  
**Susan W. Liebeler, Vice Chairman**  
**Alfred E. Eckes**  
**Seeley G. Lodwick**  
**David B. Rohr**  
**Anne E. Brunsdale**

---

Larry Reavis, Office of Investigations  
Maria MacKay, Office of Industries  
Jeffrey Anspacher, Office of Economics  
Richard Laulor, Office of Investigations  
Paul Bardos, Office of the General Counsel  
Robert Eninger, Supervisory Investigator

---

**Address all communications to**  
**Kenneth R. Mason, Secretary to the Commission**  
**United States International Trade Commission**  
**Washington, DC 20436**

# C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Determination-----	1
Views of Chairwoman Stern, Commissioner Eckes, and Commissioner Lodwick---	3
Views of Chairwoman Stern on Investigation No. 701-TA-273-----	14
Views of Vice Chairman Liebel and Commissioner Brunsdale-----	16
Views of Commissioner Rohr-----	19
Information obtained in the investigations:	
Introduction-----	A-1
The product:	
Description and uses-----	A-2
U.S. tariff treatment-----	A-3
Nature and extent of alleged subsidies and sales at LTFV-----	A-4
U.S. channels of distribution-----	A-4
U.S. producers-----	A-5
U.S. importers-----	A-5
Consideration of alleged material injury-----	A-5
U.S. production, capacity, and capacity utilization-----	A-6
U.S. producers' domestic shipments and exports-----	A-6
Inventories-----	A-6
Employment-----	A-7
U.S. producers' financial experience-----	A-8
Consideration of alleged threat of material injury-----	A-10
Consideration of the causal relationship between the alleged subsidized and LTFV imports and the alleged material injury:	
U.S. imports-----	A-11
U.S. consumption and market penetration of imports-----	A-13
Prices-----	A-13
Trends in prices-----	A-14
Margins of underselling-----	A-16
Exchange rates-----	A-19
Lost sales-----	A-20
Appendix A. Commerce's and Commission's <u>Federal Register</u> notices-----	A-25
Appendix B. List of witnesses at the Commission's conference-----	A-36

## Tables

1. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. production, average capacity, and capacity utilization, 1983-85-----	A-6
2. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. producers' intracompany consumption, domestic shipments, and exports, 1983-85-----	A-7
3. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. producers' end-of-period inventories, 1983-85-----	A-7
4. Average number of production and related workers producing unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over in U.S. establishments, and hours worked by and total compensation and average hourly compensation paid to such workers, 1983-85-----	A-8
5. Selected financial data for U.S. producers' operations on unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, 1983-85-----	A-9

## CONTENTS

## Tables--Continued

	<u>Page</u>
6. Selected financial data for U.S. producers' operations on all flat glass mirrors, 1983-85-----	A-10
7. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. imports, by countries under investigation, 1983-85-----	A-12
8. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: apparent U.S. consumption and ratio of imports to consumption, 1983-85-----	A-14
9. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, clear 6mm: weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by quarters, January 1983-December 1985----	A-15
10. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, tinted 6mm: weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by quarters, January 1983-December 1985----	A-17
11. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, clear 5mm: weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by quarters, January 1983-December 1985----	A-18
12. Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, clear 3mm: weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by quarters, January 1983-December 1985----	A-19
13. Exchange rates: Nominal-exchange-rate equivalents of selected currencies in U.S. dollars, real-exchange-rate equivalents, and producer price indicators in specified countries indexed by quarters, January 1983-December 1985-----	A-21

Note.--Information which would reveal the confidential operations of individual concerns may not be published and, therefore, has been deleted from this report. Such deletions are indicated by asterisks.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION  
Washington, DC

Investigations Nos. 701-TA-273 (Preliminary)  
and 731-TA-320-325 (Preliminary)

CERTAIN UNFINISHED MIRRORS FROM BELGIUM, THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY,  
ITALY, JAPAN, PORTUGAL, TURKEY, AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

Determination

On the basis of the record 1/ developed in the subject investigations, the Commission determines, 2/ pursuant to section 703(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, that there is no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from Turkey of unfinished glass mirrors, 15 square feet and over in reflecting area, provided for in item 544.54 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, which are allegedly being subsidized. The Commission also determines, 3/ pursuant to section 733(a) of the Act, that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of such imports from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, and the United Kingdom, which are allegedly being sold at less than fair value (LTFV).

Background

The Commission instituted these investigations on April 1, 1986, following the receipt of a petition from the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers, Potomac, MD, which alleged that subsidized imports of the above

---

1/ The record is defined in sec. 207.2(i) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR § 207.2(i)).

2/ Commissioners Eckes and Lodwick dissenting.

3/ Vice Chairman Liebeler and Commissioners Rohr and Brunsdale dissenting.

Lib  
R  
B.

articles from Turkey and LTFV imports from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, and the United Kingdom are being sold in the United States and that an industry in the United States is materially injured and threatened with material injury by reason of such imports. Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register of April 9, 1986 (51 FR 12221). The conference was held in Washington, DC, on April 23, 1986, and all persons who requested the opportunity were permitted to appear in person or by counsel.

VIEWS OF CHAIRWOMAN STERN, COMMISSIONER ECKES,  
AND COMMISSIONER LODWICK

We determine <sup>1/</sup> that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of certain unfinished mirrors from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Portugal, Italy, and the United Kingdom, that are allegedly being sold at less than fair value (LTFV). We further <sup>2/</sup> determine that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of such products from Turkey that are allegedly subsidized. <sup>3/</sup>

These determinations are based primarily on the poor financial performance of the domestic industry, the significant and increasing market penetration of cumulated imports, and the adverse effect of imports on the prices of the domestic product during the period under investigation.

Like product and the domestic industry

The term "industry" is defined in section 771(4)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 as "the domestic producers as a whole of a like product, or

---

<sup>1/</sup> Vice-Chairman Liebel, Commissioner Rohr, and Commissioner Brunsdale find that there is no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is being materially injured or is threatened with material injury by reason of any of the imports under investigation. While they join in the like product/domestic industry section of this opinion, see their separate views on material injury and causation.

<sup>2/</sup> Chairwoman Stern finds no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of allegedly subsidized imports from Turkey. See her dissenting views.

<sup>3/</sup> Material retardation is not an issue in these investigations and will not be discussed further.

those producers whose collective output of the like product constitutes a major portion of the total domestic production of that product." <sup>4/</sup> In turn, "like product" is defined as "a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation. . . ." <sup>5/</sup>

The "article subject to investigation", as defined by the Department of Commerce, is "unfinished glass mirrors 15 square feet (sq. ft.) or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, or framing." <sup>6/</sup>

To produce unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, one side of a lehr end or stock sheet of glass is coated with a reflective compound. <sup>7/</sup> These mirrors are primarily differentiated and priced according to the thickness of the glass and whether the glass is tinted or clear. The per-square-foot price depends on these variables and not on mirror size. <sup>8/</sup> The domestic product is basically the same as the imported product. The issue raised with regard to like product in these investigations is whether to include mirrors other than unfinished mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over in the like product definition.

<sup>4/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(4)(A).

<sup>5/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(10).

<sup>6/</sup> These items are classifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (TSUSA) under item 544.5400 and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 541.11 through 544.41. International Trade Administration, Initiation of countervailing and antidumping duty investigations, Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom, 51 Fed. Reg. 15933-38, 15954 (April 1986).

<sup>7/</sup> Lehr and stock sheet mirrors are produced in standard rectangular sizes of approximately 125 inches x 100 inches (lehr end mirrors), or 1/2, 1/3, or 1/4 thereof (stock sheet mirrors). Report to the Commission (Report) at A-2.

<sup>8/</sup> Id. at A-2.



It is petitioner's contention that the Commission should find one like product, consisting of unfinished, flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, and one domestic industry producing this like product. <sup>9/</sup> The German, Belgian, and Japanese respondents argued that the like product should include finished and unfinished flat glass mirrors of less than 15 sq. ft. of reflecting surface, collectively called "cut mirrors." <sup>10/</sup> Respondents contend that such mirrors are made on the same production lines as lehr end and stock sheet sizes; are produced by both petitioners and respondents using the same machinery, technology, and workforce; and have the same use as reflective surfaces.

We find that significant differences exist between stock sheet and lehr end sizes on the one hand and cut mirrors on the other with regard to characteristics and uses. The size 15 sq. ft. of reflective surface is the clearest dividing line. Mirrors that size or larger (the mirrors subject to investigation) are mass produced in a very small number of standard sizes, and are frequently used without further processing. Cut mirrors are virtually all made to order, in a wide range of sizes and styles, and are invariably subjected to additional fabrication, such as edging, beveling, etching, and/or framing, in labor intensive operations. <sup>11/</sup>

---

<sup>9/</sup> Transcript of the Conference (Tr.) at 27.

<sup>10/</sup> However, no party has suggested that automotive rear view mirrors should be included in this definition.

<sup>11/</sup> Report at A-2; Tr. at 39. Cut mirrors can be produced by simply cutting lehr end or stock sheet sizes to the appropriate size, but this procedure is less frequently used. Report at A-3. Although cut mirrors can also be produced on the same type of equipment that produces lehr end and stock sheet sizes, adjustment of the machinery to the smaller size is needed. In addition, unfinished mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over and cut sizes are usually produced on separate lines, and the work forces used to produce these products are different. Id. at A-7.

We also note that unfinished mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over are sold for different uses and through different channels of distribution than are cut mirrors. <sup>12/</sup> Unfinished glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over are sold to installers for large projects such as hotel lobbies, and to dealers and distributors who resell to such customers as furniture manufacturers for whom the mirrors are cut and finished. Cut mirrors are sold directly to furniture makers and retailers. <sup>13/</sup>

In light of the above factors, the Commission finds, for the purposes of these preliminary investigations, that there is one like product, consisting only of unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, and that the domestic industry consists of the producers of this product. <sup>14/ 15/</sup>

#### Condition of the Domestic Industry

In assessing the condition of the domestic industry the Commission considers, among other factors, consumption, production, capacity, capacity utilization, employment, and financial performance. <sup>16/</sup> The domestic industry's performance was clearly worse in some indicators in 1985 than it was in 1983. <sup>17/</sup>

<sup>12/</sup> Report at A-2 and A-5.

<sup>13/</sup> *Id.* at A-4; Tr. at 39.

<sup>14/</sup> Japanese respondents argued that, even if cut mirrors are excluded from the like product, the Commission should use a product line analysis pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1677(4)(D) and consider data on unfinished and cut mirrors, on the ground that it would be difficult to obtain data broken out for unfinished mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over. The Commission has had little difficulty obtaining specific data on such unfinished mirrors, and therefore has no need to use a product line analysis.

<sup>15/</sup> If these investigations return to the Commission as final investigations, the Commission will, however, further examine the issue of whether cut mirrors should be included in the like product.

<sup>16/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(7)(C)(iii).

<sup>17/</sup> We note that a substantial downturn in industry performance did not occur until 1985, despite the fact that imports were increasing in 1984.

U.S. consumption of the subject product increased by 21.0 percent from 1983 to 1985, as the construction industry expanded. With the rise in consumption came an increase in the domestic mirror industry's capacity and production, as existing firms expanded and new firms entered the market. <sup>18/</sup>

Production of the subject article increased considerably from 85.4 million sq. ft in 1983 to 96.1 million sq. ft. in 1984, but then increased only slightly to 96.7 million sq. ft. in 1985. <sup>19/</sup> Shipments increased from 76 million sq. ft. to 83 million sq. ft. in 1984 and 85.6 million sq. ft. in 1985. <sup>20/</sup> The average number of production and related workers producing unfinished glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over also increased about 5 percent over the period of investigation. <sup>21/</sup>

At the same time, there were clear indications, particularly in 1985, that the industry's condition was not as robust as the above factors might otherwise indicate. Capacity utilization dropped from 58.5 percent in 1983 to 55.6 percent in 1985, even though one plant closed in 1985. <sup>22/</sup> U.S. producers' share of the market declined from 92.3 percent in 1983 to 85.1 percent in 1985. <sup>23/</sup>

The financial performance of the domestic industry deteriorated rapidly from 1983 through 1985. Net income as a ratio to net sales declined during the period under investigation, falling from 5.0 percent in 1983 to 4.9 percent in 1984 and then to 0.8 percent in 1985. Cash flow increased from \$5.2 million in 1983 to \$5.6 million in 1984, but then declined

<sup>18/</sup> Report at A-6, Tr. at 26.

<sup>19/</sup> Report at A-6.

<sup>20/</sup> Id. at A-7.

<sup>21/</sup> Id. at A-8.

<sup>22/</sup> Id. at A-8.

<sup>23/</sup> Id. at A-13.

sharply in 1985 to \$2.6 million. Four firms reported losses in 1984, and six did so in 1985. <sup>24/</sup> We also note that the cost of production, which includes raw material (the largest component), labor, and overhead, increased 5.5 percent 1983-1985, but net sales increased only 1.7 percent in this period. <sup>25/</sup>

Based on the above, we determine that there is a reasonable indication that the domestic industry is experiencing material injury. <sup>26/ 27/</sup>

#### Cumulation

Under the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984, <sup>28/</sup> the Commission shall cumulatively assess the volume and effect of imports if the imports (1) compete with both other imports and the domestic like product, (2) are marketed within a reasonably coincidental period, <sup>29/</sup> and (3) are

<sup>24/</sup> Id. at A-9-10.

