between "importers" and "domestic producers", include such American companies as Admiral, General Electric, Motorola, Magnavox, and Westinghouse, to name just a few. That these companies are just as much American producers as any of the companies for which the Parts Division speaks is patently obvious. Collectively they employ hundreds of thousands of workers in the United States in the production of billions of dollars worth of U.S.-made products. They need no defense from any one as to their overwhelming standing as U.S. producers of electronic articles.

The Parts Division accuses these "importers" of wanting "to protect their investment in foreign plants" while the Parts Division "U.S. producers" want "to protect [their] investment in American plants, and . . . the employment which [their] U.S. investment has created."

The weakness of the merits of their case is thus sharply outlined by resort to this type of shocking invective. Of course it is true that some of the member companies in the Consumer Products Division have investments in foreign plants and obviously they desire to protect these investments. Their interest in protecting their foreign investments no doubt is matched by the interest of some of the member companies of the Parts Division who also have extensive investments abroad. We do not find it strange that these member companies of the Parts Division should take this attitude toward their foreign holdings and we are not prepared to label such an approach as "un-American".

But the member companies of the Consumer Products Division—some of whom are named above—have far greater investments in the United States which call for a greater protective attitude. This is so obvious as not to require any listing of the billions of dollars of investment which our companies have in United States plants and facilities. We know that the Committee on Ways and Means fully appreciates that the companies who oppose the Parts Division's request for quota restrictions on electronic articles are acting out of a reasoned concern for their own U.S. interests and the interests of their U.S. workers.

CONCLUSION

We respectfully submit that there is no case for the imposition of quotas on imports of consumer electronic products and parts and components.

ALFRED R. MCCAULEY, *Special Counsel.*

(The following letter and attachment were subsequently received by the committee:)

GRAUBARD, MOSKOVITZ & MCCAULEY,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1968.

JOHN M. MARTIN, Esq.,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Ways and Means,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I am enclosing a memorandum of the Magnavox Company, dated September 17, 1967, which opposes any move to remove the present temporary partial suspension of duty on imported color television picture tubes.

Because of developments at the hearing on June 25, 1968, we respectfully request that the memorandum be inserted at the conclusion of Mr. George E. Fezell's testimony on that date. For the record, the Consumer Products Division of the Electronic Industries Association supports the Magnavox position as reflected in this memorandum.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED R. MCCAULEY,
Special Counsel to Consumer Products Division, Electronic Industries Association.

MEMORANDUM OF THE MAGNAVOX CO. ON COLOR TELEVISION PICTURE TUBES

I. INTRODUCTION

The Tube Division of the Electronic Industries Association (EIA)[1] and the Imports Committee of that Division, under date of July 11, 1967, filed a joint

[1] The Electronic Industries Association (EIA) is the national industrial organization of electronic manufacturers in the United States. EIA is composed of a number of divisions, one of which is the Tube Division. Another division of EIA is the Consumer Products Division of which the Magnavox Company is a member.

It is important here to note that the Tube Division does not, indeed cannot, speak for the Electronic Industries Association; it speaks only for its own division.