Antidumping Proceeding	Period
Korea: Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Plate	
C–580–818	1/1/95–12/31/95
Malaysia: Extruded Rubber Thread	
C–557–806	1/1/95–12/31/95
Mexico: Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate	
C–201–810	1/1/95–12/31/95
Spain: Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate	
C–469–804	1/1/95–12/31/95
Sweden: Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate	
C–401–804	1/1/95–12/31/95
The United Kingdom: Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate	
C–412–815	1/1/95–12/31/95

In accordance with sections 353.22(a) and 355.22(a) of the regulations, an interested party as defined by section 353.2(k) may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. The Department has changed its requirements for requesting reviews for countervailing duty orders. Pursuant to 19 CFR 355.22(a) of the Department's Interim Regulations (60 FR 25137 (May 11, 1995)), an interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by the order for which they are requesting a review. Therefore, for both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin, and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B–099, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their requests to Import Administration, Attention: Sheila Forbes, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 353.31(g) or 355.31(g) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the Federal Register a notice of ''Initiation of Antidumping (Countervailing) Duty Administrative Review,'' for requests received by August 31, 1996. If the Department does not receive, by August 31, 1996, a request for review of entries covered by an order or finding listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute, but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: August 7, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 96–20508 Filed 8–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–614–801]

Fresh Kiwifruit From New Zealand: Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On June 25, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register (61 FR 32771) the notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Fresh Kiwifruit from New Zealand. We are terminating this review as a result of the timely withdrawal by New Zealand Kiwifruit Marketing Board, of its request for the review. New Zealand Kiwifruit Marketing Board was the only interested party that requested this review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 12, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul M. Stolz, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4474.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 3, 1996, New Zealand Kiwifruit Marketing Board, an interested party, requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Fresh Kiwifruit from New Zealand for the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996, pursuant to 751(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. On June 25, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register (61 FR 32771) the notice of initiation of that administrative review. New Zealand Kiwifruit Marketing Board withdrew its request for review on July 3, 1996, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5). There were no other requests for this review. As a result, the Department is terminating this review.

This notice is published in accordance with section 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22.(a)(5)).

Dated: July 29, 1996.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–20501 Filed 8–9–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–122–814]

Pure Magnesium From Canada; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On June 10, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from Canada (61 FR 29343). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments and rebuttal comments received, we have corrected certain clerical errors in the margin calculations. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled ''Final Results of the Review.''

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 12, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Rausher or Richard Rimlinger, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Background

On June 10, 1996, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from Canada (61 FR 29343). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. There was no request for a hearing. The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this review is pure magnesium. Pure unwrought magnesium contains at least 99.8 percent magnesium by weight and is sold in various slab and ingot forms and sizes. Granular and secondary magnesium are excluded from the scope currently classified under subheading 8104.11.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The review covers one Canadian manufacturer/exporter, Norsk Hydro Canada Inc. (NHCI), and the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received a case brief from the petitioner, Magnesium Corporation of America (Magcorp), and we received a case brief and rebuttal brief from the respondent, NHCI.

Comment 1: NHCI argues that the Department's methodology in deducting from NHCI's gross unit price the amounts reported for antidumping and countervailing duty cash deposits is contrary to the antidumping statute and the Department's consistent practice which has been upheld by the Court of International Trade. Respondent claims that only ordinary *ad valorem* import duties, not antidumping and countervailing duty cash deposits, should be deducted from the gross unit price in calculating export price and requests that the Department amend its calculations accordingly.

Department's Position: We agree with NHCI that we incorrectly deducted antidumping and countervailing duty cash deposits from the gross unit price of the U.S. transactions. For these final results, we have deducted only import duties from the gross unit price.

Comment 2: Magcorp claims that the Department appears to have made a clerical error in the margin calculations with respect to currency conversion. Petitioner argues that a currency conversion is not necessary in the calculation of home market price, because there are several instances in the respondent's questionnaire response which indicate that a currency conversion is not necessary in order to calculate the dumping margin. Therefore, petitioner requests that the Department correct its calculations for the final results of review.

NHCI agrees with Magcorp that the Department's margin calculations contain a currency conversion clerical error.