<sup>25/</sup> Id. at A-10.

<sup>26/</sup> Chairwoman Stern does not believe it necessary or desirable to make a determination on the question of material injury separate from the consideration of causality. She joins her colleagues by concluding that the domestic industry is experiencing economic problems.

<sup>27/</sup> Commissioner Eckes believes that the Commission is to make a finding regarding the question of material injury in each investigation. See, American Spring Wire Corp. v. United States, 590 F. Supp. 1273, 1276 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1984), aff'd sub nom., Armco Inc. v. United States, 760 F.2d 249 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

<sup>28/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(7)(C)(iv) provides in pertinent part:

[T]he Commission shall cumulatively assess the volume and effect of the imports from two or more countries of like products subject to investigation if such imports compete with each other and with like products of the domestic industry in the United States market.

Section 612(a)(2)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984, amending the Tariff Act of 1930, section 771(7)(C)(iv), 19 U.S.C. § 1677(7)(C)(iv).

<sup>29/</sup> This requirement is derived from the legislative history of the statute. H.R. Rep. No. 1156, 98th Cong., 2d Sess. 173 (1984).

subject to investigation. <sup>30/ 31/</sup> For the purposes of our preliminary determination in these investigations, we cumulated imports from all seven countries subject to investigation. <sup>32/</sup>

We determine that domestic unfinished mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over and imports from the seven countries compete with each other. These mirrors are fungible. Also, the domestic product and imports from the seven countries are directed to the same customers such as installers and furniture makers, <sup>33/</sup> and pass through the same channels of distribution.

Japanese respondents contend that imports from Japan should not be cumulated with imports from any other country, since the Japanese imports

---

<sup>30/</sup> To determine whether the imports compete with each other and the domestic product, the Commission has considered several factors among them:

- The degree of fungibility between imports from different countries and between imports and the domestic like product, including consideration of specific customer requirements and other quality related questions;
- The presence of sales or offers to sell in the same geographical markets, the imports from different countries, and the domestic like product;
- The existence of common or similar channels of distribution for imports from different countries and the domestic like product;
- Whether the imports are simultaneously present in the market.

The Commission has often noted that no single factor is determinative.

<sup>31/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(7)(E); H.R. Rep. No. 725, 98th Cong., 2nd Sess. 37 (1984).

<sup>32/</sup> Chairwoman Stern cumulatively assessed the volume and effect of allegedly LTFV imports from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Portugal, Italy, and the United Kingdom. However, she does not find cross-cumulation to be appropriate. Therefore, she did not cross cumulate imports of allegedly subsidized mirrors from Turkey with allegedly LTFV imports of mirrors from the other six countries in the present investigations to reach her determination in the investigations.

<sup>33/</sup> Tr. at 10.

are of such a high quality that they do not compete with other imports and with the domestic like product. The Japanese respondents claim that their mirrors are less susceptible than other mirrors to deterioration such as "black edge", (the loss of reflective surface at a mirror's edge) and that the prices of their mirrors are always higher than those of other imports and the domestic product.

Some purchasers have echoed this perception of superior Japanese quality, citing quality as the primary reason they chose Japanese mirrors over domestic products. However, even though Japanese mirrors continue to sell at prices often higher than those of U.S. <sup>34/</sup> and other imported mirrors, purchasers note that the domestic mirror manufacturers have greatly improved the quality of their product in the past three years, and that this quality has in some cases reached the Japanese level. <sup>35/</sup> The Japanese respondents have themselves admitted that the quality of domestic mirrors has nearly reached that level, and noted that other imports are generally of a quality comparable to domestic mirrors. <sup>36/</sup>

As did the Japanese respondents, both the German and the Belgian respondents argued that their imports should not be cumulated with any other imports, since their quality was high. However, purchasers made no distinction among European countries and stated that there was very little, if any, quality difference between European and U.S. mirrors. <sup>37/</sup>

---

<sup>34/</sup> The record shows that this price gap has narrowed substantially in the last two years and there is Japanese underselling for one type of mirror.

<sup>35/</sup> Report at A-20 and A-23.

<sup>36/</sup> Report at A-23; Tr. at 104-5.

<sup>37/</sup> Report at A-20.

We determine that imports from the seven countries were marketed within a reasonably coincident period. The record shows that domestic shipments and the imports maintained a share of the market, and therefore were simultaneously present in the market during the period of investigation. The record also indicates that the prices for the domestic product and the imports were reasonably comparable. <sup>38/</sup>

Finally, for purposes of these investigations, we also determine that imports from the seven countries may properly be considered "subject to investigation," since they all are a part of these present investigations.

Reasonable indication of material injury by reason of allegedly unfair imports

When making a determination as to whether there is a reasonable indication of material injury by reason of the subject imports, the statute states that:

the Commission shall consider, among other factors:

- (i) the volume of imports of the merchandise which is the subject of the investigation,
- (ii) the effect of imports of that merchandise on prices in the United States for like product, and
- (iii) the impact of imports of such merchandise on domestic producers of like products. <sup>39/</sup>

The aggregate volume of imports from the six countries subject to the antidumping investigation increased from 6.3 million sq. ft. in 1983 to 13.1 million sq. ft. in 1985. <sup>40/</sup> Market share for these six countries

<sup>38/</sup> Id. at A-14-19.

<sup>39/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(7)(B).

<sup>40/</sup> The data regarding allegedly subsidized imports from Turkey is confidential and can not be discussed in detail.

increased from 6.7 percent of U.S. consumption in 1983 to 11.7 percent in 1985. The volume of imports and market share held by Turkey also increased from 1983 to 1985. <sup>41/</sup>

The Commission obtained quarterly pricing data for 5 domestic mirror categories. Prices remained relatively stable for those categories during the period of investigation. <sup>42/</sup> The fact that domestic prices did not increase while raw material costs were rising, indicates that price suppression may have resulted from the presence of the allegedly unfairly traded imports in the market. Consequently, this price suppression may have been, in part, responsible for the decline in domestic profits.

In these investigations, the Commission obtained 74 direct quarterly pricing comparisons between domestic and imported mirrors from Japan, Belgium, and Portugal. The majority of comparisons showed underselling by the imports. <sup>43/</sup> There were confirmed lost sales to imports from the majority of the countries subject to investigation on the basis of price.

For the foregoing reasons, we conclude that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by imports of certain unfinished mirrors from Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, and the United Kingdom that are

---

<sup>41/</sup> Report at A-14.

<sup>42/</sup> Id. at A-21-27. This is particularly true for clear and tinted 6mm mirrors, which comprise the vast bulk of the market. Id. at A-2, A-14, and A-16.

<sup>43/</sup> We note that the Commission received no pricing data on imports from Italy, Turkey, or the United Kingdom, and that the data on Japanese prices showed considerable overselling by the imports from Japan. Should these cases return as final investigations, the Commission will seek further information on pricing.



allegedly sold at less than fair value. We further determine <sup>44/</sup> that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured by imports of unfinished mirrors from Turkey that are allegedly subsidized.

---

<sup>44/</sup> See Chairwoman Stern's dissenting view on allegedly subsidized imports from Turkey.

Chairwoman Stern's Views on Investigation No. 701-TA-273,  
Certain Unfinished Mirrors from Turkey

Chairwoman Stern finds that in the record of this preliminary investigation, the information indicates there is no reasonable indication that the domestic industry is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of allegedly subsidized imports of unfinished mirrors from Turkey.

Chairwoman Stern does not believe the cumulation of import volumes across statutes is appropriate and therefore analyzes countervailing duty and antidumping investigations separately, on their own merits. An analysis of allegedly subsidized imports from Turkey in 1985, the only year in which such imports were reported, indicates a low volume of imports and a miniscule level of market penetration.

Information on the record does not suggest that Turkey is likely to increase significantly its exports to the United States in the foreseeable future as to pose a threat to the domestic industry. The one Turkish producer is reportedly already operating at a high level of capacity and has traditionally directed its exports toward markets in Europe and the Middle East.

These factors suggest it would be highly speculative to assume that imports of unfinished mirrors from Turkey pose a real and imminent threat to the U.S. industry.

Therefore, Chairwoman Stern determines that imports of unfinished mirrors from Turkey do not significantly contribute to the domestic industry's current condition nor do they pose a threat to the domestic industry.

## VIEWS OF VICE CHAIRMAN LIEBELER AND COMMISSIONER BRUNSDALE

Investigations Nos. 701-TA-273 (Preliminary) and 731-TA-320-325 (Preliminary),  
 Certain Unfinished Mirrors from Turkey, Belgium, the Federal Republic  
 of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom

We determine there is no reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury <sup>1/</sup> by reason of allegedly dumped and subsidized imports of certain unfinished mirrors from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Portugal, Italy, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. This conclusion is based on two factors: (1) the improvement in virtually every indicator Congress directs the Commission to consider in evaluating the condition of the domestic industry <sup>2/</sup> and (2) the absence of any indication in the record that a threat of material injury is real and imminent. For the purposes of this preliminary investigation, we accept the majority's definition of like product and domestic industry.

Condition of the domestic industry

Domestic production, capacity, and shipments all increased steadily throughout the period of these investigations. Production rose from 85,389,000 sq. ft. in 1983 to 96,099,000 in 1984 and 96,729,000 in 1985. <sup>3/</sup> Shipments rose from 76,067,000 sq. ft. in 1983 to 82,958,000 in 1984 and 85,593,000 in 1985. <sup>4/</sup> Capacity increased from 146,045,000 sq. ft. in 1983 to 149,282,000 in 1984 and 173,987,000 in 1985. <sup>5/</sup> The capacity increases

<sup>1/</sup> Material retardation is not an issue in these investigations and will not be discussed further.

<sup>2/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(7).

<sup>3/</sup> Report at A-9, Table 1.

<sup>4/</sup> Id. at A-11, Table 2.

<sup>5/</sup> Id. at A-9, Table 1.

resulted chiefly from the entry of two new producers to the industry and the installation of additional capacity by one existing producer. <sup>6/</sup> Despite these increases in capacity and production, inventories declined by 10 percent in the period and the ratio of inventories to total shipments declined from 4.5 percent in 1983 to 3.6 percent in 1985. <sup>7/</sup>

The average number of workers employed by the domestic industry increased from 469 in 1983 to 493 in 1985. Hours worked increased from 927,000 to 983,000 over the period, while total compensation rose from \$7,290,000 to \$8,738,000 and hourly compensation rose from \$7.86 to \$8.89. <sup>8/</sup>

The financial condition of the domestic industry was stable in 1983-84, notwithstanding increasing market penetration by the subject imports. Both net sales and the unit value of net sales were increased. <sup>9/</sup> The only decline in any of the indicators in any year was the profitability drop in 1985 when 24,000,000 sq. ft. of new capacity came on line and the cost of raw materials and general, selling, and administrative expenses increased significantly. <sup>10/</sup>

Given the combination of favorable indicators, we cannot find any reasonable indication of material injury to the domestic industry.

No reasonable indication of threat of material injury to the domestic industry

Although the volume and market share of the imports in question have increased somewhat during the period, the increases have not adversely affected the domestic industry. <sup>11/</sup> As already noted, virtually all of the

<sup>6/</sup> Id. at A-9.

<sup>7/</sup> Id. at A-10.

<sup>8/</sup> Id. at A-12, Table 4.

<sup>9/</sup> Id. at A-12-A-14.

<sup>10/</sup> Id. at A-13, Table 5.

<sup>11/</sup> Id. at A-19, Table 8. The actual data are confidential.

indicators on the industry's condition are improving. <sup>12/</sup> Moreover, the record is replete with optimistic projections of future growth and vitality by members of the petitioning group. <sup>13/</sup> None of the petitioners mentioned any threat from increasing imports. Nor was there reason to do so.

Imports are not likely to increase significantly in the future. Producers in the two largest importing countries--Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany--are operating at high rates of capacity utilization, as are producers in other countries, and there is no indication whatsoever that any foreign producer plans to increase its capacity. <sup>14/</sup> Furthermore, the recent decline in the dollar is expected to erode the competitive position of foreign producers sufficiently to retard import growth and perhaps even reverse it.

Finally, imports are not likely to have a significant effect on domestic prices, in the near future. Not only are imports unlikely to increase significantly, but current price data indicate that domestic prices remained stable despite increasing imports and expanding domestic capacity and production in 1984-85. <sup>15/</sup> Domestic inventories of imported mirrors are not overhanging the market, and there are numerous markets that have greater importance to the foreign producers than the United States. <sup>16/</sup>

Thus we determine that there is no reasonable indication of a real and imminent threat of material injury to the domestic industry.

<sup>12/</sup> 19 U.S.C. § 1677(7).

<sup>13/</sup> These optimistic projections are discussed in the respondents' briefs. See, e.g., Post-Conference Brief of the Republic of Turkey at 8-10; Post Conference Brief of FLABEG GmbH and VEGLA GmbH at 11; Post-Hearing Brief of Glaverbel S.A., Appendix 3.

<sup>14/</sup> Report at A-16.

