

While Mr. Curtis in his colloquy with the spokesman for the Parts Division set the record straight and demonstrated the error in this claim of a loss of jobs, we are constrained to add just a few thoughts.

It is patently disingenuous for the Parts Division to take two average monthly employment figures—one the highest average monthly employment in the history of the parts industry and the other a lower monthly figure taken from a slack period—and compare the two and then conclude that some 45,900 workers lost their jobs. It would have been equally wrong for us to have taken the employment figures for April of 1964 and April of 1966 to show a gain in jobs of 102,900. The only relevant employment data here are all of the data, not data selected by the Parts Division or by us. Here are those data :

EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS: ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS INDUSTRY

	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Annual average.....	264.8	307.1	381.5	360.6	(1)
January.....	259.8	280.5	351.9	393.2	352.4
February.....	258.3	283.3	360.9	385.8	352.7
March.....	258.8	286.1	367.9	378.0	374.4
April.....	258.3	290.7	374.3	365.3	² 375.1
May.....	259.4	294.6	378.3	354.9	² 376.0
June.....	260.1	301.7	387.3	344.4	-----
July.....	257.9	303.9	384.1	342.4	-----
August.....	264.4	311.5	392.2	351.5	-----
September.....	270.2	319.1	392.3	351.8	-----
October.....	274.2	330.1	396.3	353.3	-----
November.....	277.6	338.3	395.9	352.6	-----
December.....	279.0	344.8	395.9	354.2	-----

¹ Not available.

² Preliminary.

Sources: Bulletin No. 1312-4 and "Employment and Earnings and Monthly Reports on Labor Force," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

While these data, as all such figures, show some peaks and valleys, it cannot be disputed that employment in the electronic components industry is trending upwards. Employment this year is picking up at a good pace and no doubt 1968 will at least equal and may even top, record 1966 employment.

We submit that these objective employment data in full are the only relevant figures. As with so many other statistical series, selectivity distorts the picture and can be very misleading.

The employment data also attest to the sound economic status of the U.S. electronic parts and components industry. Like the sales figures given previously, they negate any claim of serious injury and support the rejection of a plea for quota relief from imports.

IMPORT QUOTAS WILL HURT THE U.S. PRODUCERS OF CONSUMER ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS

In our main presentation to the Committee on Ways and Means we demonstrated the role imports play in the marketing of all consumer electronic products. We showed how the availability of imports materially assists in the marketing of U.S.-produced articles by permitting the U.S. manufacturer of consumer electronic products to offer a full line of products to the consumer.

The Parts Division attempts to lower our standing before the Committee on Ways and Means by characterizing the members of Consumer Products Division of EIA for whom we speak as "importers and some manufacturers of products such as radios, televisions, tape recorders, and phonographs."

Of course any one who imports a product, even an American tourist who brings back a box of Dutch chocolates, is an importer. To the extent that companies which are members of the Consumer Products Division import some of the products they sell and some of the components they use, they are in that sense "importers".

But to say that because these companies do import some of their products—"They are the importers; we are the domestic producers" is an irresponsible appeal to emotionalism. The companies the Parts Division classifies as "importers" in its attempts to capitalize on the prejudicially-oriented dichotomy