· 63704828(E)

doc -	
CA1 EA21 85T21	2
ENG	

TRADE NEGOCIATIONS STUDIES:

۱

DOCUMENTS RELEASED UNDER THE ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT,

MAY 21, 1986

STUDY NO. 21:

Unit cost comparisons for Canadian and American industries. (Data Resources of Canada for Dept. of External Affairs. September 1985)

TRADE NEGOCIATIONS STUDIES:

DOCUMENTS RELEASED UNDER THE ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT,

MAY 21, 1986

STUDY NO. 21:

1642618

| | | | | |

ነ የሳ ት Unit cost comparisons for Canadian and American industries. (Data Resources of Canada for Dept. of External Affairs. September 1985)

> Dept, of External Affairs Min. des Affaires extérieures

> > AUG 21 1986

RETURN TO DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY RETURNER A LA SIBUIOTRESSE DU MINISSERS

THIS STUDY WAS COMMISSIONED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. HOWEVER, THE ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHORS AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA.

.

۶.

UNIT COST COMPARISONS FOR CANADIAN AND AMERICAN INDUSTRIES

Data Resoncestor Canada :

Þ

35

PREPARED FOR: THE DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

> PREPARED BY: DATA RESOURCES OF CANADA

> > SEPTEMBER 1985

•

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY - AN OVERVIEW	3
INDUSTRY ANALYSIS	9
Agriculture Forestry Fishing, Hunting & Trapping Metal-Mines Mineral Fuels Non-Metal Mines & Quarries Food & Beverage Industries Food & Beverage Industries Tobacco Products Industries Rubber & Plastics Products Industries Leather Industries Textile Industries Textile Industries Knitting Mills Clothing Industries Wood Industries Furniture & Fixture Industries Paper & Allied Industries Paper & Allied Industries Printing & Publishing Primary Metal Industries Metal Fabricating Industries Machinery Industries Transportation Equipment Industries Electrical Products Industries Non-Metallic Mineral Products Industries Petroleum & Coal Products Industries Chemical and Chemical Ptoducts Iron & Steel Synthetic Textiles Motor Vehicle Accessories & Parts Pulp & Paper Metal Stamping, Plessing & Coating	11 13 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 23 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42

P

APPENDIX

Canadian Data Definitions	A2
U.S. Data Definitions	A21
Extending U.S. Data	A23

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .

Data Resources of Canada wishes to acknowledge the roles of several people in preparing the following analysis:

Bill Empey Vice-President and General Manager Author and Advisor

Lyn Zurbrigg Area Manager

 \mathbf{Y}_{i}

Author, Advisor, Project Co-Ordinator

Author, Analyst, Chief Economist

Adrian Redhead Economist

David Tyerman Consultant

2

Frank Cronin Senior Economist U.S. Inter-Industry Group Advisor, Analyst

Analyst

We would also like to acknowledge the guidance of Mark D. Segal, Senior Advisor,

We would also like to acknowledge the guidance of Mark D. Segal, Senior Advisor Economic and Trade Analysis, Department of External Affairs.

INTRODUCTION

The following pages contain a detailed compilation of Canadian and American economic and industrial statistics. This data was organized by Data Resources of Canada (DRI) for the Department of External Affairs with the intention of revealing the cost-competitiveness between the two countries for major industry groupings. The selection of industries and related data was predicated on the overall objective of having the report serve as one input into the Canadian government's current review of Canada-U.S. trade policy. In particular, if this policy review encompasses plans for reduced trade barriers; there will be a critical need to distinguish which sectors will be more severely impacted by increased competition. These contemplated policy issues helped to reduce the choice of industries under evaluation to goods-producing sectors.

Before work began on the project, it was agreed that no interpretation, analysis of causality or behavioural hypotheses testing would be included in the report. The emphasis is, rather, on a graphical/numerical comparison of cost measures. As such, most of the work concentrated on building the underlying data base and checking the comparability of different concepts and sources of information.

Section II of the report, "Methodology - A General Overview", provides an outline of the approach taken to create comparable cost data for the two countries. The subsequent "Industry Analysis" section presents comparisons of material and labour costs, indirect taxes, and capital-related measures for each industry in question. Numerical detail and documentation and an in-depth review of data sources and methodology is contained in the appendices.