<sup>15/</sup> Id. at A-21-A-25.

<sup>16/</sup> Id. at A-15-A-16.

## Views of Commissioner David B. Rohr

I have determined that there is no reasonable indication that the domestic industry producing unfinished, flat glass mirrors, 15 sq. ft. and over, is materially injured or is threatened with material injury 1/ by reason of the allegedly subsidized and dumped imports from the countries subject to these investigations. 2/ The indicators of the performance of this industry do not provide a reasonable indication that it is experiencing harm that is not inconsequential, immaterial, or unimportant 3/ or that the subject imports are a cause of such harm. Neither do the facts provide a basis for concluding there is a reasonable indication that the industry is threatened with material injury by the subject imports. I have also concluded that it is not likely that further information would be developed in any final investigations that would result in an affirmative determination.

Like Product/Domestic Industry

I concur with my colleagues on the majority as to their

---

1/ Material retardation of the establishment of an industry is not an issue in these investigations because there is an existing, established industry and will not be discussed further.

2/ These include allegedly subsidized imports from Turkey and allegedly LTFV imports from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, and the United Kingdom.

3/ 19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(A).

findings with respect to the like product and the definition of the domestic industry.

#### Condition of the Domestic Industry

In analyzing the condition of the domestic industry, the Commission has traditionally examined various indicators, relating to production, employment, and profitability, that allow us to assess the performance of the industry. These indicators include production, capacity, capacity utilization, domestic consumption, shipments, inventories, employment, wages, productivity, net sales, income, and profit margins. No single factor is decisive. Both the absolute levels and the trends in these indicators are important. All of these factors must be looked at in context in order to conclude whether there is a reasonable indication of material injury. It must also be recognized that changes in many of the indicators we examine are the statistical result of changes in other indicators, and are not independent indicators of performance.

The basic indicators of production in this industry have all risen throughout the period of this investigation, with one exception. Production rose by more than 13 percent, primarily in 1984, with a small increase through 1985. <sup>4/</sup> Capacity also rose significantly, by 19 percent, during the period with the increase concentrated in 1985. <sup>5/</sup>

---

<sup>4/</sup> Id. at A-6, Table 1. In 1984, production rose 12.5 percent.  
<sup>5/</sup> Id. The 1985 increase was 16.5 percent.



Apparent consumption rose over the period by 21 percent (15 percent in 1984 and a further 6 percent in 1985). 6/ Overall domestic shipments, including both open market and intracompany transfers, increased by 12 percent over the period, although there was a very slight decrease between 1984-85. 7/ That slight decrease was the result of a decline in intracompany transfers. Domestic open market shipments increased by 13 percent over the period (by approximately 9 percent in 1984 and by a further 3 percent in 1985). 8/ Inventories decreased over the period slightly from 4.5 percent of total shipments to 3.6 percent of total shipments. 9/

The information on shipments and inventories also explains the apparent failure of the domestic industry to participate in the 1985 market growth. In fact, such a conclusion is totally unwarranted. Given the low levels of inventories, and the minimal change in inventories between 1984 and 1985, production and overall shipment levels must be, and are, closely related. Because open market shipments increased by 3 percent (over 2.5 million square feet), the relatively flat productions levels occurred because captive consumption decreased by a similar, but slightly smaller amount. While the decrease in captive consumption may reflect changes in the market for finished mirrors, petitioner and the Commission have defined the

---

6/ Report at A-14, Table 8.

7/ Id. at A-7, Table 2.

8/ Id.

9/ Id. at A-7, Table 3.

industry in these investigations to include only unfinished mirrors.

The one production indicator in which statistics reflect a possibly significant decline is capacity utilization, which rose from 58.5 to 64.4 in 1984 and then dropped to 55.6 in 1985. 10/ In the context of these investigations, this decline in capacity utilization has little significance as an indicator of the true condition of this industry. First, while capacity utilization dropped 9 percent in 1985, capacity itself grew by close to 17 percent. Second, this capacity increase was the result of new domestic entrants into the industry, and the opening of a new production line by one existing producer. Changes in capacity utilization must be expected as the market adjusted to the new producers and sudden increase in capacity. The decline in capacity utilization thus does not reflect the true operating conditions in the industry.

Employment indicators show consistent significant increases throughout the period of investigation. The average number of workers increased from 469 to 493; hours worked increased from 927 thousand to 983 thousand; total compensation increased and hourly compensation rose from \$7.86 to \$8.89. 11/ While employment at some individual companies declined, the employment indicators of the industry, as a whole, improved.

---

10/ Id. at A-6, Table 1.

11/ Id. A-8, Table 4.

The financial indicators present the most complicated picture in this investigation. Net sales increased 14 percent, following the same pattern as production and shipments. 12/ There were also significant increases in the value of the industry's assets, particularly in 1985, relating to the increased capacity in that year.

The most significant feature of the financial indicators, however, is the dramatic increase in cost of goods sold (COGS) in 1985. The significance of this increase can be seen particularly in the ratio of COGS to net sales, which increased from 76.8 percent in 1984 to 79.7 percent in 1985. This dramatic increase caused changes in all financial indicators based on income, which, consequently, all show significant decreases in 1985. 13/

The issue, however, is whether such a decline in income is sufficient to provide a reasonable indication of material injury. Income is clearly one of the most important indicators of an industry's performance. Nevertheless, it is only one indicator of profitability. It must also be recognized that

---

12/ It must also be noted that the net sales, and consequently all indicators derived from net sales, are significantly understated on two counts. First, two significant producers did not include the value of their intracompany transfers in their net sales. Second, most companies reported their intracompany transfers at cost. Because such transfers account for approximately 10 percent of shipments, the industry profitability figures are understated by showing no profits on such transfers. These problems affect only the absolute levels of the financial statistics. They do not significantly affect the trends.

13/ Id. at A-9, Table 5.

its significance as a "bottom line" for an industry cannot be analyzed as simply as its significance for an individual firm.

Several facts persuade me that it is not a sufficient basis to predicate a finding of a reasonable indication of material injury in these investigations. First, the increase in net sales is entirely consistent with the increase in both consumption, production, and shipments. In the face of such trends, and in the absence of a decline in any other independent performance indicator, I cannot assume that it is primarily changes in the market which account for the changes in the financial condition of the industry. Second, the data clearly reveal that it was the increase in COGS, and more specifically an increase in the cost of a principal raw material, float glass, that accounts for the decline in the income indicators.

Third, the decline occurred in a year in which there were new entrants and substantial new capacity in the industry, as well as significant investments to improve product quality. Financially, this is reflected in a significant increase in the value of the assets of the industry. It is to be expected, based on the Commission's experience, that such new assets would, initially, have an influence on the financial statistics of the industry which do not reflect their true value or the industry's true performance.

I am therefore faced with an industry in which only two indicators, capacity utilization and income, have declined even<sub>24</sub> slightly. This raises the issue whether the simple fact that the statistics for one or two of the many indicators the

Commission examines to evaluate industry performance show declines is sufficient to raise a reasonable indication of material injury. Unless there is some other information on the record that shows the particular significance of those declining indicators, I cannot conclude that they are sufficient. More importantly, in these particular investigations, capacity utilization and income do not reflect the true conditions of production and profitability in this industry, which are clearly revealed by other indicators to be unharmed. I cannot conclude, in this circumstance, that there is reasonable indication that this industry is experiencing material injury.

#### Causation

Even were I to have concluded that this industry is experiencing material injury, the information developed in this investigation does not provide a basis for concluding there is a reasonable indication that imports from the subject countries are the cause of that injury.

Imports from the various countries subject to this investigation have increased significantly over the period. <sup>14/</sup> From 1984 to 1985, imports increased by over 34 percent. <sup>15/</sup> This increase, occurring as it did during the time of the

---

<sup>14/</sup> In this investigation I have applied the cumulation provisions of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984.

<sup>15/</sup> *Id.* at A-12. As a result of this increase, import market share rose from 7 to 12 percent of domestic consumption.

declines in domestic industry income, standing alone, might support an affirmative findings in these investigations. This fact does not, however, stand alone. It occurred in the context of an virtually identical increase in volume in the prior year that had no effect on industry income. Further, there is no information that suggests that an increase in domestic production would significantly reduce the COGS that is the cause of the decline in income in 1985. The volume of imports thus does not appear to be causally linked to the decline in industry profits.

The other possible linkage between the subject imports relates to price. It was argued that the low-priced imports prevented the domestic industry from raising its prices when its costs rose in 1985. The data before the Commission reveals that domestic prices trended upwards throughout the period of investigation, and, significantly, also in 1985. At the same time, Japanese imports, which account for more than half of the subject imports and which for the most significant products oversold the domestic product, trended downward. The price of other imports appears to have trended upwards. There appears to be no relationship between the price trends for the imports and the domestic industry. At the same time, this is a widely diverse industry in which new domestic entrants and new domestic capacity were introduced in a year in which the growth in consumption slowed. In such a situation, I cannot conclude that underselling by only some of the imports, without the support or corroboration of other information, provides a reasonable indication of a causal link between the imports and

the condition of the domestic industry.

#### Threat of Material Injury

In the absence of present material injury causally linked to the subject imports, I have also looked to determine whether the subject imports threaten the domestic industry with material injury. I have concluded that there is no reasonable indication of such a threat.

Only the investigation concerning Turkey involves subsidies, some of which are alleged to be export subsidies. The remaining investigations involve allegations of dumping.

With respect to those indicators listed in the statute that relate to the ability of foreign producers to increase their exports to the United States, there does not appear to be a reasonable indication that the volume of imports will increase to injurious proportions. Most significant foreign producers are operating at high levels of capacity utilization. In no case does the U.S. market appear to be significant for them. No information has been provided suggesting that foreign production or capacity is likely to significantly increase in the near future. There are no significant importer inventories overhanging the market. To conclude that there is a reasonable indication that imports will increase to injurious levels in light of such facts would be speculation of the most egregious sort.

With respect to price, it is clear that the entry of the new foreign suppliers into the U.S. market in 1985 was the result, in large part, of the favorable exchange rates that

these producers faced in the U.S. in 1984 and most of 1985. The current exchange rate trend makes the U.S. a much less attractive market for those producers. I must also note that the trend in most import prices through 1985 was upwards, so that any suppressive effect they might have had is lessening. Again, to assume that the subject imports would develop a price suppressive effect in the near future, which there is no evidence they have had in the recent past or the present, would require impermissible speculation. The evidence before me does not support the conclusion that there is a reasonable indication of a threat of material injury.

#### Likelihood of Further Information

In reaching my negative conclusion, I have also considered the limitations on the information available in a preliminary investigation and the possibility of developing information during further investigations that might lead to affirmative findings.

Approximately 70 percent of the domestic industry responded to the Commission's questionnaires. There is, of course, a likelihood that we would improve our response rate in a final investigation. However, a 70 percent response rate is comparable to the normal rate of response to Commission questionnaires. It is also true that in almost every investigation the Commission undertakes, additional time would improve response rates. For an improvement in response rates to be a significant factor, however, I would have to assume that the 30 percent of the industry that did not respond to the



Commission are more injured than the 70 percent, which includes the petitioners, that did respond. This would be unreasonable.

It is also true that in a further investigation additional information on import prices could be obtained. In light of my observations on pricing, I cannot conclude that such information would affect the outcome of the investigations. In reaching my conclusions, I assumed that those imports for which data is incomplete undersold the domestic product. Additional information would merely confirm this assumption, or, if contrary, be merely cumulative of existing information.

#### Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, I have concluded that there is no reasonable indication that the domestic industry is materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of the subject imports.



## INFORMATION OBTAINED IN THE INVESTIGATIONS

## Introduction

On April 1, 1986, a petition was filed with the U.S. International Trade Commission and the U.S. Department of Commerce on behalf of the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers, Potomac, MD, 1/ alleging that subsidized imports of mirrors in lehr end and stock sheet sizes from Turkey and less-than-fair-value (LTFV) imports of such articles from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), Italy, Japan, Portugal, and the United Kingdom are being sold in the United States and that an industry in the United States is materially injured and threatened with material injury by reason of such imports.

Accordingly, effective April 1, 1986, the Commission instituted countervailing duty investigation No. 701-TA-273 (Preliminary) under section 703(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a)) and antidumping investigations Nos. 731-TA-320-325 (Preliminary) under section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)) to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of such imports.

Notice of the institution of the Commission's investigations and of a public conference to be held in connection therewith was given by posting copies of the notice in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, Washington, DC, and by publishing the notice in the Federal Register on April 9, 1986 (51 F.R. 12221). 2/ The public conference was held in Washington, DC, on April 23, 1986, 3/ and the vote was held on May 13, 1986. The applicable statute directs the Commission to notify Commerce of its preliminary determination within 45 days after the date of the filing of the petition, or by May 16, 1986.

---

1/ Members of the Association include Binswanger Mirror Products, Memphis, TN; Carolina Mirror Corp., North Wilkesboro, NC; Carolina Mirror of Houston, Houston, TX (a subsidiary of Carolina Mirror Corp.); Colonial Mirror and Glass, Brooklyn, NY; Downey Glass Co., Los Angeles, CA; Falconer Glass Industries, Falconer, NY, and Lewistown, PA; Gardner Mirror Corp., North Wilkesboro, NC; Lenoir Mirror Co., Lenoir, NC; Stroupe Mirror Co., Thomasville, NC; Texas Mirror, Inc., Huntsville, TX; Toledo Plate and Window Glass Co., Toledo, OH; Virginia Mirror Co., Inc., Martinsville, VA; and Willard Mirrors, Inc., Fort Smith, AR.

