

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

June 2, 2023

The Honorable Mike Gallagher
Chairman
House Select Committee on the CCP
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Raja Krishnamoorthi
Ranking Member
House Select Committee on the CCP
Washington, DC 20515

RE: Impact of Tariffs on American Companies

Dear Chairman Gallagher and Ranking Member Krishnamoorthi:

The Americans for Free Trade coalition is a broad alliance of American businesses, trade organizations, and workers united against tariffs. We appreciate the work that the Select Committee on the CCP is undertaking to highlight and address the ongoing economic and national security risks posed by the Chinese Communist Party. We believe it is important to provide Committee members with additional perspective about how the punitive Section 301 tariffs on Chinese products continue to impact U.S. businesses, workers and consumers. We believe this is especially urgent after the Committee's most recent hearing – *Leveling the Playing Field: How to Counter the Chinese Communist Party's Economic Aggression* during which it was suggested that the Section 301 tariffs have been beneficial to the U.S. economy, businesses, and workers and that they should remain in place or even be increased. For the reasons described below, we strongly disagree.

By way of background, [Americans for Free Trade](#) (AFT) represents every part of the U.S. economy including manufacturers, farmers and agribusinesses, powersports, retailers, technology companies, service suppliers, natural gas and oil companies, importers, exporters, and other supply chain stakeholders. Collectively, we employ tens of millions of Americans through our vast supply chains.

For more than four years, AFT has called for an end to the Section 301 tariffs on products from China, which have had a disproportionate economic impact on American companies, consumers, and workers. While we support efforts to hold China accountable for its acts, policies, and practices regarding intellectual property rights theft, forced technology transfers, and innovation, these harmful taxes have not been effective in changing China's behavior. As a result, we have repeatedly called for the Administration to find a new path forward to address China's ongoing unfair trade practices. We believe it is time for a strategic realignment of the tariffs to focus on the original intent of the Section 301 investigation and seek alternate measures, including working with our allies, to achieve the necessary changes in China's behavior.

Until that time, we also believe that the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) should relaunch a fair and transparent exclusion process that is available to all HTS lines impacted by the Section 301 tariffs. A product exclusions process ensures that U.S. businesses have the

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

opportunity to request targeted relief from the tariffs if certain criteria are met. Members of Congress have repeatedly urged USTR to institute a robust process, including through letters sent by [House](#) and [Senate](#) members to Ambassador Tai last year as well as through [appropriations language](#). Yet, USTR has refused to re-establish such an exclusions process and, in fact, stated in its fiscal year [2024 budget justification](#) that it anticipates work relating to the 301 product exclusions process to decrease. This suggests that USTR has no intention of administering a robust exclusions process in the next fiscal year. We therefore believe it is important for Congress to insist that USTR make a products exclusions process available immediately and for as long as Section 301 tariffs remain in place.

In addition to the Section 301 tariffs, we are concerned about recent suggestions in hearing testimony that Congress should move to revoke China's Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status. As the Committee knows, revocation of PNTR would significantly increase the tariff rates for many products, both finished goods and inputs to production. But it is important to note that as with the Section 301 tariffs, it will be U.S. businesses who pay that additional cost, not the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) or exporters in China. This would result in higher prices for American families. Everyday products such as toys, shoes, clothing, and consumer electronics could see tariff rates of 50 percent or more when combined with the Section 301 tariffs. The U.S. economy is already grappling with high inflation and high interest rates, and further shocks such as significantly higher tariff rates on imports from China could cause significant economic hardship across the U.S. economy. Finally, any serious deliberation regarding the revocation of PNTR status for China must include economic studies as well as robust consultations with stakeholders to ensure a clear understanding of the full range of implications for American businesses, workers, and consumers.

I. American Businesses Pay the Section 301 Tariffs, Not China

Since April 2018, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has assessed more than [\\$180 billion](#) in Section 301 tariffs on American companies who import products from China. These taxes continue to create tremendous uncertainty, increase the cost of doing business in the United States, and place a financial burden on American businesses – negatively impacting their ability to invest in their companies, hire more American workers, innovate new technologies, and remain competitive globally. The tariffs also impact American consumers. While many companies have tried to absorb the costs of the tariffs, others have had to pass along the increased costs to final consumers.

AFT has argued for years that American companies, not China, bear the economic brunt of the tariffs. Those who argue otherwise are simply ignoring reality. This was confirmed by the non-partisan, independent U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC) in its recent [report](#) entitled “Certain Effects of Section 232 and 301 Tariffs Reduced Imports and Increased Prices and Production in Many U.S. Industries”. The report states: “U.S. importers bore nearly the full cost of these tariffs because import prices increased at the same rate as the tariffs. The USITC estimated that prices increased by about 1 percent for each 1 percent increase in the tariffs under Sections 232 and 301.”



