On October 25, 1996, petitioners claimed that publicly available import data contradicted Siderca's claims. Petitioners contended these data showed that Siderca was the shipper of a substantial quantity of OCTG (drill pipe and green tubing) during the period August through December, 1995, and that Siderca was listed as the consignee of each entry. Petitioners noted that none of these entries appeared in official U.S. import statistics. Petitioners also claimed those statistics showed that a very small quantity of seamless casing entered the United States from Argentina in December 1995, and requested that Siderca be asked to explain the exact nature, timing, and details of this shipment.

On October 30, 1996, we sent a no-shipment inquiry regarding Siderca to the U.S. Customs Service (''Customs''). Customs did not indicate that there were records of any consumption entries of OCTG by Siderca during the POR. On November 13, 1996, Siderca asserted in a letter to the Department that none of the six entries of drill pipe and green tubing referenced by petitioners was a consumption entry; rather, Siderca claimed, two of these entries were temporary importation in-bond (''TIB'') entries and four were entries into a foreign-trade zone (''FTZ''). Siderca argued that none of these entries could serve as the basis for an administrative review since they were not imported into the United States for consumption. Siderca also stated that it had no knowledge of, or involvement with, the very small shipment of seamless casing that allegedly entered the United States in December 1995. Siderca surmised that this shipment involved parties other than itself. There is no evidence on the record that would lead us to question this claim by Siderca.

On April 8, 1997, we received official confirmation from Customs that two of the entries of drill pipe and green tubing in question were TIB entries and that the remaining four were FTZ entries. Customs also confirmed that none of these six entries entered the customs territory of the United States during the POR for consumption.

Because the only firm for which a review was requested made no entries into the customs territory of the United States during the POR, we are rescinding this review in accordance with the Department's practice. *See Antidumping Duties; Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 61 FR 7308, 7317, 7365 (February 27, 1996) (section 351.213(d)(3)). The cash deposit rate for this firm will continue to be the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. § 1675 (1995)), and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations (19 CFR § 353.22 (1996)).

Dated: April 10, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–9967 Filed 4–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A489–807]

Antidumpting Duty Order: Certain Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars From Turkey

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 17, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shawn Thompson, Cameron Werker, or Fabian Rivelis, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1776, (202) 482–3874, or (202) 482–3853; respectively.

Scope of Order

The merchandise covered by this order is all stock deformed steel concrete reinforcing bars sold in straight lengths and coils. This includes all hot-rolled deformed rebar rolled from billet steel, rail steel, axle steel, or low-alloy steel. It excludes (i) plain round rebar, (ii) rebar that a processor has further worked or fabricated, and (iii) all coated rebar. Deformed rebar is currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers 7213.10.000 and 7214.20.000. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Antidumping Duty Order

In accordance with section 735(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department made its final determination that rebar from Turkey is being sold at less than fair value (62 FR 9737, March 4, 1997). On April 10, 1997, the International Trade Commission (ITC) notified the Department of its final determination, pursuant to section 735(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, that a regional industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of the subject merchandise from Turkey.

In accordance with section 736(a)(1) of the Act, the Department will direct Customs officers to assess, upon further advice by the administering authority, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the normal value of the merchandise exceeds the export price (or the constructed export price) of the merchandise for all entries of rebar from Turkey. These antidumping duties will be assessed on all unliquidated entries of rebar from Turkey entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after October 10, 1996, the date on which the Department published its preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 53203). On or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, Customs officers must require, at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, a cash deposit equal to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margins as noted below. The ''All Others'' rate applies to all exporters of rebar not specifically listed below.

The ad valorem weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage
Colakoglu Metalurji A.S. or Colakoglu Dis Ticaret (Colakoglu)	9.84
Ekinciler Demir Celik or Ekinciler Dis Ticaret (Ekinciler)	18.68
Habas Sinai Ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S. (Habas)	18.54
Izmir Demir Celik Sanayi A.S. (IDC)	41.80
Izmir Metalurji Fabrikasi Turk A.S. (Metas)	30.16
All Others	16.06

In the final determination, the Department found that critical circumstances exist with respect to exports of rebar from Turkey by all exporters except Colakoglu. However, on April 10, 1997, the ITC notified the Department of its negative determination regarding critical circumstances. As a result of the ITC's determination, pursuant to section 735(c)(3) of the Act, we shall order Customs to terminate the retroactive suspension of liquidation and to release any bond or other security and refund

any cash deposit required under section 733(e)(2) of the Act with respect to entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption prior to October 10, 1996.

This notice constitutes the antidumping duty order with respect to rebar from Turkey. Interested parties may contact the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building, for copies of an updated list of antidumping duty orders currently in effect.

This order is published in accordance with section 736(a) of the Act.

Dated: April 11, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–9968 Filed 4–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Tennessee, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 96–142. *Applicant:* University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Knoxville, TN 37996–1200. *Instrument:* Energy Analyzer and Power Supply, Model SES–200. *Manufacturer:* Scienta Instrument AB, Sweden. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 5619, February 6, 1997. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides an energy resolution of 5 meV (Xe gas phase) using a Gammadata VUV-source and nine predefined pass energies of 2, 5, 10, 20, 40, 75, 150, 300 and 500 eV. *Advice received from:* A domestic manufacturer of electron analyzers, March 27, 1997.

Docket Number: 96–143. *Applicant:* University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487–0209. *Instrument:* Auger XPS Spectrometer. *Manufacturer:* Kratos Analytical Inc., United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 5620, February 6, 1997. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) A combination of magnetic and electrostatic lenses providing a peak sensitivity of 500 000 cps at 10–9 A beam current, (2) charge neutralization and (3) digital control of transfer optics, analyzer, and other instrument functions. *Advice received from:* A U.S. Department of Energy laboratory, March 19, 1997.

Docket Number: 96–145. *Applicant:* Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30322–0834. *Instrument:* Ion-Assisted Deposition System, Model APS 1104. *Manufacturer:* Leybold AG, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 6215, February 11, 1997. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) A proprietary plasma source for ion-assisted deposition, (2) uniform deposition over an area as large as one meter in diameter and (3) ability to operate with lower substrate temperatures than conventional electron beam deposition systems. *Advice received from:* Brookhaven National Laboratory, March 14, 1997.

A domestic manufacturer of electron analyzers, a U.S. Department of Energy laboratory and Brookhaven National Laboratory advise that (1) The capabilities of each of the foreign instruments described above are pertinent to each applicant's intended purpose and (2) they know of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value for the intended use of each instrument.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus being manufactured in the United States which is of equivalent scientific value to any of the foreign instruments.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 97–9964 Filed 4–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Washington University; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 96–136. *Applicant:* Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130–4899. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model MAT 252. *Manufacturer:* Finnigan MAT, Germany. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 5619, February 6, 1997.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) Automated preparation and isotopic analysis of carbonate, CO_2 and O_2 microsamples, (2) an ion collection system with 460 mm deflection radius and (3) mass range of 1–150 at 10 kV. These capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 97–9965 Filed 4–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–122–815]

Pure and Alloy Magnesium From Canada; Final Results of the Third (1994) Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews

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

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

SUMMARY: On October 7, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its preliminary results of administrative reviews of the countervailing duty orders on pure and alloy magnesium from Canada for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 (see *Pure Magnesium and Alloy Magnesium From Canada; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews (Preliminary Results),* 61 FR 52435. We have completed these reviews and determine the net subsidy to be 4.48 percent *ad valorem* for Norsk Hydro Canada, Inc. (NHCI) and all other producers/exporters except Timminco Limited, which has been excluded from these orders. We will instruct the U.S.