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


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.


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.


18. September 2019, Moody’s Analytics: Trade War Chicken: The Tariffs and the Damage Done; Mark Zandi, Jesse Rogers & Maria Cosma.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Headline</th>
<th>Outlet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2022</td>
<td><strong>Biden Must Roll Back the Tariffs Weighing So Heavily On the Economy</strong></td>
<td>RealClearMarkets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/2022</td>
<td><strong>As Businesses Struggle, Tariffs Create Avoidable Challenges</strong></td>
<td>The Well News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/2022</td>
<td><strong>End China trade war</strong></td>
<td>Times-Tribune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2022</td>
<td><strong>Supply Chain Issues Continue to Hurt Businesses, Lifting Tariffs Can Help.</strong></td>
<td>RealClearPolitics, The Center Square, Livingston Parish News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2022</td>
<td><strong>To Help Revive the U.S. Economy, the Biden Administration Must Lift the Tariffs</strong></td>
<td>RealClearMarkets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/2022</td>
<td><strong>Tariffs Hurt Virginia Businesses</strong></td>
<td>The Gazette-Virginian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2022</td>
<td><strong>To Fulfill His Economic Vision, President Biden Must End Trump’s Tariffs</strong></td>
<td>The Well News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td><strong>Want to Stem Inflation? End the Trade War</strong></td>
<td>RedState</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td><strong>Trade War Continues to Batter New Hampshire Businesses</strong></td>
<td>NH Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/2022</td>
<td><strong>2 Years Since Trade Deal with China, Tariffs Aren't Working for American Businesses</strong></td>
<td>Entrepreneur.com, MSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td><strong>Cutting Chinese tariffs would help Del. businesses</strong></td>
<td>Delaware Business Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/2022</td>
<td><strong>Keep Wisconsin moving forward</strong></td>
<td>WisPolitics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/2021</td>
<td><strong>Amid Pressing Economic Crises, Biden Administration Must Lift Tariffs</strong></td>
<td>Townhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/2021</td>
<td><strong>Biden must end failed trade policy that has hurt Pennsylvanians</strong></td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2021</td>
<td><strong>It's Time to End the Trade War With China</strong></td>
<td>Newsweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2021</td>
<td><strong>Post-Covid, the Federal Government Must Remain Committed to Helping Businesses</strong></td>
<td>Entrepreneur/com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2021</td>
<td><strong>U.S. tariffs on Chinese goods hurts Arizona's economic growth</strong></td>
<td>Arizona Daily Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2021</td>
<td><strong>For Washington’s Economy to Fully Recover, Biden Administration Must End Tariffs</strong></td>
<td>Kirkland Pathc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2021</td>
<td><strong>Duane Garfoot: Continued tariffs still loom large following Biden's Wisconsin visit</strong></td>
<td>WisPolitics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2021</td>
<td><strong>Trade Wars Worsen Shipping Crisis</strong></td>
<td>Townhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22/2021</td>
<td><strong>The time has come for Biden to repeal Trump’s tariffs</strong></td>
<td>News Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/2021</td>
<td><strong>Biden can help American workers and protect U.S. jobs by ending trade wars</strong></td>
<td>Washington Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>Outlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2021</td>
<td>Ongoing trade war limits recovery for U.S. businesses</td>
<td>Tribune-Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/2021</td>
<td>As COVID-19 recovery begins, Granite State needs tariff relief</td>
<td>Manchester Ink Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7/2021</td>
<td>Oregon businesses bear the brunt of the U.S. tariffs on China</td>
<td>The Oregonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/2021</td>
<td>Repealing Trump-era trade tariffs would throw a lifeline to struggling businesses</td>
<td>Crain's New York Business</td>
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