

of nitrate manufacturers to discontinue its production. Over the last half century, the nitrate eyeglass frame has become the preferred plastic frame of professional ophthalmologists and optometrists because of its durability and quality stability. It is a known and accepted fact in the industry that nitrate is superior to other plastic materials because of its ability to retain shape under adverse conditions and changes of climate. Retention of shape, and ability to hold the position of the lenses is an important feature of an eyeglass frame and is essential to good vision, since the adjustment and position of the lenses in the frame is directly related to the interpretation of the doctor's prescription. Further, nitrate material will accept a much higher finish and has a greater resistance to body acids than other types of plastics.

It is also a matter of public record that imported eyeglass frames have not had an adverse impact upon the industry in the United States. In October of last year, the Tariff Commission presented a detailed report to the President on the conditions of the eyeglass frame industry in this country. This report was the culmination of a thorough investigation by the Commission, which was instituted under section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by a petition of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers. In its report, the Commission unanimously found that both production and profits in the industry had increased substantially from 1962 to 1966 and, further, that the increase in the volume of imports over the same period had not caused, nor did it threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry.

We believe that the growth of the industry in this country is in part due to the imaginative styling of European-made frames. The fact is that imports have been the proximate cause of the industry moving from a period where eyeglass frames were nothing more than prosthetic devices, to the stage where fashion considerations have stimulated and increased consumption. The ability of imported frames to compete in the U.S. market is not due to any price advantage. Indeed, in most cases, European-made frames sell at prices substantially higher than domestic frames. Rather, as found by the Tariff Commission, it is the new shapes, colors and decorations created by importers which have stimulated the demand for imported frames. The style innovations introduced by importers have also stimulated the domestic industry into producing more fashionable eyeglass frames which have been well received by consumers.

It is submitted that the record of the nitrate eyeglass frame of over fifty years of safe, efficient and beneficial service to the public militates against any curtailment of its availability and continued use in this country. H.R. 16906 is not, on its face, designed to serve the public interest and we urge the Committee to reject this attempt to place an unjustified embargo on imported eyeglass frames.

Mr. BURKE. Our next witness is the barber and beauty shop equipment industry, Mr. John A. Dlouhy.

Before you proceed, Congressman Rostenkowski of Chicago is very interested in your testimony and regrets that he is unable to be here. He is going to read it in its entirety.

You may identify yourself for the record.

STATEMENT OF JOHN DLOUHY, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, EMIL J. PAIDAR CO.

Mr. DLOUHY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John Dlouhy. I live in Chicago and am employed as executive vice president at the Emil J. Paidar Co., a manufacturer of barber chairs for the past 60 years.

Last November I represented that industry at a formal U.S. tariff hearing as the cost spokesman discussing the relative costs of manufacturing not only here in the United States, but in Japan and Hong Kong.

As a result of a manufacturing investigation, representatives from the Armour Research Foundation and the Illinois Institute of Technology were sent to the Orient in 1961 to explore the feasibility of a joint