While we would have liked to have seen a more fulsome discussion in the USITC report regarding the Section 301 tariffs' impact on downstream industries and consumers, we welcomed the report and were pleased that it confirmed the economic impact of the Section 301 tariffs that we have been discussing for years. As part of the study, AFT shared materials, including a list of Studies on Economic Impact of Tariffs – 2018-2022 and a list of Articles on the Impact of Tariffs, which we have also attached for your reference.

During recent testimony before the House Ways & Means Committee, Ambassador Tai noted that USTR is currently undertaking its “necessity review” of the China Section 301 tariffs, which is required by statute. This exercise began last year on the four-year anniversary of the Section 301 tariffs, and it is unlikely that USTR will announce the outcomes of this review before the tariffs' five-year anniversary. While we believe USTR must move expeditiously to announce determinations related to its review, it is imperative that this review is fair and transparent. We are disappointed that the review has not included a public hearing – something USTR offered when promulgating Lists 1-4 tariffs and that the USITC offered in crafting its recent economic impact report. While written comments are extremely important, they alone do not provide the same opportunity for companies to tell their story about the ongoing impact of the tariffs and answer questions from the Section 301 Committee as a public hearing would provide.

That said, we encourage Members of Congress to insist that USTR use the necessity review process to conduct a holistic assessment of whether the tariffs have achieved their stated objectives, as identified in the underlying Section 301 report from 2018, and provide a full picture of the impact the tariffs have had to the U.S. economy, as well as American businesses, workers, and consumers. USTR should seriously consider whether the Section 301 tariffs truly are necessary to change the PRC's behavior and whether they have unnecessarily harmed the U.S. economy, workers, manufacturers, farmers, ranchers, and service-providers.

II. Section 301 Tariffs' Impacts on American Businesses and Consumers

As part of the Section 301 necessity review, AFT provided USTR with feedback from a number of coalition partners regarding the negative impacts that the tariffs have had on their businesses, workers and consumers. We have provided some of those stories below.

a. Tariffs Make U.S. Manufacturers Less Competitive

Proponents of the Section 301 tariffs claim that lifting them – and even offering a targeted product exclusions process – would harm domestic manufacturing. We strongly disagree with that sentiment. While protecting domestic manufacturing was never the stated purpose of the Section 301 tariffs, they have been harmful to manufacturers by taxing inputs they need to produce more products domestically.

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

Consider the case of one manufacturer who has been producing speakers in the United States since 1949. This manufacturer produces speakers for nearly every audio application - mass transit, aerospace, medical equipment, professional audio, motorcycles, home audio, etc.

Because it is one of the last companies that still builds speakers in the United States, the company has been unable to find domestic suppliers who can produce the specialty parts required for the speakers. To be globally competitive, the company must buy its components primarily from China where their global competitors purchase their parts. Unfortunately, these parts are on List 3 and are subject to an additional 25% tariff. The company described this as “a direct addition of 25% to our cost of goods sold.” The company further stated that its competitors who import completed speakers made in China only pay a 7.5% tariff. The company said this makes it “less competitive than [its] USA competitors who import complete products made in China with no USA labor content” and that it is essentially “penalized for building speakers in America.”

Because of the significant impact to its ability to compete, the company said it is now “moving more manufacturing out of the USA.” In other words, the tariffs have *disincentivized* manufacturing in the United States.

An information technology company told us something similar. This American business pays tariffs on parts and components listed on Lists 3 and 4a and initially paid over \$350 million per year in Section 301 tariffs. The company moved some of its supply chain from China to Mexico to reduce this duty burden by a little more than half, but these increased costs were eventually passed along to customers through price increases. The company previously sought product exclusions on key parts and components under the Trump Administration – a process which no longer exists – but was denied. Because the company cannot source the parts and components from anywhere other than China, it is now considering whether to move its manufacturing to Mexico and then import the products into the United States duty-free – putting 1,300 American jobs in jeopardy.

