

It is clear that there was no leveling off during this period as imports in 1953 were more than 34% higher than 1952 and 50% higher in 1954.

Many domestic manufacturers were disillusioned by the complete distortion of the facts by their government, lost all hope of any help, discharged their employees and closed their plants. This was a further loss to the nation.

By 1957 imports of scissors and shears that the Tariff Commission had found in 1954 causing a threat of serious injury had reached over five million pairs. More than half the firms manufacturing scissors and shears in 1950 had reluctantly dismissed their skilled labor, disposed of their productive equipment and facilities, and either dropped all contact with the industry or become jobbers of imported scissors and shears. There were only 23 firms manufacturing scissors and shears in 1958 in the United States. Many were on the brink of closing down because of the flood of low cost imports when the members of the Association decided that another application should be filed with the Tariff Commission for a second escape clause investigation.

The application was filed on August 29, 1958 with respect to serious injury to the domestic industry from imports of scissors and shears valued over \$1.75 per dozen. The Tariff Commission instituted the investigation on September 3, 1958, and on February 25, 1959, made a report finding, "that scissors and shears are not being imported in such increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products". The domestic industry in making application followed the determination made by the Tariff Commission in 1953-54 that the minimum importers' selling price of imports entered in the over-\$1.75-per-dozen classification is about \$4.80 per dozen. The effects of imports of scissors and shears valued over \$1.75 per dozen was applied to domestic production valued over \$4.80 per dozen. The Tariff Commission in the second investigation did not follow their earlier determination. However, in the 1959 report it was stated that the "finding and conclusion would not have been different had it considered the domestic industry to be coextensive with the domestic production of scissors and shears valued at more than \$4.80 per dozen".

The Shears, Scissors and Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association challenges this statement. An important table in the Tariff Commission report was designated as number 9. In this table shipments of the domestic industry of scissors and shears of *all* values were added to import of *only* scissors and shears valued over \$1.75 per dozen to obtain apparent consumption and the ratio of imports to consumption and to shipments.

The ratio of imports to consumption and shipments were shown as follows:

[In percent]

Year or period	Ratio of imports to—	
	Consumption	Shipments
1953.....	14.0	16.2
1954.....	14.8	17.3
1955.....	15.0	17.6
1956.....	15.3	18.0
1957.....	16.9	20.1
January-September:		
1957.....	15.6	18.3
1958.....	16.3	19.4

To be consistent, either shipments of the domestic industry valued over \$4.80 per dozen should be compared with imports valued over \$1.75 per dozen, *or* all imports should have been compared with all shipments of the domestic industry. Either of these proper comparisons would have given a true picture and one entirely different from that shown in Table 9.