

# AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

April 6, 2023

The Honorable Ron Wyden  
Chairman  
Senate Finance Committee  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Mike Crapo  
Ranking Member  
Senate Finance Committee  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Jason Smith  
Chairman  
House Ways & Means Committee  
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Richard Neal  
Ranking Member  
House Ways & Means Committee  
Washington, DC 20515

**RE: Statement for the Hearing Record: The President's 2023 Trade Policy Agenda**

Dear Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Crapo, Chairman Smith, and Ranking Member Neal,

The Americans for Free Trade coalition, a broad alliance of American businesses, trade organizations, and workers united against tariffs, respectfully submits this written statement to include in the public record of the Senate Finance Committee and House Ways & Means Committee's ("the Committees") 2023 Trade Policy Agenda hearings, which took place on March 23 and 24, respectively. We appreciate the Committees holding hearings on this important matter.

By way of background, [Americans for Free Trade](#) 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 China 301 tariffs which have had a disproportionate economic impact on American companies, consumers, and workers and that have failed to change China's unfair trade practices relating to intellectual property rights, forced technology transfers, and innovation. We have also repeatedly called for the administration to find a new path forward to address the ongoing China trade issues. We believe it is time for a strategic realignment of the tariffs to focus on the original intent of the 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 USTR should relaunch a fair and transparent exclusion process that is available to all HTS lines impacted by the 301 tariffs. 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 request that it anticipates work relating to product exclusion requests 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.

### **I. American Businesses Pay the 301 Tariffs, Not China**

Since April 2018, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has assessed more than **\$173 billion**<sup>1</sup> 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 have an impact on consumers. While many companies have tried to absorb the costs of the tariffs, many have had to share the costs with final consumers.

AFT has argued for years that American companies, not Chinese companies, 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<sup>2</sup>”. 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 301 tariffs’ impact on downstream industries and consumers, we welcomed the report and were pleased that it confirmed the economic impact of the 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 included as part of this statement for the record.

During her testimony at the trade agenda hearings, Ambassador Tai noted that USTR is currently undertaking its statutory four-year review of the China 301 tariffs. We continue to believe this review needs to be 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

---

<sup>1</sup> CBP Trade Statistics - <https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/trade>

<sup>2</sup> Economic Impact of Section 232 and 301 Tariffs on U.S. Industries – <https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/pub5405.pdf> , March 15, 2023



insist that USTR use the four-year review process to conduct a holistic assessment of whether the tariffs have achieved their stated objectives, as identified in the underlying section 301 report, 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 301 tariffs truly provide leverage to elicit a change in behavior by China or whether they represent the best path forward given the current state of the U.S. economy.

## **II. 301 Tariffs' Impacts on American Businesses and Consumers**

As part of the 301 four-year 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.

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

# AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

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 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.

# AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

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.<sup>3</sup> 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.*



# AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

- 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 Members of Congress 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 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:

- 1) **Realign the Section 301 Tariffs** – Through the strategic four-year review process, USTR and 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 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 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. We need 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 by working in concert with allies.

- 4) **Support Efforts on Supply Chain Diversification** – Congress and the Biden-Harris 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. 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 Committees' continued engagement and focus on ensuring that U.S. trade policy advances American values and boosts U.S. competitiveness. We urge the Committees to continue weighing in with the Biden-Harris Administration to ensure that destructive tariffs are lifted, and that a new and more effective approach to addressing China's unfair trading practices is adopted. We thank the Committees for holding this year's trade agenda hearings and look forward to continuing to work with you.

Sincerely,

Accessories Council	American Lighting Association
ACT   The App Association	American Petroleum Institute
Agriculture Transportation Coalition (AgTC)	American Pyrotechnics Association
ALMA, International (Association of Loudspeaker Manufacturing and Acoustics)	American Rental Association
American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA)	American Seed Trade Association
American Association of Exporters and Importers (AAEI)	American Specialty Toy Retailing Association
American Association of Port Authorities	American Trucking Association
American Bakers Association	Arizona Technology Council
American Bridal & Prom Industry Association (ABPIA)	Arkansas Grocers and Retail Merchants Association
American Chemistry Council	Association For Creative Industries
American Clean Power Association	Association for PRINT Technologies
American Down and Feather Council	Association of American Publishers
American Fly Fishing Trade Association	Association of Equipment Manufacturers (AEM)
American Home Furnishings Alliance	Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers
	Auto Care Association
	Beer Institute
	BSA   The Software Alliance



# AMERICANS FOR FREE TRADE

Building Service Contractors Association International (BSCAI)  
Business Alliance for Customs Modernization  
California Retailers Association  
Can Manufacturers Institute  
Chemical Industry Council of Delaware (CICD)  
Coalition of New England Companies for Trade (CONNECT)  
Coalition of Services Industries (CSI)  
Colorado Retail Council  
Columbia River Customs Brokers and Forwarders Assn.  
Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA)  
Computing Technology Industry Association (CompTIA)  
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  
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 Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions (IAAPA)  
International Bottled Water Association (IBWA)  
International Foodservice Distributors Association  
International Housewares Association  
International Warehouse 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)

# AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

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  
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  
TechNet  
Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA)  
Texas Retailers Association  
Texas Water Infrastructure Network  
The Airforwarders Association  
The Fertilizer Institute  
The Hardwood Federation  
The Vinyl 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  
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)



### **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](#).
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.

# AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

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



# AMERICANS FOR FREE ★ TRADE

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

**AMERICANS FOR  
FREE ★ TRADE**

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

**AMERICANS FOR  
FREE ★ TRADE**

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