The tariffs have also prevented small American businesses from growing. We spoke with a company that produces home theater accessories, and it described the impact of the tariffs on its products – which are on List 3 – as follows:

The tariff impacted us in three major ways. 1. The best manufacturers are all located in China for our products. Finding new manufacturers, even here in the US, was difficult to secure due to the premium level of our technology and design. Also with COVID happening immediately after List 3 was released, traveling abroad to find other manufacturers was impossible. 2. If we did find a manufacturer that was at our standard, the additional cost of building new tools, that had already been made and paid for in China, was a very hard burden on our small company. Also, we have to certify a good portion of our goods and any new product created from a new tool has to go through recertification at a cost that was also unbearable to our small business. 3. Being a brand new business, we secured funding to build and grow our brand, and immediately 20% of

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

the funding went to a cost via the tariff that I had slated for new technology and product development, employees, and programs with our retail partners. It stunted our growth. Though there are more, these three actions have cost us in multiple ways the ability to grow and compete with businesses that have been around much longer.

Another small business we spoke with imports industrial magnets from China that are incorporated into devices that work in vehicle engines to conserve fuel. The business owner produces these devices in the United States. The business owner told us that the Section 301 tariffs have added a million dollars to his costs in the past several years. He described the impact as follows: *“With this money I could have added at least one more engineer and support staff in the US. I also have European competitors who don't have the extra 25% cost. It's throwing money down a hole and makes no sense.”*

We spoke with another American manufacturer that produces a plastic material used in the development of U.S.-made parts for autos, farm equipment, transportation equipment and more. The value of the material comes largely from two key properties – hardness and rigidity. But to achieve these two key properties, the material must first be mixed with a specific chemistry that cures, or hardens, the final product. That essential hardening chemistry is not produced in the United States; it must be imported. Approximately 40 to 80 percent of the import is produced in China, with the balance produced in Japan and Taiwan. But there is not enough capacity in Japan and Taiwan to supplant the supply from China. Therefore, applying the Section 301 tariff to this import does not hurt China – it hurts U.S. businesses which have no choice but to pay the tariff anyway to continue to enhance the competitiveness of their American made products.

These examples illustrate how the tariffs have both impacted small businesses and will continue to impact American businesses for as long as they remain in place. Consider the example of a small flower seed business that has paid “nearly \$1.5 million in tariffs for seed produced in China.” The company said that this money could have been used “for further investment in our technology, improving customer service or increasing seed quality.” Because the seeds they cultivate “need that environment for cultivation purposes” (China), the business cannot readily shift production of additional seed to other locations to accommodate the tariffs. This small business also has European and Asian competitors who do not pay the tariffs, so it has been forced to absorb most of the costs to remain competitive. Most concerning, the business is considering moving jobs to China, which would also require transferring proprietary technology, to cope with the increased costs:

We have been exploring options to make better use of the farm and are looking at shipping seed that is produced in China to other markets to avoid the tariffs. This is rather cumbersome because we need to manage separate inventories, we need to much more carefully plan what we can place in China and it has caused us to move some jobs from the US to China to deal with this. If we ramp the activity up we will need to transfer some proprietary technology from the US to China or other countries which we prefer not to do.



The Section 301 tariffs have harmed, and continue to harm, U.S. manufacturers and make them less competitive vis-à-vis their competitors and China. They should be lifted immediately.

b. Tariffs Increase Costs for American Consumers and Contribute to Inflation

Proponents of the tariffs also ignore the very real contribution tariffs have had on inflation. While there are various contributing factors to inflation, lifting tariffs is one of the few tools that the Administration could utilize to bring down inflation.³ At a time when inflation is at a four-decade high, the Administration should be leveraging every tool at its disposal to combat this crisis, which is squeezing hard-working American families and businesses. Time and again, we have heard from businesses of all kinds that they were forced to pass along the increased costs associated with the Section 301 tariffs directly to their customers. Consider the statements we received from coalition members below:

There's a 25% supplemental tariff on our new product, [a type of lamp], we have to pass on the cost to customers (total tariff of 28%). We would lower the price right away if the Trump tariff were removed.

- Consumer Electronics Company

We were impacted by Lists 3 and 4a, initially paying over \$350M per year in tariffs. Supply chain moves - mostly from China to Mexico - cut that to where we are paying just over \$150M per year today (2022). We immediately passed on the costs to our customers through price increases, which of course, is inflationary.

- Information Technology Company

The 25% tariff (tax) has been nothing but that, a tax or penalty on us as a small US based business. The Chinese do not pay the tariff or any portion of it! We do not have the gross profit margins to absorb this tariff so as a result we need to incorporate this into what we charge our customer - more US based small businesses harmed by these tariffs/taxes.