2/ A copy of the Commission's notice and copies of Commerce's notices instituting the investigations are shown in app. A.

3/ A list of witnesses appearing at the conference is presented in app. B.

## The Product

Description and uses

The articles subject to the petitioner's complaint--mirrors in lehr end and stock sheet sizes--are unfinished 1/ flat 2/ glass mirrors having reflective surfaces of 15 sq. ft. or more. These articles may either be used as such--for example, to cover a commercial or residential wall--or cut into sections with reflecting areas less than 15 sq. ft. and finished in ways identified in footnote 1 below.

Unfinished flat glass mirrors with reflecting surfaces of 15 sq. ft. or more are produced in standard rectangular dimensions of approximately 125 inches X 100 inches (lehr end mirrors) 3/ or 1/2, 1/3, or 1/4 thereof (stock sheet mirrors) and are sold by manufacturers at the same price per square foot regardless of size. Unfinished flat glass mirrors with less than 15 sq. ft. of reflecting surface (cut mirrors) may either be 1) cut from lehr end and stock sheet mirrors by producers or purchasers, or 2) produced already in the appropriate size. They are virtually all made to order and are almost invariably subjected to additional fabrication, such as edging, beveling, etching, and/or framing.

Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over are differentiated (and priced) primarily according to the thickness of the glass and whether the glass is tinted or clear. The most common thicknesses produced in and exported to the United States are 6 millimeter (mm), which accounts for at least 80 percent of U.S. consumption, and 5mm, 4mm, and 3mm, which together account for all but about 1 percent of the remainder. 4/ About 90 percent of the glass used in the production of unfinished mirrors is clear. The composition of the glass and reflective coating used for glass mirrors is similar worldwide. Some manufacturers, however, coat the back of the reflective surface with a sealer.

At some point during the life of a glass mirror, its reflective coating may begin to deteriorate, particularly at its edges, leaving a black residue in place of the mirrored surface. Most manufacturers, as a matter of good business practice, honor claims to replace such mirrors. "Black edging" is a universal phenomenon, and it is not clear whether such deterioration is inherent in the mirror itself, in its treatment, care, and handling, or in atmospheric conditions, such as humidity. No manufacturer can guarantee its

---

1/ i.e., not edged, beveled, etched, framed, or subjected to any other fabrication after production.

2/ i.e., not concave, convex, warped, or having any other than a flat surface.

3/ The width of a lehr end mirror, the largest flat glass mirror available, is limited by the width of the float tank in which the glass is made. This width ranges from about 80 to 120 inches worldwide. Because the production of flat glass is continuous, the length of the glass from which mirrors are made is potentially subject to considerable variation. In practice, however it is about 125 inches.

4/ Price and weight vary directly with thickness and purchasers have the opportunity to choose accordingly. The different thicknesses are not designed for different uses.

mirrors to be completely free of this problem, although several, in view of real or potential lost sales and replacement costs, have taken steps to identify and minimize the conditions under which it occurs. Other problems associated with mirrors are scratches, glass defects, surface distortions, packaging demands, and inconsistency of color (tint). 1/

To produce unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, glass sheets in lehr end and stock sheet sizes, purchased from glass manufacturers, 2/ are first cleaned and then coated on one side successively with an adhesive compound, the reflective compound, and a binding compound. The process, which is capital intensive, is similar throughout the world. In some instances a sealant is applied to the back and edges. Mirrors under 15 sq. ft. are produced on identical equipment, adjusted for smaller dimensions, from glass sheets already in the appropriate size. (Alternatively, albeit less frequently, such mirrors are produced by simply cutting standard-sized (lehr end and stock sheet) mirrors).

There are currently no known products or processes which may substitute for unfinished flat glass mirrors.

#### U.S. tariff treatment

Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. and over are currently provided for in item 544.54 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (TSUS), a classification which includes all flat glass mirrors, finished and unfinished, over 1 sq. ft. in reflecting area. The column 1 (most-favored-nation) rate of duty for this item, applicable to imports from Belgium, West Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom, is 10 percent ad valorem. 3/ This rate will be reduced to 8 percent ad valorem on January 1, 1987, the last in a series of duty reductions granted in the Tokyo round of the Multilateral Trade

---

1/ Counsel for the Japanese producers and importers has made a case for differentiating Japanese mirrors on the basis of superior quality. See Transcript of Conference, pp. 58-110.

2/ In Belgium, West Germany, Italy, Japan, and Turkey, the manufacturers of unfinished mirrors also manufacture the sheet glass from which they are made. The two processes are not integrated in the United States, Portugal, and the United Kingdom.

3/ The rates of duty in the column numbered 1 are most-favored-nation (MFN) rates and are applicable to imported products from all countries except those Communist countries and areas enumerated in general headnote 3(d) of the TSUS. The People's Republic of China, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia are the only Communist countries eligible for MFN treatment. However, MFN rates would not apply if preferential tariff treatment is sought and granted to products of developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) or the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA), or to products of Israel or of least developing developing countries (LDDC's) as provided under the Special rates of duty column.

Negotiations. The special duty rate, applicable to Portugal and Turkey under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), is free. 1/

#### Nature and Extent of Alleged Subsidies and Sales at LTFV

There is no information relating to the nature and extent of the alleged subsidies and sales at LTFV other than the allegations of the petitioner. With respect to subsidies, the petitioner cited various Turkish programs, such as export and supplemental tax rebates, tax deductions for export revenues, and a general incentive program incorporating tax allowances and duty exemptions, which have conferred subsidies on other products and which, by generalization, confer subsidies on the subject product. 2/ The petitioner estimated a subsidy rate of 17.80 percent for what is believed to be the sole producer of unfinished mirrors in Turkey, Turkiye Sise ve Cam Fabrikalari AS, Istanbul.

On the basis of home-market prices or constructed prices in the exporting countries and known or estimated purchase prices in the United States, the petitioner calculated dumping margins for clear 6mm, 5mm, and 3mm mirrors imported in 1985, by quarter and, in some cases, by port of unloading. With the exception of those for imports from Japan, the margins were not identified with individual manufacturers (except by elimination when only one producer in a country was known to be producing and/or exporting to the United States). The alleged margins ranged from 4.94 to 345.59 percent for Belgium, 1.98 to 50.42 percent for West Germany, 1.25 to 103.00 percent for Italy, 29.39 to 70.05 percent for Japan, 6.41 to 128.60 percent for Portugal, and 1.13 to 60.99 percent for the United Kingdom, depending on glass thickness, port of unloading, the basis used to calculate fair-market value or U.S. purchase price, and, for Japan, the specific manufacturer.

#### U.S. Channels of Distribution

Most unfinished glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over sold in the United States by U.S. producers are sold to 1) installation subcontractors, which install mirrors in business and/or residential properties; 2) glass dealers and home improvement centers, which offer several products for residential and commercial remodeling; and 3) wholesale glass distributors, which serve several types of businesses including other glass distributors, the smaller installation subcontractors (glaziers) and dealers, and furniture manufacturers, for which the mirrors are cut and finished. (The larger

---

1/ The GSP affords nonreciprocal tariff preferences to developing countries to aid their economic development and to diversify and expand their production and exports. The U.S. GSP, enacted in title V of the Trade Act of 1974 and renewed in the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984, applies to merchandise imported on or after Jan. 1, 1976, and before July 4, 1993. It provides duty-free entry to eligible articles imported directly from designated beneficiary developing countries.

2/ Commerce's notice of institution of countervailing duty investigation (app. A) identifies each program on which it is initiating an investigation.

furniture manufacturers buy cut and finished mirrors directly from the mirror producers). Most of the subject articles sold in the United States by foreign producers are sold to unrelated wholesale glass-product distributors that purchase very little, if any, of the U.S.-produced product.

#### U.S. Producers

In addition to the 13 members of the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers identified on page A-1, there are at least 8 other firms which manufacture unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over in the United States. <sup>1/</sup> None of the producers are disproportionately large or dominant in terms of production or trade volume, and, with one exception, none have more than one plant location at which the subject product is produced. Twelve of the 22 plants are concentrated in North Carolina, southern Virginia, and California. The remainder are located in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Arkansas, Florida, Washington, Ohio, and New York. All of these firms also produce cut and finished mirrors. The subject articles account for from 25 percent to nearly 100 percent of these firms' combined sales of standard-sized and cut and finished mirrors. Several other firms in the United States manufacture cut and finished mirrors exclusively.

#### U.S. Importers

At least 50 firms imported the subject merchandise from one or more of the countries under investigation in 1985. A few account for the bulk of the imports, \* \* \*. \* \* \*. Most of the importers are wholesale distributors and are unrelated to the producers from which they import. None modify or otherwise add value to the imported product, other than cutting it in some instances into ordered sizes.

#### Consideration of Alleged Material Injury

The following data, compiled from all of the members of the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers and one other producer which responded to the Commission's questionnaire, represent about 70 percent of domestic production of the subject articles in 1985. In the few instances in which a specific datum was not available from a specific producer, an estimate was made on the basis of an average for all other producers so that derivative calculations and proportional relationships for the aggregate would remain unchanged. In no instance was this necessary for more than one producer in any one data series.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Avalon Glass and Mirror, Gardena, CA; Consolidated Glass and Mirror, Galax, VA; Weiner and Wursell Mirror, Huntington Park, CA; Cristalum Transamerica Corp., Miami, FL; Sierra Mirror Co., Straithmore, CA; Bay City Mirror Co., Newark, CA; Belknap Mirror Co., Seattle, WA; and Buchmin Industries, Reedley, CA.

U.S. production, capacity, and capacity utilization

U.S. producers' average capacity to produce unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over increased by 19.1 percent from 1983 to 1985, largely because of the installation of \* \* \* at \* \* \* plant and the appearance of two new producers--Texas Mirror and Consolidated in 1985 (table 1). One producer--\* \* \*--closed a plant in the same year. U.S. producers reported capacity on the basis of operating their facilities 80 hours per week (two shifts), 50 weeks per year, and at an average product mix in 1985, since the lines used to produce mirrors inlehr end and stock sheet sizes may also be used to produce mirrors in cut sizes. \* \* \*.

Production also increased from 1983 to 1985, but at a slower rate than capacity, with the result that capacity utilization fell from a high of 64.4 percent in 1984 to a low of 55.6 percent in 1985. The overwhelming bulk of U.S. production, as indicated previously, is 6mm in thickness and of clear (untinted) glass. There were no reported losses in production due to employment-related problems, sourcing problems, transitions, power shortages, natural disasters, or any other unusual circumstances.

Table 1.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. production, average capacity, and capacity utilization, 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
Production.....1,000 sq. ft..	85,389	96,099	96,726
Average capacity.....do....	146,045	149,282	173,987
Ratio of production to capacity.....percent..	58.5	64.4	55.6

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

U.S. producers' domestic shipments and exports

Approximately 10 percent of U.S. producers' lehr end and stock sheet production is captively consumed in the production of cut and finished mirrors. The remainder is sold to unrelated dealers, installers, and distributors in the United States. From 1983 to 1985, U.S. producers' domestic shipments increased from 76.1 million sq. ft., valued at \$81.4 million, to 85.6 million sq. ft., valued at \$94.7 million, or by 12.5 percent (table 2). There were no reported exports in this period.

Inventories

U.S. producers do not ordinarily produce lehr end and stock sheet mirrors for inventory. Those that are in stock at any one time are usually already



Table 2.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. producers' intracompany consumption, domestic shipments, and exports, 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
	Quantity (1,000 sq. ft.)		
Intracompany consumption.....	9,740	12,816	10,170
Domestic shipments.....	76,067	82,958	85,593
Exports.....	0	0	0
	Value (1,000 dollars)		
Intracompany consumption.....	-	-	-
Domestic shipments.....	81,448	92,478	94,723
Exports.....	-	-	-

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

sold and awaiting shipment. From 1983 to 1985, such mirrors declined from 3.8 million sq. ft., or 4.5 percent of the preceding year's shipments, to 3.4 million sq. ft., or 3.6 percent of the preceding year's shipments (table 3).

Table 3.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. producers' end-of-period inventories, 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
Inventories.....1,000 sq. ft..	3,826	3,365	3,436
Ratio of inventories to total shipments and intracompany consumption during the preceding period.....percent..	4.5	3.5	3.6

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

#### Employment

The bulk of the production and related workers in U.S. plants producing the subject articles are employed in mirror-finishing operations (edging, beveling, polishing, framing, etc.), a more labor-intensive operation than the production of the mirror itself. The remainder are employed in the production of unfinished mirrors in both standard (15 sq. ft. and over) and cut (under 15 sq. ft.) sizes. For the most part the average number of production and related workers producing standard-sized mirrors, shown in table 4, represents actual workers, since standard sizes and cut sizes are usually produced on separate lines. For those instances in which shifting from one line to

Table 4.--Average number of production and related workers producing unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over in U.S. establishments, and hours worked by and total compensation and average hourly compensation paid to such workers, 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
Average number of production and related workers producing unfinished glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over.....	469	465	493
Hours worked by such production and related workers 1,000 hours..	927	955	983
Total compensation paid to such production and related workers.....1,000 dollars..	7,290	7,811	8,738
Hourly compensation paid to such production and related workers.....	\$7.86	\$8.18	\$8.89

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

another was a factor, U.S. producers reported an average number of production and related workers equivalent to the proportional number of hours used to produce the subject articles.

