

---

often made about another aspect of the NEP's impact. I have seen it claimed that the recent takeovers of foreign-controlled Canadian oil and gas subsidiaries by Canadians have been at "fire-sale" prices caused by the NEP.

In fact, the biggest single takeover since the NEP, the purchase of Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas from Conoco, was at a price that Conoco itself has termed fair and reasonable. The price included a premium of 52 per cent above the pre-NEP stock market price. The highest premium of all, 67 per cent, was won by St. Joe's Minerals for the alleged "forced" sale of Candel Oil Limited, in order to ward off a takeover attempt on St. Joe's itself. Not bad business for an alleged shotgun wedding. In comparison, the average premium in over 60 takeovers in Canada since 1978 was 35 per cent. Indeed, the government in Canada has consistently been criticized for Petro-Can purchases on the grounds that the premiums paid have been too high.

One last note — the takeover fever in Canada began long before the NEP. It has had involved Canadian as well as foreign firms and sectors beyond energy. I suggest that some recently interested observers of Canada step back a bit for a little perspective.

I have taken some time tonight to discuss Canadian investment and energy policies. I did so because these are areas of concern to many in the United States, and this seemed a good opportunity to explain the Canadian position before a largely American audience. I would not like to leave the impression, however, that these American concerns and our responses define the state of relations between us. The United States' own record on trade and investment is not unblemished. Measures have been taken, for example, to assist industrial sectors having difficulty meeting international competition. Buy-American preferences abound. There are sectors of the U.S. economy from which foreign investors are excluded. We are still awaiting action on shared environmental and fisheries issues. Raising these problems gives me no pleasure. It does, however, help to put the bilateral situation into better perspective.

Let me conclude these remarks by returning to a point I made earlier. For Canada, the state of relations with the United States is a crucial matter, full of political sensitivity. Energy and investment questions lie at the heart of the relationship between our two countries. The Canadian government has developed policies in these areas which command broad national support. The government has sought to take American concerns into account (we amended provisions of the NEP, for example), but the main lines of our policies are set. They are set because they correspond to the firm wish of the people of Canada. They are in the political mainstream, and also in the mainstream of a larger, wider current of Canadian economic and political history.

#### Long-term policies

Let us be clear about this. Contrary to a recent Atlantic Council report on the subject, the Canadian policies in investment and energy are not the product of short-term political expediency. The genesis of these policies can be traced back through at least two decades of spirited and intensive national debate. It would be a mistake to suppose that a Canadian government would be able or willing to resist the historical momentum of our country's growing determination to have the necessary amount of control over its own destiny.