Throughout the report, the reader should bear in mind that many difficult trade-offs and approximations are involved when making both international and inter-industry cost comparisons. Perhaps first among these is the aggregation problem that not only affects this report, but will also affect the whole process of building a new national trade policy. There is also the issue of data definitions and comparability between countries. For these and other reasons, the interpretation of the numbers must necessarily be partial and limited. The following discussion of methodology is intended to review these matters carefully, but as briefly as possible, so as to

a:1 -

provide the reader an opportunity to objectively review the findings in the report.

Notwithstanding these caveats, the current analysis, and previous work of this nature, allows Data Resources to offer the following study as an important contribution to the policy review. The authors believe that the analysis reveals key areas of strength and weakness in Canadian industry. In general, the results confirm the overall perspective that Canadian industries were operating in 1984 with costs that were 10 to 20 per cent higher than those faced by comparable American industries before accounting for the effect of the exchange rate. The depreciation of the Canadian dollar relative to the U.S. dollar after 1976 has provided a significant advantage to domestic producers, making most industries more cost-competitive than their U.S. counterparts in 1984.

The relatively strong position of many Canadian industries in 1984 is a recent development and few industries have enjoyed a consistent cost advantage for many years. Rather most sectors showed a consistent loss of competitiveness, especially before the exchange adjustment, during the 1970's.

Another general observation is that where Canadian industries show a cost advantage it is more often related to lower material costs (often lower energy costs) than to labour costs. Many industries show high and rising labour costs relative to U.S. industries.

4

.

·

• •

•

Given these concerns, and extensive research on data availability, it was decided to proceed with an analysis of the following 25 large industrial sectors and five selected sub-groups:

- 1) Agriculture
- 2) Forestry
- 3) Fishing, Hunting & Trapping
- 4) Metal Mines
- 5) Mineral Fuels
- 6) Non-Metal Mines & Quarries
- 7) Food and Beverage Industries
- 8) Tobacco Products Industries
- 9) Rubber & Plastics Products Industries
- 10) Leather Industries
- 11) Textile Industries
- 12) Knitting Mills
- 13) Clothing Industries
- 14) Wood Industries
- 15) Furniture & Fixture Industries
- 16). Paper & Allied Industries
- 17) Printing & Publishing
- 18) Primary Metal Industries
- 19) Metal Fabricating Industries
- 20) Machinery Industries
- 21) Transportation Equipment Industries
- 22) Electrical Products Industries
- 23) Non-Metallic Mineral Products Industries
- 24) Petroleum & Coal Products Industries
- 25) Chemical & Chemical Products Industries
- 26) Iron and Steel
- 27) Synthetic Textiles
- 28) Motor Vehicle Accessories & Parts
- 29) Pulp and Paper
- 30) Metal Stamping, Pressing & Coating

For each of these 30 industries, cross-country comparisons were made for:

- 1) material costs¹;
- 2) labour costs;
- 3) indirect taxes;
- 4) interest payments; and,
- 5) depreciation.

This was done by creating historical "unit cost" measures for each of these factors, defined as nominal-dollar expenditures for each item in each year divided by constant-dollar (1971\$) real output for the industry in question. In Canada, most of the data was taken from the Input-Output (I=O) tables prepared by Statistics Canada². Current- and constant-dollar I=O tables itemize output for 191 industry groupings and summarize all of the related costs of doing business. These include purchases of materials; outlays for wages, salaries and supplementary labour income; and payments of direct and indirect taxes. Creating unit-cost measures in this manner allowed us to get a handle on exact expenditures made by each industry. They reflect the fact that an industry may buy goods at discounted prices, purchase imported as well as domestically produced materials, and use a different mix of inouts than comparable U.S. industries.

Canadian I-O data and corresponding U.S. information prepared by the U.S. Department of Commerce is available on an establishment basis. The establishment is defined as the smallest operating unit which produces as homogeneous a set of goods and services as possible, capable of reporting all elements of basic industrial data. So, for example, if a company produces both raw chemicals and packaging materials, it would be classified in two separate industry groupings on an establishment basis.

