condition it is being entered for consumption and being re-exported later.

Comment 26: Adjusting USP for Transportation Expenses

Petitioner contends that the Department should reduce USP by the expenses the Zhujiang factory incurs to transport persulfates from the plant to the factory's warehouse where ICC takes possession of the merchandise. Petitioner claims that reducing USP by these transportation expenses is in accordance with the Department's policy outlined in *Brake Drums*. Because Zhujiang did not submit factors for these expenses, petitioner requests that the Department use, as facts available, the greatest amounts incurred by any respondent in this investigation for inland freight and brokerage and handling.

Respondents argue that USP should not be adjusted by intra-factory transportation expenses because these expenses are part of factory overhead. Respondents maintain that intra-factory transportation costs are inherently part of factory overhead and it would be very unusual for the Department to reduce USP by such costs, particularly without determining whether the costs have been excluded from the surrogate value for factory overhead. Further, respondents claim *Brake Drums* does not support petitioner's position because in that case the Department reduced factory overhead by the surrogate cost of transportation expenses before deducting foreign inland freight costs from USP. Respondents also note that the facts in the instant case are similar to the facts in *Titanium Sponge From Russia* where the Department did not reduce USP by foreign inland freight expenses (*see Titanium Sponge From the Russian Federation: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* FR 61 58525, 58529 (November 15, 1996) (''*Titanium Sponge From Russia*'')). Specifically, respondents note that like the instant case, in *Titanium Sponge From Russia,* the non-market economy producer, who did not know the ultimate destination of the subject merchandise, incurred foreign inland freight expense selling the subject merchandise to a market economy exporter who took physical possession of the merchandise. Thus, respondents contend the Department should not reduce USP by intra-factory transportation expenses.

DOC Position

We agree with respondents that USP should not be reduced by intra-factory transportation expenses. Section 772 (c)(2)(A) of the Act states that USP should be reduced by expenses which are included in USP and ''incident to bringing the subject merchandise from the original place of shipment in the exporting country to the place of delivery in the United States'' (emphasis added). When a reseller is the exporter rather than the producer, it is the Department's practice to consider the place from which the reseller shipped the merchandise as the ''original place of shipment'' (*see Titanium Sponge From Russia*). Hence, in the instant case the ''original place of shipment'' is Zhujiang's warehouse because the reseller/exporter, Guangdong, shipped the subject merchandise from that point. Thus, transportation costs incurred to bring the merchandise from the plant to the factory's warehouse should not be deducted from USP.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 735(c)(1) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of persulfates from the PRC that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of our notice of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or posting of bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds EP as indicated in the chart below. This suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Weight-average margin percentage
Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Corporation	40.97
Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation	42.18
Guangdong Petroleum Chemical Import & Export Trade Corporation	43.93
China-wide Rate	134.00

The China-wide rate applies to all entries of subject merchandise except for entries from exporters that are identified individually above.

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, within 45 days, whether these imports are causing material injury, or threat of material injury, to an industry in the United States. 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.

Dated: May 12, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–13060 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–806]

Silicon Metal From Brazil; Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Silicon metal from Brazil; Extension of time limit for antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits for its preliminary results in the administrative review of the antidumping order on silicon metal from Brazil. The review covers the period July 1, 1995, through June 30, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 19, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alexander Braier or James C. Doyle, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3818.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit, the Department is extending the time limit for the completion of the preliminary results to July 31, 1997, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). (See Memorandum from

Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce).

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the URAA (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).

Dated: May 9, 1997.

Roland MacDonald,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97–13059 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–808]

Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India; Extension of Time Limit of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit of new shipper antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the final results in the new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rod from India, covering the period January 1, 1996 through June 30, 1996, because the review is extraordinarily complicated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 19, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald Little or Maureen Flannery, 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:

Background

On February 11, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of this review (*see Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India; Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 62 FR 6171). The review covers the period January 1, 1996, through June 30, 1996. We have determined that this review is extraordinarily complicated within the meaning of section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act (*see* Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, Extension of Time Limits for New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India, May 7, 1997). Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the final results to July 11, 1997. This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act.

Dated: May 7, 1997.

Roland L. MacDonald,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97–13056 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Duke University; 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: 97–021. *Applicant:* Duke University, Durham, NC 27708. *Instrument:* ICP Mass Spectrometer, Model PlasmaQuad 3. *Manufacturer:* VG Elemental, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 15657, April 2, 1997.

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, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides analysis of trace elements at less than part per trillion abundance levels with a precision of ±2.0%. This capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 97–13054 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Skidmore College; 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: 97–026. *Applicant:* Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866. *Instrument:* Electron Microscope with Accessories, Model JEM–1010. *Manufacturer:* JEOL, Ltd., Japan. *Intended Use:* See notice at 62 FR 17783, April 11, 1997. *Order Date:* January 31, 1997.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as the instrument is intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the instrument was ordered. *Reasons:* The 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 at the time of order of the instrument.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 97–13053 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

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.