Canadian investment in United States

sistant Secretary of State for European Affairs (among others), U.S. ownership of Canada has grown by the greatest amount ever since the Foreign Investment Review Act was introduced in Parliament. In the "silly comments" class. Porter joined many prominent Canadians when he referred to the supposedly heavy per capita Canadian investment in the U.S. (see Page 34 of the November-December issue of International Perspectives). The Stanford Research Institute, as part of their Long-Range Planning Service, last year produced a private document entitled Foreign Direct Investment in the U.S. At the end of 1973 all foreign direct investment in the U.S. totalled only \$17,751 million, of which \$4,003 million came from Canada. But only about \$2.6 billion of this was really Canadian investment, the balance being mostly American capital reinvested back into the U.S. Based on either GNP or population, were the U.S. to have as much foreign ownership as Canada (over \$70 billion book value in 1975) foreign direct investment in the U.S. would have to be about \$700 billion to be equivalent. Instead, in 1975 it was only about \$20 billion, or less than 3 per cent of the equivalent amount! In turn the Canadian share of the 3 per cent was less than one-quarter. Porter and others contribute nothing but obfuscation when they make such foolish comparisons. Barron's, the U.S. financial weekly, put it rather nicely:

It is difficult to imagine a legitimate business venture which would be impeded by the Foreign Investment Review Act...the only U.S. business which wouldn't be cordially welcomed to Canada is Murder Inc.

In 1974, Canada had an all-time record current-account deficit of over \$1.6 billion. In 1975, that record deficit increased by some 320 per cent to \$5.1 billion. The year 1976 will be almost as bad. Conventional wisdom has it that we had such a bad year because of the down-turn in the world and U.S. economies. This is a bit hard to explain though, when one considers that the value of our exports actually increased by 2 per cent. It is even harder to explain when one considers that in 1975, while Canada had its largest-ever merchandise trade deficit, at the same time the U.S. was enjoying its largest-ever trade surplus, over \$11 billion.

Canada simply must curtail imports from the U.S., and curtail them sharply. There is no alternative. However, there is a bit of a problem. Over 60 per cent of the "Canadian" manufacuring industry, which would have to make up for at least some of the decreased imports, is foreign owned

and controlled, mostly in the form American branch plants, and most revery heavily on parts and components the import from head office or their foreign affiliates. Is it any wonder then that, American ownership of our manufact unit has grown, the "Canadian" manufact m industry has become less compet time During the past ten years Canada's expo deficit in manufactured goods has j creased in every major category of finish products. For the decade of the Seventi our growth-rate of national productivity will probably be lower than that o a other industrialized country in the work Greece and Ireland apparently employ smaller percentage of their work for ces manufacturing, but no other "Western" nation does.

Leading importer

Canadians are by far the world's leading importers of manufactured goods in porting twice as much as the average European and four times as much as the average American. Good old Canada relying, as it does, so heavily on the su posedly indispensable imported fore technology - is now last in the wor among "developed" nations in its n trading deficits in such categories a ele tronic components, machine tools and plastics. (Surely only in Canada cod such facts and the "Canadian" manufa turing industry's 22-per-cent-behind-th U.S. productivity lag be ignored by 1 go ernment-appointed organization such the Economic Council of Canada.)

So, there it is. We must curtail in ports from the U.S., but it will be ver difficult. I am not suggesting higher and but rather measures to increase do nest efficiency and to decrease artificial and/o excessive dependency on imports. We must cut back on future foreign direct invest ment, but instead we are doing precised the opposite.

This brings me to the second bas problem. But first, let me sum up the economic results for 1975 for the country that has more foreign ownership that all Western Europe combined. In 1975 (analhad:

its highest annual average une np^[0] ment since the Depression;

its largest-ever current account lefid by far;

its record outflow of interest pay ment dividends and "service charges";

its largest-ever merchandise trade lefter its largest-ever deficit in manuficture goods;

its poorest GNP growth-performant since 1954.