Since Canada I-O data is not available for capital costs, it was necessary to use Statistics Canada corporate tax statistics in this area. The use of interest and

2

For a more detailed description of I-O tables, see the Appendix page A2.

- 5 -

¹ Material costs include transportation and storage, utilities, communication expenses, advertising etc.

depreciation values from this source makes it important to use care in interpreting the results on the study. This is due to fact that these capital-related measures are collected on a "corporate" rather than an "establishment" basis. A corporation is classified in its entirety to a single industry, even if it is engaged in a variety of industrial activities. Unfortunately, this creates some differences in accounting for costs in some industries. Similar U.S. data used in the study is measured on an establishment basis³. While these matters were outlined as a concern from the beginning, the data that follows reveals an encouraging similarity between U.S. and Canadian data on interest and depreciation costs. This similarity plus the fact that these costs are a relatively small part of the totals, suggest that important information can be added to the analysis on the capital side.

A series of data definitions and manipulation issues are also relevant. While in general the study-team tried to follow the Standard Industrial Classifications (SIC's), it was often not possible to build on a consistent base. In almost every case, this would be due to the larger U.S. economy and the fact that more and different products are produced there. While much time was spent in trying to ascertain that U.S. and Canadian data were collected from comparable industry groups, in the final analysis it is likely that the industrial groupings are not exactly homogeneous.

One mitigating consideration is that the thrust of this report is an inquiry into the unit costs of production and that these are intended to reflect the costs of industrial processes. Insofar as Canadian and American industries use similar processes, the unit cost analysis will still offer the derived "competitiveness" interpretation.

In the case of both Canadian and American data, industrial detail is only available up to the 1980 to 1983 period. Since many related data sources are available to 1984, most measures have been extended forward⁴. In general, this process involves

³ For some industries the misallocation of corporate data with establishments makes comparison of interest and depreciation costs unreliable. For this reason there are no such comparisons for Mineral Fueis, Transportation Equipment and Motor Vehicle Parts and Accessories

⁴ Interest and depreciation payments in Canada are only available to 1982 and were not extended beyond this date.

using early data on production techniques and more recent data on prices. Production techniques are generally captured in the "fixed proportions" model of I-O systems. In this framework, the ratio of constant-dollar inputs to constant-dollar outputs reflect the productivity of, say, materials and labour used. The unit cost measures shown in the next section combine productivity and price data. That is, they reflect both changing prices and changing utilization rates for the inputs. In most cases, the process of extending unit costs to 1984 combines trended or constant productivity measures from 1980 with a relevant aggregation of price/wage measures. Special attention was given to measuring unit labour costs, as recent data does allow a more careful presentation of labour productivity. Indeed, the combination of the 1982 recession and the 1983-84 recovery provides important changes in this area.

The treatment of indirect taxes was a challenging and useful addition. Canadian data was collected for total indirect taxes and indirect taxes net of subsidies. Although this latter subsidy measurement might be useful for purposes of negotiating trade protection measures, several data limitations made it impossible to present this information. Not only was it difficult to obtain comparable Canadian and American data on subsidies by industry, but the data that was available was only updated to the 1980 to 1982 time-frame. While the extrapolation of indirect taxes to 1984 did not seem likely to violate any known tax changes, the authors felt less able to support an assumption that the structure of subsidies has remained unchanged in both countries over the past few years. Examination of the results and a check of data sources also showed that U.S. data on indirect taxes includes royalties while Canadian data does not include this measure.

Consideration of the preceding remarks will help the reader to understand that great care must be taken in aggregating the various input measures. One clear objective of the study is to arrive at a single "total unit cost" measure for each industry based in a common currency. After consideration of all of the above issues, it is the authors' view that total costs defined as the sum of material, labour and indirect taxes is the more appropriate measure to use.

While this caveat may be disappointing, it is worthwhile to note that more research may be worthwhile in this area. U.S. analysis by Data Resources' Inter-Industry Group has prepared user cost of capital measures for a set of U.S. industries that

- 7 -

roughly correspond to the 30 used here. Comparable Canadian measures might be built in fairly short order. The "user cost of capital" concept is a more marketbased cost measure than the analysis attempted here. Interest and depreciation payments are more of a return to capital already put in place, while the user cost measure looks at the cost of the next incremental unit of capital to be added.