Despite the closing of one plant and the curtailment of workers at several others, the average number of production and related workers producing unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over in U.S. establishments increased by 6.0 percent from 465 in 1984 to 493 in 1985, largely as a result of the opening of Texas Mirror's and Consolidated's plants in 1985, which added more than \* \* \* employees to the work force. Hours worked by and total compensation paid to these workers increased similarly, as shown in table 4.

#### U.S. producers' financial experience

Selected financial data for U.S. producers' operations onlehr end and stock sheet mirrors are shown in table 5. After a modest gain in 1984, U.S. producers' financial performance deteriorated in 1985. Aggregate operating income declined from \$5.2 million to \$2.3 million, or by 55.9 percent. Four of the 13 reporting producers reported net operating losses for 1984; 6 reported losses for 1985. No producer experienced a gain in operating profit. As the cost of goods sold, which includes raw materials, labor, and

Table 5.--Selected financial data for U.S. producers' 1/ operations on unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
Net sales.....1,000 dollars.. <u>2/</u>	83,859	94,108	95,734
Cost of goods sold.....do.... <u>2/</u>	65,123	72,307	76,262
Gross profit.....do....	18,736	21,801	19,472
General, selling, and administrative expenses.....do....	13,851	16,629	17,193
Operating income.....do....	4,885	5,172	2,279
Interest expense.....do....	1,207	1,211	2,312
Other income, net.....do....	511	615	771
Net income before income taxes.....do....	4,189	4,576	738
Depreciation and amortization expenses.....do.... <u>3/</u>	1,057	1,055	1,861
Cash flow from operations..do....	5,246	5,631	2,599
As a share of net sales:			
Cost of goods sold.....do....	77.7	76.8	79.7
Gross profit.....percent..	22.3	23.2	20.3
General, selling and administrative expenses.....do....	16.5	17.7	18.0
Operating income.....do....	5.8	5.5	2.4
Net income before income taxes.....do....	5.0	4.9	0.8
Fixed assets:			
Original cost...1,000 dollars..	23,377	25,697	30,344
Book value.....do....	12,391	13,143	18,025
Ratio of operating income to--			
Original cost of fixed assets percent..	20.9	20.1	7.5
Book value of fixed assets do....	39.4	39.4	12.6

1/ Based on data reported by 13 of the 14 firms which responded to the Commission's questionnaire.

2/ Does not include \* \* \* and \* \* \* intracompany consumption (about \* \* \* percent and \* \* \* percent of each firm's production, respectively).

3/ Does not include \* \* \* or \* \* \*.

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

overhead, <sup>1/</sup> increased by 5.5 percent in 1984-85, net sales increased by only 1.7 percent, despite the entry of two new producers. When labor and overhead costs could not be specifically identified withlehr end and stock sheet production, they were allocated on the basis of square footage produced or floor space required. In any case labor and overhead account for a relatively small proportion of U.S. producers' cost of goods sold. The increase in cost of goods sold was primarily due to an increase in raw-material costs (particularly float glass), which accounts for about 75 percent of U.S. producers' production costs. The result was that while the unit value of cost of goods sold increased by more than 4 cents per square foot from 1984 to 1985 (from \$0.755 to \$0.796), the unit value of net sales increased by less than 2 cents per square foot (from \$.983 to \$1.000). General, selling, and administrative expenses were also a factor in U.S. producers' declining profitability, but much less so than raw material costs. As a percent of net sales, general, selling, and administrative expenses increased by only three-tenths of a percentage point in this period (as compared to about 3 percentage points for cost of goods sold).

U.S. producers' sales of lehr end and stock sheet mirrors account for about 58 percent of their total flat glass mirror sales, which include sales of cut and finished mirrors. U.S. producers' financial performance on all flat glass mirrors also deteriorated from 1984 to 1985, as shown in table 6.

Table 6.--Selected financial data for U.S. producers' operations on all flat glass mirrors, <sup>1/</sup> 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
Net sales.....1,000 dollars..	142,883	160,424	165,203
Cost of goods sold.....do....	111,847	124,395	131,952
Gross profit.....do....	31,036	36,029	33,251
General, selling and admin- istrative expenses.....do....	22,315	25,490	27,694
Operating income.....do....	8,721	10,539	5,557
As a share of net sales....percent..	6.1	6.6	3.4

<sup>1/</sup> Lehr end and stock sheet plus cut and finished.

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

#### Consideration of Alleged Threat of Material Injury

In the examination of the question of threat of material injury to an industry in the United States, the Commission may take into consideration such

<sup>1/</sup> Overhead includes such expenses as depreciation, utilities, factory supplies, equipment maintenance, insurance, and building repairs.

factors as the nature of the subsidy, the rate of increase of imports and market penetration of such imports, probable suppression and/or depression of U.S. producers' prices, the capacity of producers in the exporting country to generate exports (including the existence of underutilized capacity), the availability of export markets other than the United States, and U.S. importers' inventories. Imports, market penetration, and prices are discussed in the following sections. A discussion of importers' inventories and foreign capacity and exports, to the extent such information is available, is presented below.

In general, U.S. importers do not import the subject articles for inventory. Nearly all imports are preordered and shipped directly from the port of unloading to the buyer.

There is one known producer of the subject merchandise in Belgium, two in FR Germany, one in Italy, three in Japan, one in Portugal, two in the United Kingdom, and one in Turkey. Glaverbel, SA, the sole Belgian producer, is reportedly operating at near full capacity and has no plans to increase capacity. 1/ Of its current total production, 5 percent is shipped to home-market buyers, 70 percent is shipped to other Western European countries, and 25 percent is exported abroad, of which the United States receives about 75 percent. Flaberg GmbH and Vereinigte Glaswerke GmbH, the two West German producers, reportedly operated at \* \* \* percent of capacity in 1985. Of their total production in 1985 (about \* \* \* sq. ft.), about \* \* \* percent was shipped to home-market buyers and \* \* \* percent to foreign markets, of which the United States received about \* \* \* percent. As a share of production, their total exports increased from \* \* \* percent in 1983 to \* \* \* percent in 1985, while exports to the United States increased from \* \* \* percent to \* \* \* percent in the same period. 2/ The Japanese producers are reportedly operating at \* \* \* percent of capacity and \* \* \*. 3/ No further information is currently available. According to counsel for the Government of Turkey, the Turkish producer is operating at about \* \* \* percent of annual capacity, which is currently about \* \* \* square feet. Its historic and natural markets have been in Europe and the Middle East, and it \* \* \*. 4/

Consideration of the Causal Relationship Between  
the Alleged Subsidized and LTFV Imports and  
the Alleged Material Injury

U.S. imports

Estimated U.S. imports of unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over are shown in table 7. Total imports for each year under consideration represent 77.5 percent of total imports reported in official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce for TSUS item 544.54, in accordance with the U.S.

---

1/ Transcript of conference pp. 111-131

2/ Letter to the Commission from Counsel for the West German manufacturers, dated Apr. 30, 1986.

3/ Post-conference brief of Counsel for the Japanese manufacturers and importers, confidential exhibit 5.

4/ Post-conference brief of Counsel for the Government of Turkey, p. 15.

Table 7.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: U.S. imports, by countries under investigation, 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
Quantity (1,000 sq. ft.)			
Japan.....	5,076	6,706	6,707
West Germany.....	1,059	1,833	3,487
Italy.....	***	***	***
United Kingdom.....	63	335	1,077
Belgium.....	***	***	***
Portugal.....	0	0	***
Total.....	6,250	9,815	13,135
Turkey.....	0	0	***
All others.....	954	1,376	***
Grand total.....	7,204	11,191	1/ 16,802
Value (1,000 dollars)			
Japan.....	5,929	7,614	7,551
West Germany.....	895	1,416	2,406
Italy.....	***	***	***
United Kingdom.....	48	165	692
Belgium.....	***	***	***
Portugal.....	-	-	***
Total.....	6,896	10,047	12,231
Turkey.....	-	-	***
All others.....	3,654	6,046	***
Grand total.....	10,550	16,093	19,447

1/ Official statistics for 1985 included about 1.7 million sq. ft. which are unrelated to imports of any kind. These were deducted from the data before the adjustment of 77.5 percent was applied.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

Customs Service's estimate that 75 to 80 percent of total imports reported under this item werelehr end and stock sheet mirrors. Imports for the individual countries under investigation were derived from Custom's confidential Net Import File for TSUS item 544.54, which shows both quantity and value of imports by shipment, importer of record, country of origin, port of unloading, and other variables. Certain shipments and importers were eliminated from the data on the basis of unit values which were obviously out of line with the subject articles and/or on the basis of telephone contacts. Finally, Net Import File data for certain importers were adjusted in accordance with questionnaire responses.

From 1983 to 1985, total U.S. imports oflehr end and stock sheet mirrors increased by 133 percent from 7.2 million sq. ft. valued at \$10.6 million, to 16.8 million sq. ft., valued at \$19.4 million. The vast bulk of these imports were exported by the countries under investigation, particularly Japan and FR Germany; however, there appears to have been several other large exporters to the United States in 1983-85, including Denmark, the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. Imports from West Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and Belgium increased several times over in the period, while imports from Japan, the largest source in recent periods, increased by 32.1 percent. There were no imports from Portugal or Turkey until 1985.

#### U.S. consumption and market penetration of imports

Apparent U.S. consumption of unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over and ratios of imports to consumption are shown in table 8. From 1983 to 1985, consumption increased by 21.0 percent, largely because of increased construction and building activity in this period. As a share of consumption, cumulative imports from the countries under investigation, less Turkey, increased from 6.7 percent to 11.7 percent in this period. At the same time U.S. producers' share declined from 92.3 percent to 85.1 percent. The ratio of imports to consumption for each country under investigation increased in 1983-85. For all but Japan and West Germany, however, it remained at 1 percent or less.

#### Prices

U.S. producers and importers of unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over were asked to provide selling price data for clear and tinted mirrors 6, 5, and 3mm in thickness, by quarters, from January-March 1983 through October-December 1985. Prices were collected on both an average delivered and net average selling price basis. Separate prices were requested for sales to wholesale distributors and to dealers. Producers and importers were also requested to provide descriptions of all forms of discounts they provide to purchasers of unfinished mirrors. Because trends were virtually identical for both delivered and net selling prices, only delivered prices are discussed.

The Commission received 10 usable producer questionnaires and 7 usable importer questionnaires. Importers of Japanese mirrors provided price data for sales of clear 6, 5 and 3mm mirrors, and tinted 6mm mirror. Importers of Belgian mirrors provided price data for sales of clear 6 and 3mm mirrors, and tinted 6mm mirrors. The sole importer of Portuguese mirrors and one large importer of West German mirrors provided prices on sales of clear 6mm mirrors. All of these prices reflected sales to wholesale distributors. No prices were received for imports from Italy, the United Kingdom, or Turkey.

Four producers provided "net period with cash discounting" schemes similar in construction to the common "2 percent/10 net 30" program that many industries offer. That particular discounting method means that payment of the full amount is due in 30 days, but a purchaser can receive 2 percent off

Table 8.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over: Apparent U.S. consumption and ratio of imports to consumption, 1983-85

Item	1983	1984	1985
Apparent U.S. consumption <sup>1/</sup> sq. ft..	93,011	106,965	112,565
Ratio (percent) of imports to consumption for--			
Belgium.....	***	***	***
FR Germany.....	1.1	1.7	3.1
Italy.....	***	***	***
Japan.....	5.5	6.3	6.0
Portugal.....	-	-	***
United Kingdom.....	0.1	0.3	1.0
Total.....	6.7	9.2	11.7
Turkey.....	-	-	***
All other countries.....	1.0	1.3	***
Total, all countries.....	7.7	10.5	14.9

<sup>1/</sup> U.S. producers' intracompany consumption and shipments plus total imports.

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission and from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

the sale price if payment is made within 10 days. The discounts provided by producers included 1 percent/10 net 30, 2 percent/10 net 30, and 2 percent/15 net 30. Although three importers provide discounts, only one importer provided a description of the discounting scheme offered (2 percent/10 net 30 discount).

Transportation costs are often paid by the producer or importer. The data provided indicate that U.S. producers and importers pay transportation costs which average 6.0 and 2.0 percent of their respective selling prices.

