and adequate evidence and meet the statutory requirements for initiation. *See* Initiation Checklist, dated September 8, 1998 (public document on file in the Central Records Unit of the Department of Commerce, Room B–099).

Allegation of Critical Circumstances

The petitioners have alleged that critical circumstances exist. To support their allegation, the petitioners have provided evidence in the petition of a trend of increasing imports recently and the potential for even greater increases in the near future. The petitioners also provided evidence suggesting the person by whom, or for whose account, ERT is imported knew or should have known that the merchandise was being sold at less than fair value and that there was likely to be material injury as a result. In taking into consideration the foregoing, we find that the petitioners have alleged the elements of critical circumstances and supported it with reasonably available information. We, therefore, will investigate this matter further.

Initiation of Antidumping Investigation

Based upon our examination of the petition, we have found that the petition meets the requirements of section 732 of the Act. Therefore, we are initiating an antidumping duty investigation to determine whether imports of ERT from India are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless this deadline is extended, we will make our preliminary determination by January 26, 1999.

Distribution of Copies of the Petition

In accordance with section 732(b)(3)(A) of the Act, a copy of the public version of the petition has been provided to the representatives of the government of India. We will attempt to provide a copy of the public version of the petition to the exporter named in the petition.

International Trade Commission Notification

We have notified the ITC of our initiation, as required by section 732(d) of the Act.

Preliminary Determination by the ITC

The ITC will determine by October 2, 1998, whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured, or is threatened with material injury by reason of imports of ERT from India. A negative ITC determination will result in the investigation being terminated; otherwise, this investigation will proceed according to statutory and regulatory time limits.

This notice is published pursuant to sections 732(d) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: September 8, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–24750 Filed 9–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–423–602]

Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Belgium; Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Extension of time limit for final results of antidumping duty administrative review of industrial phosphoric acid from Belgium.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') is extending the time limit for the final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of the antidumping order on industrial phosphoric acid from Belgium. This review covers 1 producer/exporter of industrial phosphoric acid. The period of review is August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas Futtner, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482–4195 or 482–3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act'') are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351.101, et seq. (62 FR 27296—May 19, 1997).

Extension of Preliminary Results

The Department initiated this administrative review on September 25, 1997 (62 FR 50292). Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. Because of the complexity of an issue in this case, it is not practicable to complete this review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. The Department, therefore, is extending the time limit for the final results of the aforementioned review to October 8, 1998. See memorandum from Maria Harris Tildon to Robert S. LaRussa, which is on file in Room B–099 at the Department's headquarters.

This extension of time limit is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: September 8, 1998.

Maria Harris Tildon,

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

[FR Doc. 98–24747 Filed 9–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–122–814]

Pure Magnesium From Canada; Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the final results of the fifth review of the antidumping duty order on pure magnesium from Canada. The period of review is August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997. This extension is made pursuant to Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zak Smith, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0189.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (*i.e.*,

September 9, 1998), the Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for completion of the final results to not later than November 9, 1998. *See* September 4, 1998 Memorandum from Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement Richard W. Moreland to Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration Joseph A. Spetrini on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, B–099 of the Department.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(1)) and 19 CFR section 351.213.

Dated: September 4, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 98–24745 Filed 9–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–533–816]

Notice of Initiation of Countervailing Duty Investigation: Elastic Rubber Tape from India

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Hansen or Javier Barrientos at (202) 482–1276 and (202) 482–4207, respectively, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Initiation of Investigation

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

The Petition

On August 18, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a petition filed in proper form by or on behalf of Fulflex, Inc., Elastomer Technologies Group, Inc. (Elastomer), and RM Engineered Products, Inc. (RM) (collectively referred to hereinafter as ''the petitioners''). Elastomer and RM are both wholly owned subsidiaries of M-Tec Corporation. A supplement to the petition was filed on September 1, 1998.

In accordance with section 702(b)(1) of the Act, the petitioners allege that manufacturers, producers, or exporters of the subject merchandise in India receive countervailable subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring an industry in the United States. The petitioners estimate the countervailing duty rate for Garware to be 50 percent. This figure is based on the findings of the EU in its Imposition of Provisional Countervailing Duty on Imports of Certain Broad Spectrum Antibiotics Originating in India (OJ L 166/17, Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1204/98, June 11, 1998) and the Department's determination in Certain Iron-Metal Castings from India: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review (63 FR 37534, July 13, 1998).

The petitioners state that they have standing to file the petition because they are interested parties, as defined under sections 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act, and they have demonstrated that they are the only producers of ERT in the United States (*see* ''Determination of Industry Support for the Petition'' section below).

Scope of the Investigation

For purposes of this investigation, the product covered is elastic rubber tape. Elastic rubber tape is defined as vulcanized, non-cellular rubber strips, of either natural or synthetic rubber, 0.006 inches to 0.100 inches (0.15 mm to 2.54 mm) in thickness, and ⅛ inches to 1⅝ inches (3 mm to 42 mm) in width. Such product is generally used in swimwear and underwear.

The merchandise subject to this investigation is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') at subheading 4008.21.00. Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under investigation is dispositive.

During our review of the petition, we discussed scope with the petitioners to insure that the scope in the petitions accurately reflects the product for which they are seeking relief. Moreover, as discussed in the preamble to our regulations (62 FR 27323), we are setting aside a period for parties to raise issues regarding product coverage. The Department encourages all parties to submit such comments by September 29, 1998. Comments should be addressed to Import Administration's Central Records Unit at Room 1870, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230. The period of scope consultations is intended to provide us with ample opportunity to consider all comments and consult with parties prior to the issuance of our preliminary determinations.

Consultations

Pursuant to section 702(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department invited representatives of the Government of India (GOI) for consultations with respect to the petition. On September 1, 1998, the GOI submitted written comments regarding the programs alleged in the petition. Consultations were held on September 4, 1998. See memorandum to the file regarding the consultations with the GOI, dated September 4, 1998 (public document on file in the Central Records Unit of the Department of Commerce, Room B–099).

Determination of Industry Support for the Petition

Section 702(b)(1) of the Act requires that a petition be filed on behalf of the domestic industry. Section 702(c)(4)(A) of the Act provides that a petition meets this requirement if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (1) At least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the ''industry'' as the producers of a domestic like product. Thus, to determine whether the petition has the requisite industry support, the statute directs the Department to look to producers and workers who account for production of the domestic like product. The International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether ''the domestic industry'' has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both the Department and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition of domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to separate and distinct authority. In addition, the Department's determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not