

recently, the U.K. government agency regulating telecommunications has attempted to impose "voluntary" domestic purchasing quotas on British Telecom, now privatized. It is reported that BT has refused to accept this direction. See The Economist, July 27, 1985, p. 61.

7 For a discussion of defense procurement from a competition policy point of view, see Blair: op. cit., 609-610.

8 GATT, 265 BISD, 8-32.

9 See the useful article by Professor D. Cohen of the Faculty of Law of the University of British Columbia: "The Intersection of Consumer Protective Law and International Trade: Implications for Canadian Regulators", May 1983 (photocopy). The footnote references in Cohen's paper provide an extensive bibliography to the economic and legal literature on the "standards" issue in trade policy. For Cohen's comments on the "export" of U.S. standards, see page 24.

10 See, for example, H.C. Eastman and S. Stykoet: The Tariff and Competition in Canada, Macmillan of Canada, Toronto, 1964.

11 Gary Clyde Hufbauer and Joanna Shelton Erb: Subsidies in International Trade, Washington, Institute for International Economics, 1984, at p. 5, referring to a 1983 paper by Avinan Dixit.

12 Patent Act, Section 67.

13 For Alcon, see A.D. Neale and D.C. Goyder: The Anti-trust Laws of the USA, Cambridge V.P., third edition, p. 105 and following; for Dupont ICI, see United States vs ICI, ibid., p. 364 and following.

14 The writer shares this view.

15 This was the "Fulton-Rogers" understanding. This was later supplanted by the "Basford-Mitchell" understanding.

16 This brief resumé is based on this writer's involvement; he was one of the two note takers at the meeting referred to of the Joint Cabinet Committee.

17 The most important of the enquiries was that conducted by a House of Commons Committee; there were also numerous inquiries by officials.

18 Report not yet available.

19 "Canada Says Drug Firms Transferred Profits Abroad", Wall Street Journal, June 28, 1985.

20 The U.S. legislation on Domestic International Sales Corporations, (DISC) and subsequently on Foreign International Sales Corporations, allowing U.S. companies to take profits abroad rather in the United States, for export activities, is a different, but related issue.