Trends in prices.--Domestic producers' weighted-average prices for clear 6mm mirrors, to wholesale distributors (table 9) ranged from a low of \$1.09 per square foot in January-March 1983, October-December 1983, and January-March 1984 to a high of \$1.14 per square foot in July-September 1984. Producers' prices were relatively stable. Weighted-average prices of the Japanese product decreased 3.3 percent from \$1.21 per square foot in January-June 1983 to \$1.17 per square foot in April-December 1985. Prices of the Belgian product increased 9.5 percent from \* \* \* per square foot in January-March 1984 to \* \* \* per square foot in April-June 1985, and then fell by 3.8 percent to \* \* \* per square foot in July-December 1985. There were only three reported prices for the Portuguese product--\* \* \*, \* \* \* and \* \* \*



Table 9.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, clear 6mm: weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by quarters, January 1983-December 1985

Period	U.S.		Japanese		Belgian		Portu- guese		Portuguese	
	product		Japanese		margins of		margins of		underselling	
	Per square	foot	Per square	foot	underselling	Percent	underselling	Percent	underselling	Percent
1983:										
Jan.-Mar...	\$1.09	\$1.21								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.21								
July-Sept..	1.10	1.20								
Oct.-Dec...	1.09	1.20								
1984:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.09	1.19								
Apr.-June..	1.11	1.19								
July-Sept..	1.14	1.19								
Oct.-Dec...	1.13	1.18								
1985:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1986:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1987:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1988:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1989:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1990:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1991:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1992:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1993:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1994:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1995:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1996:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1997:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1998:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
1999:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2000:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2001:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2002:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2003:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2004:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2005:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2006:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2007:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2008:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2009:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2010:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2011:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2012:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2013:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2014:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2015:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2016:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2017:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2018:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2019:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2020:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2021:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2022:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2023:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2024:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2025:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2026:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2027:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								
Oct.-Dec...	1.12	1.17								
2028:										
Jan.-Mar...	1.12	1.18								
Apr.-June..	1.12	1.17								
July-Sept..	1.13	1.17								

per square foot for April-June, July-September, and October-December 1985, respectively. Although there were no quarterly prices reported for the West German product, one large importer--\* \* \*--stated that prices of the West German product have ranged from \* \* \* to \* \* \* per sq. ft.

Domestic producers' weighted-average prices for tinted 6mm mirrors to wholesale distributors (table 10) ranged from a low of \$1.58 per square foot in January-March 1985 to a high of \$1.71 per square foot in April-June 1983. Producers' prices were generally stable. Weighted-average prices of the Japanese product were also generally stable, beginning at \$1.53 per square foot in January-March 1983 and ending at \$1.54 per square foot in October-December 1985. Prices of the Belgian product increased 6.3 percent from \* \* \* per square foot in January-March 1984 to \* \* \* per square foot in October-December 1985. There were no prices reported for Portuguese mirrors.

Domestic producers' weighted-average prices for clear 5mm mirrors to wholesale distributors (table 11) ranged from a low of \$.95 per square foot in October-December 1983 to a high of \$1.07 per square foot in July-September of 1984 and 1985. Producers' prices were erratic. Weighted-average prices of the Japanese product showed an overall decrease of 12.3 percent from \* \* \* per square foot in January-March 1983 to \* \* \* per square foot in October-December 1985.

Domestic producers' weighted-average prices for clear 3mm mirrors to wholesale distributors (table 12) ranged from a low of \$.76 per square foot in January-March 1985 to a high of \$.81 per square foot in April-June 1983. Producers' prices were generally stable. Weighted-average prices of the Japanese product, though fluctuating from period to period, were generally stable during the period of investigation, beginning at \$.98 per square foot in January-March 1983 and ending at \$.97 per square foot in October-December 1985. Prices of the Belgian product increased by 14.8 percent from \* \* \* per square foot in January-March 1984 to \* \* \* per square foot in January-March 1985 before falling by 7.1 percent to \* \* \* per square foot by July-September 1985.

There were three reported weighted-average prices of Japanese tinted 5mm mirrors to wholesale distributors. The Japanese prices were \* \* \* per square foot in January-March 1983, \* \* \* per square foot in January-March 1985 and \* \* \* per square foot in July-September 1985. Domestic producers reported no prices for this article.

Margins of underselling.--There were no margins of underselling by Japanese clear glass 6mm mirrors sold to wholesale distributors. Margins of underselling by Belgian clear 6mm mirrors, sold to wholesale distributors ranged from a high of \* \* \* percent in January-March 1984 to a low of \* \* \* percent in January-March 1985. The three reported prices for imports of the Portuguese product show underselling of \* \* \* percent in April-June 1985, \* \* \* percent in July-September 1985, and \* \* \* percent in October-December 1985. On the basis of general price information provided by \* \* \*, the margin of underselling by the West German product was about \* \* \* percent in 1984 and 1985.

Table 10.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, tinted 6mm: weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by quarters, January 1983-December 1985

Period	U.S. product	Japanese product	Japanese margins of underselling	Belgian product	Belgian margins of underselling
	---Per square foot---		Percent	Per square foot	Percent
1983:					
Jan.-Mar.....	\$1.62	\$1.53	5.3	1/	1/
Apr.-June....	1.71	1.56	9.1	1/	1/
July-Sept....	1.65	1.57	5.1	1/	1/
Oct.-Dec.....	1.64	1.57	4.2	1/	1/
1984:					
Jan.-Mar.....	1.62	1.56	3.7	***	***
Apr.-June....	1.63	1.55	4.9	***	***
July-Sept....	1.66	1.50	9.5	***	***
Oct.-Dec.....	1.62	1.54	4.9	***	***
1985:					
Jan.-Mar.....	1.58	1.56	1.0	***	***
Apr.-June....	1.65	1.55	6.1	***	***
July-Sept....	1.64	1.54	6.4	***	***
Oct.-Dec.....	1.66	1.54	6.8	***	***

1/ No price data reported.

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

Note.--Percentage margins are calculated from unrounded figures; thus, margins cannot always be calculated directly from the rounded prices in the table.

Table 11.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, clear 5mm:  
weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers  
for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by  
quarters, January 1983-December 1985

Period	U.S. product	Japanese product	Japanese margins of underselling
	-----Per square foot-----		Percent
1983:			
January-March.....	\$1.01	***	***
April-June.....	1.06	***	***
July-September.....	1.02	***	***
October-December.....	.95	***	***
1984:			
January-March.....	.97	***	***
April-June.....	1.02	***	***
July-September.....	1.07	***	***
October-December.....	1.06	***	***
1985:			
January-March.....	1.04	***	***
April-June.....	1.03	***	***
July-September.....	1.07	***	***
October-December.....	1.06	***	***

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the  
U.S. International Trade Commission.

Note.--Percentage margins are calculated from unrounded figures; thus, margins  
cannot always be calculated directly from the rounded prices in the table.

Table 12.--Unfinished flat glass mirrors 15 sq. ft. and over, clear 3mm: weighted-average delivered prices reported by U.S. producers and importers for sales to wholesale distributors and margins of underselling, by quarters, January 1983-December 1985

Period	U.S. product	Japanese product	Japanese margins of underselling	Belgian product	Belgian margins of underselling
	--Per square foot----		Percent	Per square foot	Percent
1983:					
Jan.-Mar.....	\$ .79	\$.98	-24.5	1/	1/
Apr.-June....	.81	.97	-19.1	1/	1/
July-Sept....	.80	.95	-18.9	1/	1/
Oct.-Dec.....	.80	.99	-23.1	1/	1/
1984:					
Jan.-Mar.....	.79	.98	-24.5	***	***
Apr.-June....	.79	.97	-22.3	***	***
July-Sept....	.80	.97	-21.1	***	***
Oct.-Dec.....	.77	.98	-26.5	***	***
1985:					
Jan.-Mar.....	.76	.98	-30.0	***	***
Apr.-June....	.78	.97	-25.1	***	***
July-Sept....	.80	.93	-16.8	***	***
Oct.-Dec.....	.79	.97	-22.4	***	***

1/ No price data reported.

Source: Compiled from data submitted in response to questionnaires of the U.S. International Trade Commission.

Note.--Percentage margins are calculated from unrounded figures; thus, margins cannot always be calculated directly from the rounded prices in the table.

Margins of underselling by Japanese tinted 6mm mirrors sold to wholesale distributors ranged from a high of 10 percent in July-September 1984 to a low of 1 percent in January-March 1985. Margins of underselling by the Belgian product ranged from a high of \* \* \* percent in January-September 1984 to a low of \* \* \* percent in January-March 1985.

There were no margins of underselling by Japanese clear 5mm or 3mm mirrors. Margins of underselling by Belgian clear 3mm mirrors ranged from a high of \* \* \* percent in January-March 1984 to a low of \* \* \* percent in January-March 1985.

Exchange rates.--Exchange rate indices of the Japanese yen, the Belgian franc, the Italian lira, the Portuguese escudo, the Turkish lira, the British pound, and the West German mark indicate that during the interval January 1983-December 1985 the quarterly nominal value of the Japanese yen advanced sharply by 13.9 percent against the U.S. dollar, whereas the respective values of the currencies of Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and

West Germany depreciated 9.7 percent, 20.1 percent, 43.0 percent, 65.3 percent, 6.2 percent, and 6.8 percent relative to the dollar (table 13).

Because of fairly low inflation rates relative to that in the United States, changes in the real value of the British pound, the Japanese yen, the Belgian franc, and the West German mark were not greatly different from changes in the nominal value. In contrast, the high levels of inflation in Italy, Portugal, and Turkey resulted in the devaluation of the currencies of each of the aforementioned countries in real terms by 0.1 percent, 2.1 percent, and 10.9 percent, respectively, relative to the U.S. dollar, significantly less than the respective apparent depreciations of 20.1 percent, 43.0 percent, and 65.3 percent, respectively, represented by the nominal devaluation.

#### Lost sales

For 1983-85, eight U.S. producers reported losing sales of at least \$220,000 to imports of the subject article from Belgium, \$1.3 million to imports from FR Germany, \$13,000 to imports from Italy, an unspecified amount to imports from Japan, \$165,000 to imports from the United Kingdom, and \$181,000 to imports from Turkey. No lost sales were alleged in connection with imports from Portugal. In all, U.S. producers identified 42 dealers and distributors to which sales had been lost on one or more occasion as a result of these firms' preference for imports--9 for imports from Belgium, 21 for imports from FR Germany, 1 for imports from Italy, 5 for imports from Japan, 6 for imports from the United Kingdom, and 4 for imports from Turkey (some firms were mentioned in connection with more than 1 country). Nearly all were contacted by the Commission. With two exceptions, 1/ those contacted reported that they had, indeed, on one or more occasion purchased importedlehr end and stock sheet mirrors produced in one or more of the countries in question in favor of those produced in the United States. Those that had purchased material from Belgium, FR Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and Turkey cited price as the major factor in their decision. They added, however, that the price differential which made the European product more attractive in 1983 and 1984 had eroded by late 1985 because of the continuing drop in the value of the dollar relative to European currencies. Currently, according to these buyers, there was very little, if any, difference in price between the European- and U.S.-produced product. Those that had purchased material from Japan invariably cited quality as the primary factor in their decision. In this connection purchasers mentioned such factors as precision cutting, consistency in size and color, lack of surface irregularity, resistance to black edge, and precision packaging, all of which they claimed make Japanese mirrors superior to mirrors produced in the United States or Europe and for which they are willing to pay a premium. 2/ They added, however, that the

---

1/ One buyer that was alleged to have purchased the Turkish product and the sole buyer that was alleged to have purchased the Italian product denied that they had ever done so. They reported purchasing the subject product from FR Germany and the United Kingdom only.

2/ The purchasers of the Japanese-produced articles reported paying prices that were 5 to 20 percent higher than prices for the comparable U.S.-produced articles.

