

common practice in the PRC to include insurance as part of inland freight.

Specifically, for CEIEC, respondents claim that the Department verified that foreign brokerage charges were included in ocean freight and hence, this expense should not be valued separately.

Regarding CEIEC's ocean freight, the charges were incurred in U.S. dollars. Therefore, respondents argue that CEIEC's actual shipping should be used.

For HIED, respondents claim that the Department verified that foreign inspection charges were not incurred.

Hence, no deduction should be made for this expense in the final determination.

Finally, for Minmetals' ocean freight, respondents ask the Department to take the average amount Minmetals paid in U.S. dollars for shipping on most of its U.S. sales on market carriers and use that amount to value the shipping for its remaining sale.

Petitioners argue that an amount for insurance should be added to foreign inland freight because the Department found numerous situations where insurance was included as part of the freight charges paid by the respondents. Regarding the specific exporters, petitioners generally refute respondents' claims. Much of their discussion is proprietary in nature. Hence, the details are not presented here.

DOC Position: We have made deductions for all expenses incurred in shipping the merchandise to the United States (see CFR 353.41(d)(2)(i)). If an expense was not incurred, no deduction was made. With respect to insurance for foreign inland freight, we have made deduction only where we verified that insurance was included in the inland freight charge.

We have not used CEIEC's actual freight because an NME carrier was used. We have made the adjustment by using a surrogate ocean freight which includes brokerage and handling. No additional deduction for brokerage and handling was made. Thus, there is no double counting of brokerage and handling.

For HIED, we disagree that we made any deduction for inspection charges at the preliminary determination. As stated in Comment 12, the Department does not adjust for differences in selling expenses because we do not know enough about the selling expenses included in the surrogate SG&A to make an adjustment. Thus, for the final determination, the Department has continued not to make a deduction for this expense for any respondent.

Finally, for Minmetals, we used the shipping rate proposed by respondents for the single U.S. sale where shipping was paid in RMB.

Comment 14: Respondents argue that a type of packing material identified by the Department in its verification report of CMIECHN/CNIECHN's supplier should not be used to calculate FMV because this packing material was not used for POI sales.

DOC Position: The sales in question were not found to be outside the POI, as respondents claim. Therefore, we have calculated the FMV for these sales using the estimated weight of the packing material used for these sales.

Comment 15: According to respondents, both the statute and the Department's regulations require that internal taxes remitted or refunded upon export are to be excluded from the calculation of the constructed value.

Further, these respondents argue that the Department verified that the value added tax (VAT) paid by the exporters to the manganese metal producers is reimbursed by the PRC government upon exportation of the merchandise. Therefore, according to respondents, the Department should deduct VAT from all direct material inputs used to determine the cost of manufacture and which were refunded by the PRC government when subject merchandise was exported. The respondents also submit an alternative suggestion for a VAT adjustment in which the Department increases the export price by the amount of the VAT they receive from the PRC government upon exportation of the merchandise.

The petitioners claim that the PRC government does not refund VAT on material inputs, rather, the refund is on the final product. Additionally, the VAT is not incorporated in the FMV calculation, because the inputs are valued using Indian surrogate values which do not incorporate a VAT. Petitioners claim that respondents' alternative to increase the U.S. price is without merit, and that the Department correctly excluded VAT from the U.S. price-to-FMV comparison.

DOC Position: The Department's factors of production calculation uses Indian surrogate values which are exclusive of Indian taxes. Because the FMV is net of taxes, neither a downward adjustment to FMV nor the alternative upward adjustment to USP suggested by respondents is necessary.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d)(1) and 735(c)(4)(B) 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:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Margin percent
CEIEC	10.27
CMIECHN/CNIECHN	0.86
HIED	3.72
Minmetals	4.36
PRC-wide Rate	143.32

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. As our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine whether these imports are causing material injury, or threat of material injury to the industry in the United States, within 45 days. If the ITC determines that material injury, or threat of material injury, does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted will be refunded or canceled. If the ITC determines that such injury does exist, the Department will issue an Antidumping Duty Order directing Customs officials to assess antidumping duties on all imports of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the effective date of the suspension of liquidation.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.20(a)(4).