- Lighting Manufacturer and Distributor

The tariffs on our China origin goods has [sic] directly impacted or [sic] business strategy regarding the place of production for certain vegetable seed crops such as Cucumber, Melon, Tomato and Watermelon seeds. Producing hybrid vegetable seeds takes years of experience and knowledge. Weather, climate, and drought conditions are major factors especially as we are facing the global climate crisis. There are very few options for qualified and trusted growers. Our Chinese suppliers have an excellent reputation and service levels sealed with production contracts that are reviewed by legal and signed each year. Who pays the price for these high tariff rates on China origin seeds? It is the American people who pay in the form of higher prices for healthy food in the US market place.

- Vegetable Seed Business

c. Tariffs Disproportionately Harm Low-Income American Families



Tariffs harm American families by raising prices on consumer products, and this is felt most acutely by low-income families. A report by the Progressive Policy Institute found that tariffs on consumer goods are discriminatory and regressive because low-income Americans are disproportionately impacted by these tariffs, especially single-parent families and people of color.

We spoke with a small American business that produces baby products, including a portable crib that it developed to promote a safe sleeping environment for infants and that is also subject to the Section 301 tariffs. The company has distributed thousands of these cribs to low-income families for over 20 years through a non-profit organization, directly contributing to the reduction in infant deaths from Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) and Accidental Suffocation and Strangulation in Bed (ASSB). The company stated that all proceeds from the sales of these cribs go back into the non-profit so that it can continue to provide its “partners with the tools to educate their communities about the importance of infant safe sleep.” When asked about the impact of the tariffs on its mission, the company said this:

Until the tariffs were imposed, we prided ourselves on providing a safety approved crib ... to our partners for under \$50. Because of the 25% tariff and the increase in shipping from China, that was imposed on the [crib], we had to raise the price of our unit from \$49.99 to \$69.99, resulting in a decrease in the number of [cribs] that our partners were able to purchase since 2019 by well over 25%. What that means is 25% fewer infants have been able to sleep in a safe sleeping environment and babies lives have been put at risk. We know you can not effect immediate change in the high cost of shipping, however, by relieving us of the \$25% tariff on our [crib] we will be able to reduce its price and assure that more babies lives will be saved from SIDS or ASSB.

This baby products company ended its testimonial with a plea that the Administration consider the request that the tariffs be lifted to help “low-income parents throughout the country, and of course, the babies!”

This example could not be starker. The tariffs are harming U.S. businesses and Americans in ways large and small, including impacting the ability of small businesses and non-profits to get life-saving baby products into the hands of low-income families.

III. China Strategy Moving Forward

We urge the Select Committee to call upon the Biden-Harris Administration to provide a clear and transparent China trade strategy. We know that this strategy goes well beyond the China Section 301 tariffs, but we believe addressing the tariff issues and China’s unfair trade practices associated with them are important for the reasons we discussed above.

As a near-term path forward, with regards to the tariffs specifically, AFT suggests the following:

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

- 1) **Realign the Section 301 Tariffs** – Through the statutory necessity review process, the Administration should strategically realign the tariffs away from consumer goods and manufacturing inputs and equipment that are currently unavailable in sufficient quantities from sources other than China. These tariffs harm American companies and consumers and are not related to China’s Made in 2025 program or critical or strategic sectors. The realignment should provide the opportunity for the Administration to refocus the tariffs and create better leverage to achieve changes in China’s unfair trade practices regarding forced technology transfer and intellectual property theft. As part of this realignment, USTR should also include a new, fair, predictable, and transparent exclusion process available to all products subject to the Section 301 tariffs to ensure that American companies are not unduly harmed.
- 2) **Use Targeted Tools to Hold Bad Actors Accountable** – There has been ongoing discussion about what tools other than tariffs can be used to achieve success regarding China’s trade practices. USTR has discussed other “tools in the toolbox” and potentially the development of “new tools” but has stopped short of articulating what those might be. We believe these discussions are incredibly important and need to continue, with stakeholder input. It is important to find the right set of tools that address China’s unfair trade practices in a targeted way without causing disproportionate economic harm to American businesses, workers, and consumers.
- 3) **Support U.S. Supply Chain Resiliency and Competitiveness by Partnering with Allies** – AFT continues to call upon the Administration to work with allies to address China’s unfair trade practices. This includes work at the G-20, G-7, World Trade Organization, and other multilateral and regional institutions. The U.S. can be much more effective in addressing China’s unfair trade practices and changing its behavior by working in concert with allies.
- 4) **Support Efforts on Supply Chain Diversification** – Congress and the Administration should support the U.S. business community’s efforts to further diversify supply chains. This includes developing an offensive trade agenda that supports supply chain diversification and ensures the U.S. does not cede global economic influence and international rulemaking to China. This should also include seeking new free trade agreements with our allies that include market access commitments. Congress should also quickly act to retroactively renew expired trade preference programs including the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), which provide sourcing alternatives to China, as well as the Miscellaneous Tariff Program (MTB), which provides temporary duty benefits for U.S. manufacturers and businesses.