Table 13.—Exchange rates 1/: Nominal-exchange-rate equivalents of selected currencies in U.S. dollars, real-exchange-rate equivalents, and producer price indicators in specified countries 2/ indexed by quarters, January 1983–December 1985

Period	U.S.				Belgium				Italy				Japan				Portugal			
	Pro-	Pro-	Nominal-	Real-	Pro-	Pro-	Nominal-	Real-	Pro-	Pro-	Nominal-	Real-	Pro-	Pro-	Nominal-	Real-	Pro-	Pro-	Nominal-	Real-
	ducer	ducer	exchange-	exchange-	ducer	ducer	exchange-	exchange-	ducer	ducer	exchange-	exchange-	ducer	ducer	exchange-	exchange-	ducer	ducer	exchange-	exchange-
	Price	Price	rate	rate	Price	Price	rate	rate	Price	Price	rate	rate	Price	Price	rate	rate	Price	Price	rate	rate
	Index	Index	index	index	Index	Index	index	index	Index	Index	index	index	Index	Index	index	index	Index	Index	index	index
	Dollars/franc				Dollars/lira				Dollars/yen				Dollars/escudo							
	100.0				100.0				100.0				100.0							
1983:																				
Jan.-Mar...	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Apr.-June...	100.3	102.0	95.5	97.2	101.6	94.7	95.9	95.9	99.0	99.2	99.2	98.0	104.9	91.0	91.0	95.2	104.9	91.0	91.0	95.2
July-Sept...	101.2	105.7	89.2	93.2	103.9	88.8	91.2	91.2	99.2	97.1	97.1	95.2	115.8	75.6	75.6	86.5	115.8	75.6	75.6	86.5
Oct.-Dec...	101.8	108.7	86.9	92.8	107.4	86.0	90.7	90.7	98.6	100.6	100.6	97.4	122.8	72.1	72.1	87.0	122.8	72.1	72.1	87.0
1984:																				
Jan.-Mar...	102.9	110.7	85.7	92.2	110.8	84.1	90.6	90.6	98.7	102.1	102.1	97.9	132.6	69.2	69.2	89.2	132.6	69.2	69.2	89.2
Apr.-June...	103.5	112.5	85.7	93.2	113.3	83.5	91.3	91.3	98.6	102.6	102.6	97.8	138.6	66.7	66.7	89.3	138.6	66.7	66.7	89.3
July-Sept...	103.3	111.9	80.3	87.0	114.8	77.7	86.2	86.2	99.4	96.8	96.8	93.2	142.4	60.7	60.7	83.7	142.4	60.7	60.7	83.7
Oct.-Dec...	103.1	112.1	76.9	83.6	117.0	74.0	83.9	83.9	99.1	95.9	95.9	92.1	151.6	56.7	56.7	83.4	151.6	56.7	56.7	83.4
1985:																				
Jan.-Mar...	102.9	113.3	72.4	79.7	120.0	69.1	80.6	80.6	99.5	91.5	91.5	88.5	164.3	51.9	51.9	82.9	164.3	51.9	51.9	82.9
Apr.-June...	103.0	113.1	76.2	83.7	122.8	70.9	84.5	84.5	98.8	94.0	94.0	90.2	168.9	53.1	53.1	87.1	168.9	53.1	53.1	87.1
July-Sept...	102.2	111.2	82.2	89.4	122.7	73.7	88.5	88.5	97.7	98.7	98.7	94.3	172.5	54.7	54.7	92.3	172.5	54.7	54.7	92.3
Oct.-Dec...	102.9	109.6	90.3	96.2	128.6	79.9	99.9	99.9	95.4	113.9	113.9	105.7	4/ 176.7	57.0	57.0	4/ 97.9	4/ 176.7	57.0	57.0	4/ 97.9

See footnotes at end of table.

Note.--January-March 1983=100.0.



**APPENDIX A**

**COMMERCE'S AND COMMISSION'S FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES**

(C-489-601)

**Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation: Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes From Turkey****AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Commerce.**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On the basis of a petition filed in proper form with the United States Department of Commerce, we are initiating a countervailing duty investigation to determine whether manufacturers, producers, or exporters of mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes (mirrors) from Turkey as described in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, receive benefits which constitute subsidies within the meaning of the countervailing duty law. We are notifying the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action, so that it may determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Turkey materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. The ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before May 16, 1986. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before June 25, 1986.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 29, 1986

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary Martin, Office of Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-2830.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****The Petition**

On April 1, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers. The petition was filed on behalf of the United States industry producing mirrors. In compliance with the filing requirements of § 355.28 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 355.28), the petition alleges that manufacturers, producers, or exporters in Turkey of the subject merchandise receive subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Since Turkey is a "country under the Agreement" within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, Title VII of the Act applies to this investigation and the ITC is required to determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Turkey materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

**Initiation of Investigation**

Under section 702(c) of the Act, we must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth the allegations necessary for the initiation of a countervailing duty investigation, and, further, whether it contains information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting the allegations. We have examined the petition on mirrors from Turkey and have found that it meets the requirements of section 702(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 702(b) of the Act we are initiating a countervailing duty investigation to determine whether manufacturers, producers, or exporters in Turkey of mirrors receive benefits which constitute subsidies. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before June 25, 1986.

**Scope of Investigation**

The products covered by this investigation are unfinished glass mirrors 15 square feet or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, edging, or framing, classifiable in the *Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (TSUSA)* under item 544.5400, and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 544.11 through 544.41.

**Allegations of Subsidies**

The petition alleges that manufacturers, producers, or exporters in Turkey of mirrors receive benefits under the following programs which constitute subsidies. We are initiating an investigation on the following allegations:

- Export Tax Rebate and Supplemental Tax Rebate
- Resource Utilization Support Fund (RUSF)
- Export Revenue Tax Deduction
- Foreign Exchange Allocation and/or Duty Free Imports
- General Incentives Program (GIP)
  - Interest Rebates
  - Income and Corporation Tax Allowances
  - Customs Duty Exemption on Imports of Capital Equipment

**Notification ITC**

Section 702(d) of the Act requires us to notify the ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonconfidential information. We will also allow the ITC access to all privileged and confidential

information in our files, provided it confirms that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under an administrative protective order without the consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

**Preliminary Determination by ITC**

The ITC will determine by May 18, 1986, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of mirrors from Turkey materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If its determination is negative, this investigation will terminate; otherwise it will proceed according to the statutory procedures.

**Gilbert B. Kaplan,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

April 21, 1986.

[FR Doc. 86-9500 Filed 4-29-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-03-M

---

---

**Notices****Federal Register****Vol. 51, No. 82****Tuesday, April 29, 1986**

---

---

**International Trade Administration****[A-423-601]****Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes from Belgium; Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation****AGENCY:** International Trade Administration, Import, Administration, Department of Commerce.**ACTION:** Notice.

---

**SUMMARY:** On the basis of a petition filed in proper form with the United States Department of Commerce, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes (mirrors) from Belgium as described in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. We are notifying the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action so that it may determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Belgium materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If this investigation proceeds normally, the ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before May 16, 1986, and we will

make ours on or before September 8, 1986.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 29, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary S. Clapp, Office of Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-1769.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**The Petition**

On April 1, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers. The petition was filed on behalf of the United States industry producing mirrors. In compliance with the filing requirements of § 353.36 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 353.36), the petition alleges that imports of the subject merchandise from Belgium are being, or are likely to be, sold in United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and that these imports materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry.

**Initiation of Investigation**

Under section 732(c) of the Act, we must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth the allegations necessary for the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation and, further, whether it contains information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting the allegations.

We have examined the petition on mirrors from Belgium and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 732 of the Act, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before September 8, 1986.

**Scope of Investigation**

The products covered by this investigation are unfinished glass mirrors 15 square feet or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, edging, or framing, classifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (TSUSA) under Item 544.5400 and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 541.11 through 544.41.

**United States Price and Foreign Market Value**

The petitioners based United States price on average unit values, f.o.b. origin, of U.S. imports of mirrors from Belgium derived from the Bureau of Census import statistics and price quotes obtained by U.S. manufacturers. Using prices quotes petitioners arrived at average unit values, f.o.b. origin of U.S. imports by subtracting estimated charges for ocean freight, U.S. dealer markup, insurance, customs duties and U.S. inland freight.

Petitioners based home market price on actual transaction prices delivered to Belgium wholesalers in the home market. Petitioners then compared home market price with the cost of production derived from the cost components of a Belgium mirror manufacturer. Home market prices were shown to be below cost. Therefore, petitioners have alleged sales below the cost of production. We will investigate this allegation. The petitioners, therefore, based foreign market value on a weighted-average constructed value equal to the cost of production, as derived from the Belgium manufacturer, plus eight percent profit.

Based on the comparison of these estimated values, petitioners allege average dumping margins for 1985 ranging from 19.96 percent to 39.83 percent.

**Notification of ITC**

Section 732(d) of the Act requires us to notify the ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonconfidential information. We will also allow the ITC access to all privileged and confidential information in our files, provided it confirms that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under an administrative protective order without the written consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

**Preliminary Determination by ITC**

The ITC will determine by May 16, 1986, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of mirrors from Belgium materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If its determination is negative, this investigation will terminate; otherwise, it will proceed according to the statutory procedures.

Dated: April 27, 1986.

Gilbert B. Kaplan,  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 86-9500 Filed 4-28-86 6:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-H

[A-428-603]

**Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes from the Federal Republic of Germany: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On the basis of a petition filed in proper form with the United States Department of Commerce, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes from the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), as described in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. We are notifying the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action so that it may determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from the FRG materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If this investigation proceeds normally, the ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before May 16, 1986, and we will make ours on or before September 8, 1986.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 29, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary S. Clapp, Office of Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-1769.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**The Petition**

On April 1, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers. The petition was filed on behalf of the United States industry producing mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes. In compliance with the filing requirements of § 353.36 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 353.36), the petition alleges that imports of the subject merchandise from the FRG are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the

Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and that these imports materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry.

#### Initiation of Investigation

Under section 732(c) of the Act, we must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth the allegation necessary for the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation and, further, whether it contains information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting the allegations.

We have examined the petition on mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes from the FRG and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 732 of the Act, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before September 8, 1986.

#### Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are unfinished glass mirrors 15 square feet or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, edging, or framing, classifiable in the Tariff Schedule of the United States Annotated (TSUSA) under item 544.5400 and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 541.11 through 544.41.

#### United States Price and Foreign Market Value

The petitioner based U.S. price on actual sales or offers made by German producers to U.S. purchasers. Using this price data, the petitioner arrived at average unit values, f.o.b. origin, of U.S. imports by subtracting estimated charges for ocean freight, insurance, customs duties, and U.S. inland freight.

The petitioner based home market price on actual transaction prices, delivered to wholesalers in the FRG. The petitioner then compared home market price with an average German cost of production from the estimated cost components of German mirror producers. Since home market price was shown, on average, to be below the cost of production, there is an allegation of sales below the cost of production. We will investigate this allegation. The petitioner based foreign market value on constructed value equal to the cost of production plus eight percent profit.

Based on the comparison of these estimated values, petitioner alleges average dumping margins ranging from 12.77 percent to 47.06 percent.

#### Notification of ITC

Section 732(d) of the Act requires us to notify the ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonconfidential information. We will also allow the ITC access to all privileged and confidential information in our files, provided it confirms that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under an administrative protective order without the written consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

#### Preliminary Determination by ITC

The ITC will determine by May 16, 1986, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes from the FRG materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If its determination is negative, this investigation will terminate; otherwise, it will proceed according to the statutory procedures.

April 21, 1986.

Gilbert B. Kaplan;

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 86-9501 Filed 4-29-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3501-03

[A-475-602]

#### Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes From Italy: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On the basis of a petition filed in a proper form with the United States Department of Commerce, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes (mirrors) from Italy as described in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. We are notifying the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action so that it may determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Italy materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If this

investigation proceeds normally, the ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before May 16, 1986, and we will make ours on or before September 8, 1986.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 29, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary S. Clapp, Office of Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-1769.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### The Petition

On April 1, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers. The petition was filed on behalf of the United States industry producing mirrors. In compliance with the filing requirements of § 353.36 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 353.36), the petition alleges that imports of the subject merchandise from Italy are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and that these imports materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry.

##### Initiation of Investigation

Under section 732(c) of the Act, we must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth the allegations necessary for the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation and, further, whether it contains information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting the allegations.

We have examined the petition on mirrors from Italy and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 732 of the Act, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before September 8, 1986.

##### Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are unfinished glass mirrors 15 square feet or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, edging, or framing, classifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States

Annotated (TSUSA) under item 544.5400 and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 541.11 through 544.41.

#### United States Price and Foreign Market Value

The petitioners based United States price on average unit values, f.o.b. origin, of U.S. imports of mirrors from Italy derived from the Bureau of Census import statistics and price quotes obtained by U.S. manufacturers. Using price quotes petitioners arrived at average unit values, f.o.b. origin of U.S. imports by subtracting estimated charges for ocean freight, U.S. dealer markup, insurance, customs duties and U.S. inland freight.

Petitioners based home market price on price quotes for products delivered to Italian wholesalers in the home market. Petitioners then compared home market price with an average producer's cost of production derived from the cost components of an Italian mirror manufacturer. Home market price was shown to be below cost. Therefore, petitioners have alleged sales below the cost of production. We will investigate this allegation. The petitioners based foreign market value on weighted-average constructed value equal to the cost of production, as derived from an Italian manufacturer and European float glass producer, plus eight percent profit.

Based on the comparison of these estimated values, petitioners allege average dumping margins by quarters for 1985 ranging from 13.94 percent to 103 percent.

#### Notification of ITC

Section 732(d) of the Act requires us to notify the ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonconfidential information. We will also allow the ITC access to all privileged and confidential information in our files, provided it confirms that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under an administrative protective order without the written consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

#### Preliminary Determination by ITC

The ITC will determine by May 16, 1986, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of mirrors from Italy materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If its determination is negative, this investigation will terminate;

otherwise, it will proceed according to the statutory procedures.

April 21, 1986.

Gilbert B. Kaplan,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 86-9502 Filed 4-29-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-05

[A-588-603]

#### Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes From Japan; Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation

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

#### ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: On the basis of a petition filed in proper form with the United States Department of Commerce, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and lehr end sizes (mirrors) from Japan as described in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. We are notifying the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action so that it may determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Japan materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If the investigation proceeds normally, the ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before May 16, 1986, and we will make ours on or before September 8, 1986.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 29, 1986.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary S. Clapp, Office of Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-1769.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### The Petition

On April 1, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers. The petition was filed on behalf of the United States industry producing mirrors. In compliance with the filing requirements of § 353.36 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 353.36), the petition alleges that imports of the subject merchandise from Japan are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act),

and that these imports materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry.

#### Initiation of Investigation

Under section 732(c) of the Act, we must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth the allegations necessary for the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation and, further, whether it contains information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting the allegations.

