TABLE 9.2. U.S. ANTIDUMPING CASES

Calendar year	Number of cases	No price discrimination	Price revision	No injury	Injury	Appraisement withheld
1959	37	23	13	1	0	15
1960	29	19	7	2	1	24
1961	38	25	5	5	3	10
1962	23	9	12	2	0	11
1963	30	19	4	6	1	16
1964	37	13	12	9	3	13
Total	194	108	53	25	8	89

Source: Derived from tables, based on data supplied by the U.S. Treasury Department, published in the U.S. *Congressional Record*, June 1, 1965.

then finds whether or not such discrimination is causing or threatening injury to a domestic industry.[77]

Table 9.2 shows that between 1958, when the legislation was last amended, and 1965 there were 194 antidumping investigations. However, in only 8 instances, or 4 per cent of the cases, were antidumping duties imposed as the result of a finding of injury or likelihood of injury by the Tariff Commission.[78] In the remaining 186 cases, Treasury found no price discrimination in 108; 53 were terminated because the foreign exporter adjusted his prices; and the Tariff Commission found no injury in 25.

The restrictive element in U.S. antidumping practices is not the imposition of duties but the possibility that antidumping procedures will be instituted, the large number of cases actually initiated, and the withholding of appraisement in almost half of these cases. Apart from costs incurred by foreign exporters and domestic importers in an antidumping investigation, the uncertainties inherent in the initiation of an investigation are bound to have some trade-deterrent effects. These effects are enhanced by the practice of withholding ap-

[77] Between 1921 (when the U.S. Antidumping Act was legislated) and 1954, the Treasury Department made both the price discrimination and injury determinations.

[78] The eight cases in which antidumping duties were imposed and the countries affected were as follows: bicycles (Czechoslovakia, 1960), Portland cement (Sweden, 1961), Portland cement (Belgium, 1961), Portland gray cement (Portugal, 1961), Portland cement (Dominican Republic, 1963), chromic acid (Australia, 1964), steel reinforcing bars (Canada, 1964), and carbon steel bars and shapes (Canada, 1964). In April, 1965, the Tariff Commission also found injury in the case of azobisformamide (Japan), and subsequently, antidumping duties were imposed.