Department's Position: For these final results, we converted into U.S. dollars only those home market price and expense amounts that NHCI reported in Canadian dollars.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Norsk Hydro Canada, Inc	8/1/94–7/31/95	0.00

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to Customs.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for NHCI will be the rate established above; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less than fair value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review, the cash deposit rate will be 21 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in *Pure Magnesium From Canada: Amendment of Final Determination of Sales At Less Than Fair Value and Order in Accordance With Decision on Remand,* 58 FR 62643, November 29, 1993.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as final reminder to importers of their responsibility to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties

occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: August 2, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–20500 Filed 8–09–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Belmont University, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscopes

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.

Docket Number: 96–027. Applicant: Belmont University, Nashville, TN 37212–3757. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model EM208. Manufacturer: Philips, Czechoslovakia. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 28176, June 4, 1996. Order Date: January 17, 1996.

Docket Number: 96–030. Applicant: University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL 36617. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM100. Manufacturer: N. V. Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 28176, June 4, 1996. Order Date: October 13, 1995.

Docket Number: 96–034. Applicant: National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20892–7260. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model JEM–1010. Manufacturer: JEOL Ltd., Japan. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 28176, June 4, 1996. Order Date: September 27, 1995.

Docket Number: 96–035. Applicant: State University of New York, Albany, NY 12222. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model JEM–2010F. Manufacturer: JEOL Ltd., Japan. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 28176, June 4, 1996. Order Date: October 4, 1995.

Docket Number: 96–041. Applicant: Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, GA 30912. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model JEM–1010. Manufacturer: JEOL Ltd., Japan. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 28177, June 4, 1996. Order Date: February 9, 1996.

Docket Number: 96–047. Applicant: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model EM 912 Omega. Manufacturer: LEO Electron Microscopy, Germany. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 28175, June 4, 1996. Order Date: February 27, 1996.

Docket Number: 96–053. Applicant: Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48201. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model JEM–1010. Manufacturer: JEOL Ltd., Japan. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 30220, June 14, 1996. Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: May 14, 1996.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as these instruments are intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the instruments were ordered. Reasons: Each foreign instrument is a conventional transmission electron microscope (CTEM) and is intended for research or scientific educational uses requiring a CTEM. We know of no CTEM, or any other instrument suited to these purposes, which was being manufactured in the United States either at the time of order of each instrument or at the time of receipt of application by the U.S. Customs Service.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 96–20502 Filed 8–09–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

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), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 96–071. Applicant: University of California, Los Alamos National Laboratory, P.O. Box 990, Los Alamos, NM 87545. Instrument: ICP Mass Spectrometer, Model PlasmaQuad. Manufacturer: Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. Intended Use: The instrument will be used to study the transport of ultra low level contaminants in the environment, and trace composition of high purity materials, soils, waters, aerosols in air and biological tissues. Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: July 5, 1996.

Docket Number: 96–072. Applicant: Penn State University, 118 Research Building West, University Park, PA 16802. Instrument: Nano Indentor System, Model UMIS 2001. Manufacturer: CISRO, Australia. Intended Use: The instrument will be used to study interfacial phenomena in engineering materials and the information gathered will be used in mathematical models and will be applied to the design of superior alloys. It is planned to study the mechanical properties of materials as a function of precise location within the microstructure. In addition, the instrument will be used for educational purposes in the courses Esci 414M, Esci 497D, Esci 475, Esci 410H. Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: July 5, 1996.

Docket Number: 96–073. Applicant: University of California, Accounting Office, 400 University Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720. Instrument: High Pressure Freezing Machine, Model HPM 010. Manufacturer: Bal-Tec, Inc., Liechtenstein. Intended Use: The instrument will be used to freeze a wide variety of cells and tissues, including *Drosophila* embryos and *Arabidopsis* plant tissues. In addition, the instrument will be used in electron microscopy courses that teach all the techniques, including rapid freezing, needed to prepare samples and examine them in the electron microscope. Application accepted by Commissioner of Customs: July 11, 1996.

Docket Number: 96–074. Applicant: The Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., 1625 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Instrument: 8M Optical Telescope Primary Mirror. Manufacturer: REOSC Optique, France. Intended Use: The instrument will be