We have examined the petition on mirrors from Japan and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 732 of the Act, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before September 8, 1986.

#### Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are unfinished glass mirrors, 15 feet or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, edging, or framing, classifiable in the Tariff Schedule of the United States Annotated (TSUSA) under item 544.5400 and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 541.11 through 544.41.

#### United States Price and Foreign Market Value

The petitioners based United States price on average unit values, f.o.b. origin, of United States imports of mirrors from Japan derived from the Bureau of Census, Import statistics.

The petitioners based foreign market value on average unit values of delivered home market prices. Petitioners also made comparisons basing foreign market value on weighted-average constructed value.

Based on the comparison of these estimated values, petitioners allege average dumping margins ranging from 24.39 percent to 70.05 percent.

#### Notification of ITC

Section 732(d) of the Act requires us to notify ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonconfidential information. We will also allow the ITC access to all privileged and confidential

information in our files, provided it confirms that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under an administrative protective order without the written consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

#### **Preliminary Determination by ITC**

The ITC will determine by May 16, 1986, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of mirrors from Japan materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If its determination is negative, this investigation will terminate; otherwise, it will proceed according to the statutory procedures.

Gilbert B. Kaplin,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

April 21, 1986.

[FR Doc. 86-9503 Filed 4-29-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-471-601]

#### **Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes From Portugal; Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On the basis of a petition filed in proper form with the United States Department of Commerce, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and Lehr end sizes from Portugal as described in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. We are notifying the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action so that it may determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from Portugal materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If this investigation proceeds normally, the ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before May 16, 1986, and we will make ours on or before September 8, 1986.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 29, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary S. Clapp, Office of Investigation, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-1759.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **The Petition**

On April 1, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers. The petition was filed on behalf of the United States industry producing mirrors in stock sheet and Lehr end sizes. In compliance with the filing requirements of § 353.36 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 353.36), the petition alleges that imports of the subject merchandise from Portugal are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and that these imports materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry.

#### **Initiation of Investigation**

Under section 732(c) of the Act, we must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth the allegations necessary for the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation and, further, whether it contains information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting the allegations.

We have examined the petition on mirrors in stock sheet and Lehr end sizes from Portugal and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 732 of the Act, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and Lehr end sizes are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before September 8, 1986.

#### **Scope of Investigation**

The products covered by this investigation are unfinished glass mirrors 15 square feet or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, edging, or framing, currently classifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (TSUSA) under item 544.5400 and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 541.11 through 544.41.

#### **United States Price and Foreign Market Value**

The petitioner based United States price on average unit values, f.o.b. origin, of United States imports of mirrors from Portugal as derived from the Bureau of Census import statistics.

The petitioner based foreign market value on average unit values of import prices of European Economic Community mirrors as being

representative of prices in the home market. Petitioner also made comparisons basing foreign market value on weighted-average constructed value.

Based on the comparison of these estimated values, the alleged average dumping margins range from 57.15 percent to 88.13 percent.

#### **Notification of ITC**

Section 732(d) of the Act requires us to notify the ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonconfidential information. We will also allow the ITC access to all privileged and confidential information in our files, provided it confirms that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under an administrative protective order without the written consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

#### **Preliminary Determination by ITC**

The ITC will determine by May 16, 1986 whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of mirrors in stock sheet and Lehr end sizes from Portugal materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If its determination is negative, this investigation will terminate; otherwise, it will proceed according to the statutory procedures.

Gilbert B. Kaplan,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

April 21, 1986.

[FR Doc. 86-9504 Filed 4-29-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-D-M

[A-412-601]

#### **Mirrors in Stock Sheet and Lehr End Sizes From the United Kingdom: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** On the basis of a petition filed in proper form with the United States Department of Commerce, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet and Lehr end sizes from the United Kingdom (U.K.), as described in the "Scope of Investigation" section of this notice, are being, or are likely to be, sold in the



United States at less than fair value. We are notifying the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) of this action so that it may determine whether imports of the subject merchandise from the U.K. materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If this investigation proceeds normally, the ITC will make its preliminary determination on or before May 18, 1986, and we will make ours on or before September 8, 1986.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 29, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mary S. Clapp, Office of Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 377-1769.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**The Petition**

On April 1, 1986, we received a petition in proper form filed by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers. The petition was filed on behalf of the United States industry producing mirrors in stock sheet andlehr end sizes. In compliance with the filing requirements of § 353.36 of the Commerce Regulations (19 CFR 353.36), the petition alleges that imports of the subject merchandise from the U.K. are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and that these imports materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry.

**Initiation of Investigation**

Under section 732(c) of the Act, we must determine, within 20 days after a petition is filed, whether the petition sets forth the allegations necessary for the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation and, further, whether it contains information reasonably available to the petitioner supporting the allegations.

We have examined the petition on mirrors in stock sheet andlehr end sizes from the U.K. and have found that it meets the requirements of section 732(b) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with section 732 of the Act, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether mirrors in stock sheet andlehr end sizes are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. If our investigation proceeds normally, we will make our preliminary determination on or before September 8, 1986.

**Scope of Investigation**

The products covered by this investigation are unfinished glass mirrors 15 square feet or more in reflecting area, which have not been subjected to any finishing operation such as beveling, etching, edging, or framing, classifiable in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (TSUSA) under item 544.5400 and made of any of the glass described in TSUS items 541.11 through 544.41.

**United States Price and Foreign Market Value**

The petitioner based U.S. price on actual sales or offers made by a U.K. producer to U.S. purchasers. Using this price data, the petitioner arrived at average unit values, f.o.b. origin, of U.S. imports by subtracting estimated charges for ocean freight, insurance, customs duties, and U.S. inland freight.

The petitioner based foreign market value on transaction prices, delivered to wholesalers in the United Kingdom.

Based on the comparison of these estimated values, the petitioner alleges average dumping margins ranging from 50.01 percent to 60.35 percent.

**Notification of ITC**

Section 732(d) of the Act requires us to notify the ITC of this action and to provide it with the information we used to arrive at this determination. We will notify the ITC and make available to it all nonprivileged and nonconfidential information. We will also allow the ITC access to all privileged and confidential information in our files, provided it confirms that it will not disclose such information either publicly or under an administrative protective order without the written consent of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

**Preliminary Determination by ITC**

The ITC will determine by May 18, 1986, whether there is a reasonable indication that imports of mirrors in stock sheet andlehr end sizes from the U.K. materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a United States industry. If its determination is negative, this investigation will terminate; otherwise, it will proceed according to the statutory procedures.

April 21, 1986.

Gilbert B. Kaplan,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 86-9505 Filed 4-29-1986; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-06-M

conference to be held in connection with these investigations.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission hereby gives notice of the institution of preliminary countervailing duty investigation No. 701-TA-273 (Preliminary) under section 703(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671b(a)) to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from Turkey of unfinished glass mirrors, 15 square feet and over in reflecting area, provided for in item 544.54 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, which are alleged to be subsidized by the Government of Turkey. As provided in section 703(a), the Commission must complete preliminary countervailing duty investigations in 45 days, or in this case by May 16, 1986.

The Commission also gives notice of the institution of preliminary antidumping investigations Nos. 731-TA-320-325 (Preliminary) under section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673(a)) to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured, or is threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, and the United Kingdom of unfinished glass mirrors, 15 square feet and over in reflecting area, provided for in item 544.54 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, which are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value. As provided in section 733(a), the Commission must complete preliminary antidumping investigations in 45 days, or in these cases by May 16, 1986.

For further information concerning the conduct of these investigations and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Part 207, Subparts A and B (19 CFR Part 207), and Part 201, subpart A through E (19 CFR Part 201).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 1, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Larry Reavis (202-523-0296), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 701 E Street NW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired individuals may obtain information on this matter by contacting

<sup>1</sup> Mirrors which have not been subjected to any finishing operation, such as edging, beveling, etching, or framing.

the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-724-0002. Information may also be obtained via electronic mail by accessing the Office of Investigations' remote bulletin board system for personal computers at 202-523-0103.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

These investigations are being instituted in response to a petition filed on April 1, 1986, by the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers, Potomac, MD.

##### **Participation in the Investigations**

Persons wishing to participate in these investigations as parties must file an entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in § 201.11 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 201.11), not later than seven (7) days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register. Any entry of appearance filed after this date will be referred to the Chairwoman, who will determine whether to accept the late entry for good cause shown by the person desiring to file the entry.

##### **Service list**

Pursuant to § 201.11(d) of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 201.11(d)), the Secretary will prepare a service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to these investigations upon the expiration of the period for filing entries of appearance. In accordance with §§ 201.18(c) and 207.3 of the rules (19 CFR 201.18(c) and 207.3), each document filed by a party to these investigations must be served on all other parties to the investigations (as identified by the service list), and a certificate of service must accompany the document. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

##### **Conference**

The Commission's Director of Operations has scheduled a conference in connection with these investigations for 9:30 a.m. on April 23, 1986, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, 701 E Street NW., Washington, DC. Parties wishing to participate in the conference should contact Robert Eninger (202-523-0312) not later than April 21, 1986, to arrange for their appearance. Parties in support of the imposition of countervailing and/or antidumping duties in these investigations and parties in opposition to the imposition of such duties will each be collectively allocated an hour

(Investigations Nos. 701-TA-273 (Preliminary) and 731-TA-320-325 (Preliminary))

**Certain Unfinished Mirrors From Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom**

**AGENCY:** United States International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Institution of preliminary countervailing duty and antidumping investigations and scheduling of a

within which to make an oral presentation at the conference.

**Written Submissions**

Any person may submit to the Commission on or before April 29, 1986, a written statement of information pertinent to the subject of these investigations, as provided in § 207.15 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 207.15). A signed original and fourteen (14) copies of each submission must be filed with the Secretary to the Commission in accordance with § 201.8 of the rules (19 CFR 201.8). All written submissions except for confidential business data will be available for public inspection during regular business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary to the Commission.

Any business information for which confidential treatment is desired must be submitted separately. The envelope and all pages of such submissions must be clearly labeled "Confidential Business Information." Confidential submissions and requests for confidential treatment must conform with the requirements of § 201.8 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 201.8).

Authority: These investigations are being conducted under authority of the Tariff Act of 1930, title VII. This notice is published pursuant to § 207.12 of the Commission's rules (19 CFR 207.12).

Issued: April 4, 1986.

By order of the Commission.

Kenneth R. Mason,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 86-7801 Filed 4-8-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-M

---



APPENDIX B

LIST OF WITNESSES AT THE COMMISSION'S CONFERENCE

In the matter of: :

UNFINISHED MIRRORS FROM : Investigation

BELGIUM, THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC : Nos. 7C1-TA-273

OF GERMANY, ITALY, JAPAN, : and 731-TA-320

PORTUGAL, TURKEY, AND THE : through 325

UNITED KINGDOM :

- - - - - X

**Wednesday, April 23, 1986**

**COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT.**

**JEFFREY ANSPACHER, Office of Economics**

**A P P E A R A N C E S:**

**In support of the imposition of countervailing  
and antidumping duties:**

**Stewart and Stewart -- Counsel**

**Washington, D.C.**

**on behalf of**

**The National Association of Mirror**

**Manufacturers:**

**Carl Flair, Vice President,**

**Binswanger Mirror Corp.**

**Drew Hayberry, President,**

**Carolina Mirror Corp.**

**William B. McNeil, Vice President--**

**Treasurer, Carolina Mirror Corp.**

**Richard E. Turner, President,**

**Falconer Glass Industries, Inc.**

**Robert E. Stroupe, President and**

**Treasurer, Stroupe Mirror Co.**

**James E. Mack, Executive Secretary and**

**General Counsel, National**

**Association of Mirror Manufacturers**

**Eugene L. Stewart, Esq.--of Counsel**

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

In opposition to the imposition of countervailing  
and antidumping duties:

Bess & Hardies -- Counsel

Washington, D.C.

on behalf of

General Glass International Corp.

Joseph S. Kaplan, Esq.

Stephen M. Creskoff, Esq. -- of Counsel

Finley, Kumble, Jager, Heine, Unterberg, Manley &

Casey -- Counsel

Washington, D.C.

on behalf of

Bowman Webber Limited, United Kingdom

Michael J. Calhoun

Alexander P. Haig -- Of Counsel

Michael Calabrese

Brownstein, Zelnick and Schomer -- Counsel

Washington, D.C.

on behalf of

Japanese manufacturers and importers

Irvin P. Altschuler, Esq.

David B. Amerine, Esq. -- Of Counsel



## APPEARANCES: (Continued)

Olmer, Berne, Larence, Glickman & Curtis -- Counsel

Cleveland, Ohio

on behalf of

Glaverbel SA, Belgium

Morton L. Stone

Ronald H. Isroff -- Of Counsel

Peter A. Rose

Hudge, Rose, Guthrie, Alexander & Ferdon -- Counsel

Washington, D.C.

on behalf of

Flabeg GmbH, FR Germany

David P. Houlihan

Julia C. Menioza -- Of Counsel

White and Case -- Counsel

Washington, D.C.

on behalf of

The Government of Turkey

John MacAvoy -- Of Counsel



