export and domestic markets, the benefits from the program should be divided by total sales rather than by total exports. Furthermore, Ceramica Regiomontana argues that the program does not limit the use of imported machinery to production for export products only. According to Ceramica Regiomontana, machinery imported by the company is used for production of merchandise for both export and domestic markets. Ceramica Regiomontana claims that the Department's allocation method in PITEX is incorrect because it does not measure the benefit of the subsidy to the recipient and the proper method of allocation would be based on total sales.

*Department's Position*. We disagree. In order to meet the eligibility criteria for the PITEX program, a company is required to have a proven export record, and to use the imported merchandise (both raw materials and equipment) in the production of goods for export. Since receipt of benefits under PITEX is tied to the company's exports, thereby making the program an export subsidy, the proper basis for allocation of these benefits is total exports, as opposed to total sales. *See Certain Textile Mill Products from Mexico; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review* (56 FR 12175, 12178; March 22, 1991).

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine the total bounty or grant to be zero or *de minimis* for the following 32 companies during the 1992 review period and 2.08 percent *ad valorem* for all other companies. In accordance with 19 CFR 355.7, any rate less than 0.5 percent *ad valorem* is *de minimis*.

(1) Adrian Sifuentes Jimenez.
(2) Agustin Cedillo Ruiz.
(3) Alejandro Estrada Silva.
(4) Apolonio Arias Vasquez.
(5) Arturo Leija Lucio.
(6) Aurelio Cedillo Ruiz.
(7) Azuelejos Decorativos Carrillo, S.A.
(8) Efrain Medina Carrillo.
(9) Emilio Pacheco.
(10) Faustino Nuncio Silva.
(11) Ima Regiomontana, S.A. de C.V.
(12) Industrias Intercontinental, S.A. de C.V.
(13) Internacional de Ceramica, S.A. de C.V.
(14) Javier Leija Lucio.
(15) Jesus Gallegos Loivares.
(16) Jesus Jimenez Lucio.
(17) Jose Arellano Valdez.
(18) Jose Dolores Hernandez.
(19) Jose Silva Romero.
(20) Juan Cortez Coronel.
(21) Leopoldo Montiel Rincon.
(22) Luis Najera Flores.
(23) Luis Paulino Flores.
(24) Norberto Cuellar Zuniga.
(25) O.H. Internacional, S.A. de C.V.
(26) Pedro Lopez Alonso.
(27) Raul Leija.
(28) Recubrimientos Mezquital, S.A. de C.V.
(29) Ricardo Berrones.
(30) Taller de Azuelejos Coloniales.
(31) Vicente Jalomo Reyna.
(32) Zenon Cortez Coronel.

Therefore, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, entries of the subject merchandise from Mexico exported by the 32 companies listed above for the period on or after January 1, 1992, and on or before December 31, 1992, and to assess countervailing duties of 2.08 percent of the f.o.b. invoice price of shipments from all other companies for the same period.

The Department will instruct the Customs Service to collect cash deposits of zero estimated countervailing duties for the 32 companies listed above and 2.08 percent *ad valorem* estimated countervailing duties, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act, on shipments of this merchandise from all other companies entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice. This deposit requirement shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)), 19 CFR 355.22 and 19 CFR 355.25.

Dated: April 7, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95–9275 Filed 4–13–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

---

[C–201–001]

## Leather Wearing Apparel from Mexico; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of changed circumstances countervailing duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** On February 13, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its changed circumstances countervailing duty administrative review. We examined whether Maquiladora Pieles Pitic, S.A. de C.V. (MPP) and Finapiel de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. (Finapiel), two manufacturers/exporters of leather wearing apparel from Mexico to the United States, had received bounties or grants during the first three quarters of 1994. We have now completed this review and determine that neither company received bounties or grants during this time period under any programs previously found countervailable, and, consequently, their cash deposit rate should be zero.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 14, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Albright or Cameron Cardozo, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–2786.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Background

On August 25, 1994, the Department published the final results of the last administrative review of the countervailing duty order on leather wearing apparel from Mexico, covering the January 1, 1992 through December 31, 1992 review period (46 FR 21357; April 10, 1981). In that review, 65 companies which the Government of Mexico (GOM) certified did not receive benefits from the programs under review received a cash deposit rate of zero. All other companies, which did not respond to our questionnaire, including MPP and Finapiel, received a cash deposit rate of 13.35 percent based on best information available.