IV. Conclusion

We appreciate the Select Committee’s engagement and focus on addressing key strategic issues in the U.S.-China relationship. Such efforts must reflect the important role that U.S. trade policy plays in advancing American values and boosting U.S. competitiveness. We urge the Committee

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

to continue weighing in with the Administration about the need for a new and more effective approach to addressing China's unfair trading practices. We look forward to working with you on these important issues.

Sincerely,

Accessories Council
ACT | The App Association
Agriculture Transportation Coalition (AgTC)
ALMA, International (Association of Loudspeaker Manufacturing and Acoustics)
American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA)
American Association of Exporters and Importers (AAEI)
American Association of Port Authorities
American Bakers Association
American Bridal & Prom Industry Association (ABPIA)
American Chemistry Council
American Clean Power Association
American Coatings Association, Inc. (ACA)
American Down and Feather Council
American Fly Fishing Trade Association
American Home Furnishings Alliance
American Lighting Association
American Petroleum Institute
American Pyrotechnics Association
American Rental Association
American Seed Trade Association
American Specialty Toy Retailing Association
American Trucking Association
Arizona Technology Council
Arkansas Grocers and Retail Merchants Association
Association For Creative Industries
Association for PRINT Technologies
Association of American Publishers
Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers
Auto Care Association
Beer Institute
BSA | The Software Alliance
Building Service Contractors Association International (BSCAI)
Business Alliance for Customs Modernization
California Retailers Association
Chemical Industry Council of Delaware (CICD)
Coalition of New England Companies for Trade (CONNECT)
Colorado Retail Council
Columbia River Customs Brokers and Forwarders Assn.
Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA)
Consumer Brands Association
Consumer Technology Association
Council of Fashion Designers of America (CFDA)
CropLife America
Customs Brokers & Freight Forwarders Assn. of Washington State
Customs Brokers & Freight Forwarders of Northern California
Electronic Transactions Association
Energy Workforce & Technology Council
Experiential Designers and Producers Association
Exhibitions & Conferences Alliance
Fashion Accessories Shippers Association (FASA)
Fashion Jewelry & Accessories Trade Association
Flexible Packaging Association
Florida Ports Council
Florida Retail Federation
Footwear Distributors and Retailers of America (FDRA)
Fragrance Creators Association
Game Manufacturers Association
Gemini Shippers Association
Georgia Retailers
Global Business Alliance
Global Chamber®
Global Cold Chain Alliance
Greeting Card Association
Halloween & Costume Association (HCA)
Home Fashion Products Association
Home Furnishings Association

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

Household and Commercial Products Association
Housing Affordability Coalition
Idaho Retailers Association
Illinois Retail Merchants Association
Independent Office Products & Furniture Dealers Association (IOPFDA)
Indiana Retail Council
Information Technology Industry Council (ITI)
International Bottled Water Association (IBWA)
International Foodservice Distributors Association
International Housewares Association
International Warehouse and Logistics Association
International Wood Products Association
ISSA - The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association
Jeweler's Vigilance Committee
Juice Products Association (JPA)
Juvenile Products Manufacturers Association
Leather and Hide Council of America
Licensing Industry Merchandisers' Association
Los Angeles Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders Assn.
Louisiana Retailers Association
Maine Grocers & Food Producers Association
Maine Lobster Dealers' Association
Maritime Exchange for the Delaware River and Bay
Maryland Retailers Association
MEMA, The Vehicle Suppliers Association
Michigan Chemistry Council
Michigan Retailers Association
Minnesota Retailers Association
Missouri Retailers Association
Motorcycle Industry Council
NAPIM (National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers)
National Association of Chain Drug Stores (NACDS)
National Association of Chemical Distributors (NACD)
National Association of Foreign-Trade Zones (NAFTZ)
National Association of Home Builders
National Association of Music Merchants
National Association of Trailer Manufacturers (NATM)
National Confectioners Association
National Council of Chain Restaurants
National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA)
National Fisheries Institute
National Foreign Trade Council
National Grocers Association
National Industrial Transportation League (NITL)
National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association
National Marine Manufacturers Association
National Restaurant Association
National Retail Federation
National Ski & Snowboard Retailers Association
National Sporting Goods Association
Natural Products Association
New Jersey Retail Merchants Association
North American Association of Food Equipment Manufacturers (NAFEM)
North American Association of Uniform Manufacturers and Distributors (NAUMD)
North Carolina Retail Merchants Association
Ohio Council of Retail Merchants
Outdoor Industry Association
Pacific Coast Council of Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders Assns. Inc.
Pennsylvania Retailers' Association
PeopleforBikes
Personal Care Products Council
Pet Food Institute
Pet Advocacy Network
Plumbing Manufacturers International
Power Tool Institute (PTI)
PRINTING United Alliance
Promotional Products Association International
Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association
Retail Association of Maine
Retail Council of New York State
Retail Industry Leaders Association
Retailers Association of Massachusetts

