Adjustment of the Shelter Deduction

Section 13912 of the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, Chapter 3, Title XIII, Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, Pub. L. 103– 66, enacted August 10, 1993, (the Leland Act) amended section 5(e) of the Food Stamp Act to change procedures for adjusting the excess shelter deduction cap. Prior to the Leland Act, the excess shelter deduction cap was adjusted annually based on changes in the shelter, fuel and utilities components of housing costs in the CPI-U published by BLS. The Leland Act, however, mandated increases in the shelter cap effective July 1, 1994, and October 1, 1995, and an elimination of the cap effective January 1, 1997. The shelter cap amounts effective for Fiscal Year 1995 were announced in a General Notice published in the **Federal** Register on March 14, 1994 at 59 FR 11761, and in a proposed rule on Excess Shelter Expense Limit and Standard Utility Allowances published in the Federal Register on November 22, 1994. For the convenience of the reader, however, we are restating those amounts below.

MAXIMUM SHELTER DEDUCTIONS FOR HOUSEHOLDS WITHOUT ELDERLY OR DISABLED MEMBER

[Effective 07-01-94 through 09-30-95]

48 States and DC	\$231
Alaska	402
Hawaii	330
Guam	280
Virgin Islands	171

(7 U.S.C. 2011-2032)

Adjustment of the Homeless Household Shelter Expense

Section 11(e)(3)(E) of the Food Stamp Act requires the Secretary to prescribe rules requiring state agencies to develop standard estimates of the shelter expenses that may reasonably be expected to be incurred by households in which all members are homeless but which are not receiving free shelter throughout the month. 7 U.S.C. Sec. 2020(e)(3)(E). In recognition of the difficulty State agencies may face in gathering the necessary information to compute standard shelter estimates for their States, the Secretary offered a standard estimate which may be used by all State agencies in lieu of their own estimates.

In the Deduction and Disaster Provisions from the Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act final rule, published at 56 FR 63613 (December 4, 1991), the Department stated that it would annually adjust the homeless household shelter expense each October 1 using the same changes in the shelter, fuel and utilities component of the CPI used in indexing the shelter cap. This year's homeless household shelter expense is \$139.

Dated: January 4, 1995.

Ellen Haas,

Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services.

[FR Doc. 95–636 Filed 1–10–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410–30–U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [A-549-813]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 11, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michelle Frederick or John Brinkmann, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0186 or 482–5288, respectively.

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION: We preliminarily determine that canned pineapple fruit (CPF) from Thailand is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 733 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the "Act")(1994). The estimated margins of sales at less than fair value are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the initiation of this investigation on June 28, 1994 (59 FR 34408), the following events have occurred.

On July 25, 1994, the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC") issued an affirmative preliminary injury determination in this case (see ITC Investigation No. 731–TA–706).

On August 3, 1994, we named the following four companies as the respondents in this investigation: Dole Food Company, Inc., Dole Packaged Foods Company, and Dole Thailand, Ltd. (collectively "Dole"); The Thai Pineapple Public Co., Ltd. ("TIPCO"); Siam Agro Industry Pineapple and

Others Co., Ltd. ("SAICO"); and Malee Sampran Factory Public Co., Ltd. ("Malee"). These four companies accounted for at least 60 percent of the exports of CPF to the United States during the period of investigation (POI) (January through June 1994) (see Memorandum from Team to Richard W. Moreland, dated August 3, 1994). Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.42(b)(1994), we issued antidumping duty questionnaires to the four companies on August 5, 1994.

Section A of the Department's questionnaire requesting general information concerning the company's corporate structure and business practices, the merchandise under investigation that it sells, and the sales of the merchandise in all markets was received from the four respondents on September 2, 1994. We analyzed each respondent's home market and third country sales of the subject merchandise in accordance with 19 CFR 353.48(a)(1994), and determined that the home market was not viable for any of the respondents. Germany was selected as the appropriate third country market for all respondents in accordance with 19 CFR 353.49(b)(1994).

On August 10, 1994, Dole requested that the POI be modified to coincide with its fiscal half-year accounting period. We accepted Dole's proposal on August 18, 1994, and modified the POI for Dole to cover that period from January 2, 1994, through June 18, 1994 (see Memorandum from Gary Taverman to Barbara R. Stafford, dated August 18, 1994). The POI was not modified for the other three respondents.

On August 10 and 24, 1994, Dole claimed that for purposes of reporting U.S. sales, it was impossible for the company to distinguish between its pineapple grown and canned in Thailand and its pineapple grown and canned in the Philippines. Therefore, Dole requested that it be allowed to report all of its U.S. sales of CPF, including those of Philippine origin, for each product category. Dole then proposed that an allocation ratio based on 1993 shipments to the United States be applied to determine the share of Thai-origin CPF sold during the POI. By doing so, Dole stated the Department could calculate a less than fair value margin for Dole's U.S. sales of Thaiorigin merchandise during the POI based on a ratio of Thai origin to Thai and Philippine origin merchandise.

In addition, Dole requested that it be allowed to exclude all sales of 5.5 ounce cans of crushed pineapple which accounted for an insignificant volume of its U.S. sales. Dole claimed that this