venture. Their recommendations were then simply that it was less expensive to manufacture in the United States. Some 6 years later, with wage costs percentagewise having risen more than 100 percent in Japan, while materials increased from 25 percent to 30 percent, the 1961 engineering recommendations are even more valid. My visit to Japan—more precisely, my 1966 visit to Japanese barber chair manufacturers together with photos of their plants validated this point.

The U.S. Tariff Commission, in their report to the President on Investigation No. TEA–F–7 under section 301(c)(1) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the closest decision in the last 6 years, voted against relief for my company, Paidar, 3 to 2. It is not my attempt to rehash that 3 to 2 decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission. My position is public record, and I am here to lay before Congress supplementary information pertaining to my problem.

In the previous case, eyeglass frames, TEA–I–10, the Commission, in October 1967, was quick to "define" the statutes of the law and thusly, found grounds for rejection of the petitioner on that basis. However, immediately thereafter confronted with our parameter congruent to their established benchmarks, they rendered their decision with a vague thought of "everybody knows the Japanese make things cheaper" attitude. The Commission, in a split decision, using this case as unprecedented platform for generating three additional statements, officially then shifted the blame for this situation to your door.

The Paidar position is quite apparent. The public record in magazines, newspapers, and the like, as well as the obvious investment in tooling and equipment yielded the petitioner as a low-cost producer arguing the stand from the ground up, piece by piece, the Japanese chair was the same cost as the American counterpart, if not more. My exhibit No. 19 in the hearing displayed their model No. 59 as well as their domestic price direct from factory to barber.

Included herein is (1) a thermofax of that exhibit in Japanese; (2) a Takara-Belmont photo of same chair and used by their distribution; and (3) the color illustration of the Paidar advertising piece and, as you can see, is the original design from which units were copied. Although the copying is point enough, let me return to the pricing structure—domestic Japanese price, $197.63; export price and duty evaluation base, $130.00.

(The exhibits referred to are in the committee files.)

Eight months ago, before the U.S. Tariff Commission, as industry cost spokesman, I displayed 24 visual aids and exhibits building this point piece by piece, even Japanese machine by machine. Today, even more conclusive information now validates this.

The separate and supplementary statement by Chairman Metzger who had not been appointed at the time of the November hearing, stated quite clearly:

> Nor is their case necessarily weakened by the fact that there have been no petitions between 1962 and the present time deemed to have gratified for relief under the stringent standards laid down by Congress.

Metzger continued:

> I am not persuaded that identity of treatment of causation criteria in tariff relief and adjustment causes was intended by Congress. To those who would complain this congressional "substantially the same" standard does not go far