

- lower prices (36.4% of respondents);
- not available in the United States (30.3% of respondents);
- supplementary supply for domestic sources (18.2% of respondents);
- superior quality (3% of respondents).

A large number, 78.6% of the respondents, also indicated that a relationship with a parent company, subsidiary or affiliate was the reason for importing.

The majority of respondents (69.4%) reported that the devaluation of the U.S. dollar against many currencies had resulted in increasing costs of their imports of telecommunications equipment.* As a result, many expressed an interest in learning more about Canadian products as possible alternative sources of supply. Only 26% had used Canadian sources in the past and the majority of those that had were satisfied with Canadian suppliers.

Of those respondents who had not tried Canadian sources, 48.6% were interested in hearing more about Canadian companies and their products. The majority of those importers not interested in hearing more about Canadian companies and their products noted that they were committed to an existing parent company relationship. The U.S. importers that wished to know more about Canadian products and their companies indicated that brochures (96.6% of respondents), industry publications (65.5%), and trade fairs (58.6%) were preferred sources of information. Trade fairs mentioned by the greatest number of respondents include the North American Telephone Association Show in Dallas, Westcom in San Francisco and Supercom in San Francisco. Frequently identified industry publications included *Purchasing*, *Electronic Buying News*, *Communications Week*, and *Teleconnect*.

While the above are the most favoured forms of receiving initial information on Canadian firms and their products, respondents indicated that they usually base their purchasing decision on

* However, as noted in "U.S. Imports 1982-87", the devaluation of the U.S. dollar may not be a key factor in buying decisions behind high tech finished telecommunications products for which product features, connectivity and life cycle costs may be more important.