Dated: October 27, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-27369 Filed 11-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Pakistan

October 31, 1995.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 31, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ross Arnold, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port or call (202) 927-6714. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482-3715.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854).

Special shift previously applied to the 1995 limit for Category 361 is being reduced. As a result the limit for Category 360 is increased.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the **CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States** (see Federal Register notice 59 FR 65531, published on December 20, 1994). Also see 60 FR 9014, published on February 16, 1995; and 60 FR 52898, published on October 11, 1995.

The letter to the Commissioner of Customs and the actions taken pursuant to it are not designed to implement all of the provisions of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, but are designed to assist only in the implementation of certain of their provisions.

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

October 31, 1995.

Commissioner of Customs,

Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on February 13, 1995, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton and man-made fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in Pakistan and exported during the twelve-month period beginning on January 1, 1995 and extending through December 31, 1995.

Effective on October 31, 1995, you are directed to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing:

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit ¹
360	1,630,063 numbers.
361	3,315,821 numbers.

¹ The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1994.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,
D. Michael Hutchinson,
Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.
[FR Doc. 95-27409 Filed 11-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

New York Mercantile Exchange Proposed Option Contracts on Permian Basin Natural Gas Futures and Palo Verde and California/Oregon Border Electricity Futures Contracts

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the terms and conditions of proposed commodity options contract.

SUMMARY: The New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX or Exchange) has applied for designation as a contract market in Permian Basin natural gas futures options, Palo Verde electricity futures options, and California/Oregon Border electricity futures options. The Acting Director of the Division of Economic Analysis (Division) of the Commission, acting pursuant to the authority delegated by Commission Regulation 140.96, has determined that publication of the proposals for comment is in the public interest, will assist the Commission in considering the views of interested persons, and is consistent with the purposes of the Commodity Exchange Act.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 6, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Interested persons should submit their views and comments to Jean A. Webb, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street, NW, Washington, DC 20581. Reference should be made to the NYMEX Permian Basin natural gas option contract or the Palo Verde and California/Oregon Border electricity option contracts.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please contact Richard Shilts of the Division of Economic Analysis,

Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Center, 1155 21st Street, NW, Washington, DC 20581, telephone 202-418-5275.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Copies of the terms and conditions will be available for inspection at the Office of the Secretariat, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581. Copies of the terms and conditions can be obtained through the Office of the Secretariat by mail at the above address or by phone at (202) 418-5097.

Other materials submitted by the NYMEX in support of the applications for contract market designation may be available upon request pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Commission's regulations thereunder (17 CFR Part 145 (1987)), except to the extent they are entitled to confidential treatment as set forth in 17 CFR 145.5 and 145.9. Requests for copies of such materials should be made to the FOI, Privacy and Sunshine Act Compliance Staff of the Office of the Secretariat at the Commission's headquarters in accordance with 17 CFR 145.7 and 145.8.

Any person interested in submitting written data, views, or arguments on the proposed terms and conditions, or with respect to other materials submitted by the NYMEX, should send such comments to Jean A. Webb, Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Three Lafayette Centre, 1155 21st Street NW, Washington, DC 20581 by the specified date.

Issued in Washington, DC, on October 31, 1995.

Blake Imel,

Acting Director.

[FR Doc. 95-27374 Filed 11-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Federal Interagency Coordinating Council Meeting (FICC)

AGENCY: Federal Interagency Coordinating Council, Education.

ACTION: Notice of a public meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice describes the schedule and agenda of a forthcoming meeting of the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council. Notice of this meeting is required under section 685(c) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended, and is intended to notify the general public of their opportunity to attend the meeting. The meeting will be accessible to individuals with disabilities.