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment)
RV Industry Association
San Diego Customs Brokers and Forwarders Assn.
Semiconductor Industry Association (SIA)
Snowsports Industries America
Software & Information Industry Association (SIIA)
South Dakota Retailers Association
Specialty Equipment Market Association
Specialty Vehicle Institute of America
Sports & Fitness Industry Association
State International Development Organization (SIDO)
TechNet
Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA)

Texas Retailers Association
The Airforwarders Association
The Fertilizer Institute
Toy Association
Travel Goods Association
Truck & Engine Manufacturers Association (EMA)
United States Council for International Business
United States Fashion Industry Association
US Global Value Chain Coalition
US-China Business Council
Vinyl Institute
Virginia Association of Chain Drug Stores
Virginia Retail Federation
Virginia-DC District Export Council (VA-DC DEC)
Washington Retail Association
Water Quality Association
Window and Door Manufacturers Association
World Pet Association, Inc. (WPA)

CC: Select Committee on the CCP Members



Attachment 1 – Studies on Economic Impact of Tariffs – 2018-2022

1. May 2022, American Action Forum: [The Total Cost of U.S. Tariffs](#); Tom Lee & Jacqueline Varas.
2. April 2022, Tax Foundation: [Tracking the Economic Impact of U.S. Tariffs and Retaliatory Actions](#); Erica York.
3. March 2022, Peterson Institute of International Economics: [For Inflation Relief, the United States Should Look to Trade Liberalization](#); Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Megan Hogan, and Yilin Wang.
4. January 2022, USDA Economic Research Service: [The Economic Impacts of Retaliatory Tariffs on U.S. Agriculture](#); Stephen Morgan, Shawn Arita, Jayson Beckman, Saquib Ahsan, Dylan Russell, Philip Jarrell, and Bart Kenner.
5. December 2021, Tax Foundation: [Who Really Pays the Tariffs? U.S. Firms and Consumers, Through Higher Prices](#); Alex Durante & Alex Muresianu.
6. October 2021, National Bureau of Economic Research: [ILLUMINATING THE EFFECTS OF THE US-CHINA TARIFF WAR ON CHINA'S ECONOMY](#); Davin Chor and Bingjing Li.
7. May 2021, Moody's Investor Service Report, as reported in [U.S. companies are bearing the brunt of Trump's China tariffs, says Moody's](#), CNBC, Yen Nee Lee.
8. January 2021, IHS Markit: [Did the US section 301 tariffs work?](#); Yacine Rouimi.
9. May 2020, National Bureau of Economic Research: [The Effect of the U.S.-China Trade War on U.S. Investment](#); Mary Amiti, Sang Hoon Kong and David Weinstein.
10. January 2020, National Bureau of Economic Research: [Who's Paying for the US Tariffs? A Longer-Term Perspective](#); Mary Amiti, Stephen J. Redding, David E. Weinstein.
11. January 2020, National Bureau of Economic Research: [Rising Import Tariffs, Falling Export Growth: When Modern Supply Chains Meet Old-Style Protectionism](#); Kyle Handley, Fariha Kamal, Ryan Monarch.
12. January 2020, Congressional Budget Office: [The Budget and Economic Outlook 2020 to 2030](#).