On December 1, 1994, the GOM requested a changed circumstances review to examine the cash deposit rate applicable to MPP and Finapiel. In its request, the GOM stated that MPP and Finapiel were excluded from the list of GOM-certified zero-benefit recipients submitted to the Department in the recently completed administrative review due to an oversight by the GOM. With its request, the GOM provided company and government certifications that MPP and Finapiel did not apply for or receive any net subsidy during the first three quarters of 1994 from the programs that were previously found countervailable or not-used, and will not apply for or receive any such net subsidy in the future, in accordance with 19 CFR 355.22(a)(2)(1994). The GOM also stated that it has taken steps to ensure that the type of oversight which occurred in this case will not be repeated in future administrative reviews.

On December 21, 1994 (59 FR 65755), the Department initiated a changed circumstances review to examine the cash deposit rate for MPP and Finapiel. On February 13, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its changed circumstances countervailing duty administrative review on leather wearing apparel from Mexico (60 FR 8221). We have now completed this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The review covers the period January 1, 1994 through September 30, 1994, two manufacturers/exporters, and the following programs:

(A) BANCOMEXT Loans and Export Financing
(B) Certificates of Fiscal Promotion (CEPROFI)
(C) FOGAIN
(D) FONEI
(E) State Tax Incentives
(F) PITEX
(G) Import Duty Reductions and Exemptions
(H) Article 15 Loans

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of Mexican leather wearing apparel. These products include leather coats and jackets for men, boys, women, girls, and infants, and other leather apparel products including leather vests, pants, and shorts. Also included are outer leather shells and parts and pieces of leather wearing apparel. This merchandise is currently classifiable under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item numbers 4203.10.4030, 4203.10.4060, 4203.10.4085 and 4203.10.4095. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Act and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received no comments.

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we have determined that, during the first three quarters of 1994, MPP and Finapiel did not use any of the programs examined in the last administrative review of this order (59 FR 43815; August 25, 1994), and therefore their cash deposit rate should be zero.

The Department will instruct the Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation and to collect zero cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties, as provided by the Act, on shipments of Mexican leather wearing apparel from MPP and Finapiel exported on or after the date of publication of this notice of final results of review. These instructions shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This changed circumstances review and notice are in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)(1)) and 19 CFR 355.22(h).

Dated: April 7, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95–9276 Filed 4–13–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

---

## International Trade Administration

### Textile Exporters' Forum; Notice of Open Meeting

A Textile Exporters' Forum will be held on April 27, 1995. The meeting will be from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. in the Main Conference Room on the sixth floor at the office of Milliken & Company, 1045 6th Avenue, New York, New York.

The Forum is sponsored by the Department of Commerce to discuss textile and apparel export issues.

*Agenda:* The Textile Export Management Company (TEXPORT) and working with Export Trading Companies; the status of Electronic Sourcing for the Textile and Apparel Industry; the Economic Outlook for the Textile and Apparel Industry; and the Office of Textiles and Apparel Export Expansion Program.

The meeting will be open to the public with a limited number of seats available. For further information or copies of the minutes, contact William Dawson (202/482–5155).

Dated: April 10, 1995.

Rita D. Hayes,

*Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

[FR Doc. 95–9217 Filed 4–13–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–F

## Foreign-Trade Zones Board

**[Order No. 738]**

### Pursuant to Its Authority Under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as Amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) Adopts the following Order: Grant of Authority for Subzone Status, Gleason Corporation (Gear Production Equipment), Rochester, New York

Whereas, by an Act of Congress approved June 18, 1934, an Act ''To provide for the establishment . . . of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes,'' as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a–81u) (the Act), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) is authorized to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

Whereas, the Board's regulations (15 CFR Part 400) provide for the establishment of special-purpose subzones when existing zone facilities cannot serve the specific use involved;

Whereas, an application from the County of Monroe, New York, grantee of Foreign-Trade Zone 141, for authority to establish special-purpose subzone status at the gear production equipment manufacturing plant of the Gleason Corporation in Rochester, New York, was filed by the Board on March 28, 1994, and notice inviting public comment was given in the Federal Register (FTZ Docket 14–94, 59 FR 17511, 4–13–94); and,

Whereas, the Board has found that the requirements of the FTZ Act and Board's regulations are satisfied, and that approval of the application is in the public interest;

Now, Therefore, the Board hereby authorizes the establishment of a subzone (Subzone 141D) at the Gleason Corporation plant in Rochester, New York, at the location described in the application, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including § 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 7th day of April 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

*Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Import Administration, Alternate Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.*

Attest: John J. Da Ponte, Jr., *Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95–9273 Filed 4–13–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P