

publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Akzo will be 0.56 percent; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the rate published in the most recent final determination 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 the original investigation; and (4) the "all others" rate will be 24.58 percent, established in the LTFV investigation, and in accordance with the Department's practice. See *Floral Trade Council v. United States*, 822 F. Supp. 766 (2993), and *Federal Mogul Corp.*, 822 F. Supp. (1993).

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

This notice serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 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 a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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: March 16, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-7609 Filed 3-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

**Department of the Interior, 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 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: 94-141. *Applicant:* Department of the Interior, Menlo Park, CA 94025. *Instrument:* SIR Mass Spectrometer, Model PRISM.

Manufacturer: Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 442, January 4, 1995.

Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) an adjustable multicollector with four deep Faraday buckets, (2) an electromagnetic sector analyzer with a 50 cm dispersion and (3) an online elemental analyzer.

Docket Number: 94-148. *Applicant:* Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, Palisades, NY 10964. *Instrument:* Isotope Ratio-Gas Source Mass Spectrometer, Model PRISM. *Manufacturer:* Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 60 FR 443, January 4, 1995. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) an adjustable multicollector with four deep Faraday buckets, (2) an electromagnetic sector analyzer with a 50 cm dispersion and (3) an automatic cold finger for samples as small as 0.2 ml.

These capabilities of each of the foreign instruments described above is pertinent to each applicant's intended purposes. We know of no instrument or apparatus being manufactured in the United States which is of equivalent scientific value to either of the foreign instruments.

Frank W. Creel

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 95-7610 Filed 3-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-F

[C-549-501]

**Certain Circular Welded Carbon Steel
Pipes and Tubes From Thailand:
Preliminary Results of Countervailing
Duty Administrative Review**

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

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on certain circular welded carbon steel pipe and tubes from Thailand. We have preliminarily determined the net subsidy to be 0.73 percent ad valorem for Saha Thai Pipe and Tube Company and all other companies for the period January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. customs to assess countervailing duties as indicated above.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 28, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Penelope Naas and Gary Bettger, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-3534 or 482-2239, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 3, 1993, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" (58 FR 41239) of the countervailing duty order on pipes and tubes from Thailand (50 FR 32751; August 14, 1985). On August 31, 1993, the respondents, the Royal Thai Government (RTG) and Saha Thai Pipe and Tube Company (Saha Thai), requested an administrative review of this order. We initiated a review of the period January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992, on September 30, 1993 (58 FR 51053). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise and nine programs. The final results of the last administrative review in this case were published October 9, 1991 (56 FR 50852).