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

13. December 2019, Federal Reserve Board: [Disentangling the Effects of the 2018-2019 Tariffs on a Globally Connected U.S. Manufacturing Sector](#); Aaron Flaaen and Justin Pierce.
14. November 2019, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, [Trade and Trade Diversion Effects of United States Tariffs on China](#); Alessandro Nicita.
15. October 2019, Revised December 2019, National Bureau of Economic Research: [The Consumption Response to Trade Shocks: Evidence from the US-China Trade War](#); Michael E. Waugh.
16. October 2019, National Bureau of Economic Research: [Tariff Passthrough at the Border and at the Store: Evidence from US Trade Policy](#); Alberto Cavallo, Gita Gopinath, Brent Neiman, Jenny Tang.
17. September 2019, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, [The Economic Effects of Trade Policy Uncertainty](#); Dario Caldara, Matteo Iacoviello, Patrick Molligo, Andrea Prestipino, Andrea Raffo.
18. September 2019, Moody's Analytics: [Trade War Chicken: The Tariffs and the Damage Done](#); Mark Zandi, Jesse Rogers & Maria Cosma.
19. March 2019, Revised October 2019, National Bureau of Economic Research: [The Return to Protectionism](#); Pablo D. Fajgelbaum, Pinelopi K. Goldberg, Patrick J. Kennedy, Amit K. Khandelwal.
20. March 2019, National Bureau of Economic Research: [The Impact of the 2018 Trade War on U.S. Prices and Welfare](#); Mary Amity, Stephen J. Redding, David E. Weinstein.
21. February 2019, Trade Partnership Worldwide, LLC: [Estimated Impacts of Tariffs on the U.S. Economy and Workers](#); Laura Baughman and Joseph Francois.
22. December 2018, National Bureau of Economic Research: [Macroeconomic Consequences of Tariffs](#); Davide Furceri, Swarnali A. Hannan, Jonathan D. Ostry, Andrew K. Rose.

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

Attachment #2 – Articles on the Impact of Tariffs

Date	Headline	Outlet
6/7/2022	Biden Must Roll Back the Tariffs Weighing So Heavily On the Economy	RealClearMarkets
5/17/2022	As Businesses Struggle, Tariffs Create Avoidable Challenges	The Well News
4/15/2022	End China trade war	Times-Tribune
3/26/2022	Supply Chain Issues Continue to Hurt Businesses. Lifting Tariffs Can Help.	RealClearPolitics, The Center Square, Livingston Parish News
3/24/2022	To Help Revive the U.S. Economy, the Biden Administration Must Lift the Tariffs	RealClearMarkets
3/20/2022	Tariffs Hurt Virginia Businesses	The Gazette-Virginian
2/25/2022	To Fulfill His Economic Vision, President Biden Must End Trump's Tariffs	The Well News
2/14/2022	Want to Stem Inflation? End the Trade War	RedState
2/14/2022	Trade War Continues to Batter New Hampshire Businesses	NH Journal
2/11/2022	2 Years Since Trade Deal with China, Tariffs Aren't Working for American Businesses	Entrepreneur.com, MSN
2/8/2022	Cutting Chinese tariffs would help Del. businesses	Delaware Business Times
1/25/2022	Keep Wisconsin moving forward	WisPolitics
12/13/2021	Amid Pressing Economic Crises, Biden Administration Must Lift Tariffs	Townhall
12/9/2021	Biden must end failed trade policy that has hurt Pennsylvanians	Tribune-Review
11/10/2021	It's Time to End the Trade War With China	Newsweek
11/3/2021	Post-Covid, the Federal Government Must Remain Committed to Helping Businesses	Entrepreneur/com
10/12/2021	U.S. tariffs on Chinese goods hurts Arizona's economic growth	Arizona Daily Star
9/29/2021	For Washington's Economy to Fully Recover, Biden Administration Must End Tariffs	Kirkland Pathc
9/14/2021	Duane Garfoot: Continued tariffs still loom large following Biden's Wisconsin visit	WisPolitics
9/7/2021	Trade Wars Worsen Shipping Crisis	Townhall
7/22/2021	The time has come for Biden to repeal Trump's tariffs	News Journal
7/12/2021	Biden can help American workers and protect U.S. jobs by ending trade wars	Washington Times

AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

Date	Headline	Outlet
6/23/2021	Ongoing trade war limits recovery for U.S. businesses	Tribune-Review
5/19/2021	As COVID-19 recovery begins, Granite State needs tariff relief	Manchester Ink Link
5/7/2021	Oregon businesses bear the brunt of the U.S. tariffs on China	The Oregonian
4/5/2021	Repealing Trump-era trade tariffs would throw a lifeline to struggling businesses	Crain's New York Business
3/25/2021	Repeal Tariffs to Boost the Economy, Help Small Businesses	RealClearMarkets
3/3/2021	Tariff relief must play a central role in Biden trade agenda	Des Moines Register
2/24/2021	Removing tariffs is key to economic relief	Washington Examiner
2/12/2021	Repealing tariffs should be one of Biden's first acts	Wisconsin State Journal, Herald Times Reporter
2/7/2021	Biden can save Americans billions of dollars by ending Trump's trade war with China now	Business Insider
12/21/2020	Trump Must Repeal Tariffs to Provide Americans Relief	Inside Sources
12/12/2020	If Biden Wants to Help Middle America, He'll Lift Tariffs	RealClearPolitics
11/21/2020	Prospect of Tariffs on Vietnamese Imports Jeopardizes American Recovery	RedState
10/31/2020	A Pledge To Repeal Tariffs Is Crucial For Both Candidates	Townhall
10/29/2020	Tariffs Continue to Hurt Wisconsin	The Baraboo News Republic
10/29/2020	Tariffs Must Take Center Stage in Leadup to Election Day	NH Journal
10/28/2020	WTO ruling and domestic lawsuits may boost Biden's chances of winning	WisPolitics
9/24/2020	Floridians Are Frustrated With The Trade War	The Floridian
9/22/2020	Trump's trade war has punished Americans more than China	Laconia Daily Sun
9/17/2020	Mike Duerst: Tariffs Prove to be a Key Issue for Wisconsin Voters	WisPolitics
9/16/2020	Path to White House Includes Repealing Tariffs	RedState
6/1/2020	President Trump's Tariffs Put Economic Recovery at Risk	RedState
5/26/2020	One Big Way To Help US Businesses Come Back After Coronavirus	Townhall

**AMERICANS FOR
FREE ★ TRADE**

Date	Headline	Outlet
5/26/2020	More tariffs would bring Missouri to its breaking point	Missouri Times
5/7/2020	Stimulus is helpful, but tariffs are still threatening our livelihoods	MinnPost
4/4/2020	Trade War Damage Worsened by Global Health Pandemic	RealClearPolitics
3/6/2020	Trump's trade war threatens S.C.'s economy and workers — Democratic presidential candidates should vow to end it	Charleston City Paper
3/3/2020	Trade War Could Unravel President Trump's Economic Accomplishments	RedState
2/10/2020	The trade war with China has hurt my small business in Massachusetts	Boston Globe
2/10/2020	The Trade War Hurts President Trump's Re-Election Chances in New Hampshire	NH Journal
2/1/2020	The Trade War is Undoing President Trump's Economic Achievements Cucciniello	Save Jersey
1/29/2020	Democratic candidates should talk more about Trump's trade war	Sioux City Journal
1/19/2020	I supported Trump's trade war. But now it's driving my industry out of business.	Star Ledger
1/18/2020	Trump can win Wisconsin if he ends tariffs	Wisconsin State Journal
12/31/2019	The trade war has cost us over \$500,000 dollars	PennLive
12/19/2019	In the Next Debate, Democrats Must Highlight Damage Trump's Tariffs Have Caused	LA Focus
12/4/2019	Trade war undermines strong Texas economy and Trump's reelection chances	Houston Chronicle
12/3/2019	Trump has been great for Black Americans, but the trade war could hinder the progress	The State
11/25/2019	Tariffs are slowly driving me out of business	Concord Monitor
11/7/2019	Tariffs Could Hurt the Holidays – and President Trump's Re-Election in 2020	Iowa Standard
10/15/2019	Enough Is Enough: Tariffs Are Damaging Ohio's Economy	RealClearPolitics
10/4/2019	How Tariffs Are Hurting Trump's Base – and His Chances of Re-election	Save Jersey
9/20/2019	Tariffs Could Hurt President Trump's Chances in North Carolina	Townhall
8/25/2019	How Tariffs Are Hurting My Business—And Your Wallet	NY Observer

**AMERICANS FOR
FREE ★ TRADE**

Date	Headline	Outlet
8/14/2019	<u>Tariffs Are Taxes Paid by New Hampshire Businesses and Consumers</u>	NH Journal
8/4/2019	<u>Trump's economy is booming — repealing tariffs will boost it even more</u>	The Hill
8/2/2019	<u>Tariffs Looming over 2020 Election</u>	RedState
7/10/2019	<u>Rohn Bishop: Wisconsin needs four more years of Trump's economic policies – minus tariffs</u>	WisPolitics
7/9/2019	<u>LTE: Tariffs should be removed</u>	Gettysburg Times
6/19/2019	<u>Tariffs hurting same Floridians Trump is trying to help</u>	Sun Sentinel
6/19/2019	<u>Trump's tariffs endanger Wisconsin's booming economy</u>	The Cap Times
6/13/2019	<u>A Quick End to the Trade War Is the Key to Victory for President Trump in 2020</u>	Townhall