Pharmaceutical Products; and the Indian Chemical Weekly (July-November 1993). For the business proprietary input referenced above, we relied upon information submitted by the petitioners (taken from the June-October 1994 Chemical Marketing Report) for a similar input.

To value the manganese ore, we used a 1992 contract price for low-grade manganese ore (26-28% Mn content) between an Indian mine and Japanese purchasers, as published in the July 7, 1992, TEX Report. Although it is our normal practice to apply an inflation adjustment to prices predating the period of investigation, in this case, we have information which indicates that prices for this product have fallen over time. Therefore, we adjusted this price to account for declining manganese ore prices between 1992 and our POI.

To value electricity, we used the April 1992 through March 1993 average taxexclusive price for industrial electricity in India, as provided by the World Bank. To value labor amounts, we used labor rates in Investing, Licensing, and Technology November 1994 (India) as published by the Economist Intelligence Unit. We adjusted the factor values, when necessary, to the POI using wholesale price indices (WPI's) published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

To value factory overhead, we calculated the ratio of factory overhead expenses to the cost of material, labor, and energy for industries involved in "Processing and Manufacture—Metals, Chemicals and products thereof," as reported in the September 1994 Reserve Bank of India Bulletin's (RBI Bulletin). This same source was used to calculate expense (SG&A) as a percentage of cost of manufacturing. Because the RBI percentage was greater than the minimum 10 percent required by the statute, we used the SG&A percentage calculated from the RBI Bulletin. With respect to profit, we used the statutory minimum of 8 percent of materials, labor, energy, overhead, and SG&A costs calculated for each factory.

Best Information Available

Potential exporters identified by MOFTEC failed to respond to our questionnaire. In the absence of responses from these and other PRC exporters during the POI, we are basing the PRC-wide rate on the best information available (BIA). When a company refuses to provide information requested in the form required, or otherwise significantly impedes the Department's investigation, it is appropriate for the Department to assign to the company the higher of (a) the

highest margin alleged in the petition, or (b) the highest calculated rate of any respondent in the investigation (see Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products. Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products. and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Belgium (Belgium Steel) 58 FR 37083, July 9, 1993). Since some PRC exporters failed to respond to our questionnaire, we are assigning any exporter not granted a separate rate the highest margin alleged in the November 8, 1994 petition.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we will verify information relied upon in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(1)of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of manganese metal from the PRC, as defined in the "Scope of the Investigation" section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated dumping margins, as shown below. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacture/producer/exporter	Margin percent
CEIEC CMIECHN/CNIECHN HIED Minmetals PRC-Wide Rate	132.22 82.44 148.82 148.24 148.82

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry within 75 days after our final determination.

Public Comment

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room B-099, within ten days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number;

(2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38, case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary no later than September 27, 1995, and rebuttal briefs no later than September 29, 1995. A hearing, if requested, will be held on October 3, 1995, at 2:00 p.m. at the U.S. Department of Commerce in Room 1815. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours prior to the scheduled time. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.38(b), oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. We will make our final determination not later than 135 days after the publication of this preliminary determination in the Federal Register. This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.15(a).

Dated: June 5, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-14567 Filed 6-13-95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

Department of Energy, 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, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 95–008. Applicant: U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20585. Instrument: Fuel Cell. Manufacturer: Fuji Electric Company, Japan. Intended Use: See notice at 60 FR 13699, March 14, 1995. Reasons: The foreign instrument, the last of three ordered on July 13, 1992, provides a liquid cooled phosphoric acid fuel cell with a net power output of 47.5kW that is suitable for propulsion of a passenger bus prototype. Advice Received From: The Jet Propulsion Laboratory, November 10, 1993.

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, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the foreign instrument was ordered.

The Jet Propulsion Laboratory advises that (1) this capability is pertinent to the