

At a time when many newly industrialized nations are putting in place their own trade remedy procedures as their tariff and non-tariff barriers are lowered, it is obvious that the U.S. must take the lead in restraining domestic interests which seek to substitute trade remedies for tariffs and NTBs.³⁷

This heightened concern, of course, is still a long way from carrying the day in Washington. Nonetheless, it is welcome and provides some basis for careful coalition building with U.S. exporters, the users of imported inputs and consumer groups that could assist in launching an incremental reform process along the lines outlined in this Paper. Canadians, both the government and perhaps even more importantly the private sector individually and through trade and consumer associations could actively seek out those in the U.S. whose livelihood and well-being depend on truly free and unimpeded trade and work with them to build the necessary coalition of interests.

³⁷ See "Trade Lawyers Urge That GATT Bill Not Restrict U.S. AD, CVD Laws", in *Inside U.S. Trade*, Special Report (May 13, 1994), pp.S-7, S-8. Also relevant is the recent draft report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) which strongly criticizes current U.S. trade remedy law and practice: "The analysis concludes that U.S. laws treat the pricing of imports in the U.S. market differently from how they treat the pricing of domestically produced goods... Over time, the antidumping and countervailing-duty laws have become a general source of protection for U.S. firms from foreign competition." See Congressional Budget Office, "A Review of U.S. Antidumping and Countervailing-Duty Law and Policy", Washington, May 1994, pp.1-8 and the predictably sharp response from the Department of Commerce and the congressional steel caucus, as reported in "Senior U.S. Official, Members Criticize CBO for Trade Law Study", in *Inside U.S. Trade*, Special Report (June 10, 1994), pp.S-5, S-6.