The following section now draws some conclusions from the many unit cost measures presented. These conclusions are basically static, as they capture only the relative positions of specific industries up to 1984 and make no allowance for overall growth or technological change. These last factors may prove to be of considerable importance in the future. Nevertheless, in the authors' view the unit cost comparisons offer a realistic aggregate picture of the cost-competitiveness of U/S: and Canadian goods-producing sectors.

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS

This section provides an in-depth review of the different cost structures facing Canadian and American producers over the 1971 to 1984 period for each of the 30 goods-producing industries in question. To make cross-country comparisons easier, four pages of graphs are presented for each industry. The first page depicts unit costs for each of the individual inputs: materials, labour, indirect taxes, interest payments, and depreciation. In addition, two measures of total costs are included: the sum of materials, labour and indirect taxes, and the sum of all inputs including interest and depreciation⁵. This latter measure is labelled TOTAL on the graphs.

When mention is made in the text to total unit costs, it refers to the sum of materials, labour and indirect taxes only. As discussed earlier, the authors view this to be a more exact measure of costs given the discrepancies that exist between corporation- and establishment-based data. When reference is made to shares of total unit costs — for example, material costs account for 50 per cent of total costs — all costs are included in the calculation. Given the number of cost concepts under consideration, two graphs are presented for each country to avoid over-crowding in the diagrams.

The second page shows the same information, but on an exchange-rate-adjusted basis. U.S. costs are expressed in Canadian currency, and were converted from U.S. dollars by multiplying the unit cost measure by the average annual value of the Canadian/U.S. exchange rate. The discussion of cost differences between the two countries for each of the inputs is based on pre-exchange-rate-adjusted values. Given the depreciation of the Canadian dollar against the U.S. dollar from 1976 onwards, all exchange-rate-adjusted cost profiles move in Canada's favour after that time.

5 Interest and depreciation costs are not included for the Petroleum and Coal, Mineral Fuels, Transportation and Motor Vehicle Accessories and Parts industries. See Appendix, page A19 for a detailed explanation.

- 9 -

The third page illustrates the differences between the two countries on a total cost basis. Both measures of total cost are included and are shown on both a pre- and post- exchange-rate-adjusted basis.

The final page depicts labour productivity⁶, which is shown as the ratio of Canadian to U.S. productivity levels. A 100 per cent value would indicate that productivity levels were the same between the two countries in that year.

⁶ Productivity is not available for Fishing, Hunting and Trapping since there is no employment data published for this sector.

AGRICULTURE

Throughout the early 1970's, Canadian farmers held a significant cost advantage relative to U.S. producers on a pre-exchange-rate-adjusted basis. This was principally due to the fact that unit material costs in Canada, which historically accounted for over 75 per cent of total expenditures, were anywhere from 15 to 30 per cent below U.S costs. While both countries experienced substantial increases in unit material costs from 1972 to 1974, the increase in U.S. expenditures over the three-year period was higher: 65 per cent versus 52 per cent in Canada. This left Canadian material costs 28 per cent below U.S. levels in 1974.

This advantage began to diminish in the mid-1970's, however, and in 1981 domestic material costs had jumped 25 per cent above U.S. levels. In 1989, Canadian costs increased by 6 per cent, while similar U.S. costs fell by almost 22 per cent. This left Canadian material costs 67 per cent higher than U.S. levels at the end of the period.

Canadian unit labour costs, which accounted for approximately 10 to 12 per cent of total expenditures in each year, were higher and grew more rapidly than similar U.S. costs over the period. The average annual growth rate⁷ was 8.4 per cent in Canada compared to 7 per cent in the U.S., leaving domestic costs 36 per cent above U.S. costs by 1984. Labour productivity in Canada was very low compared to the U.S., fluctuating between 42 to 52 per cent of U.S. levels over the period.

U.S. unit interest payments grew at a phenomenal sate after 1976; accounting for 18 per cent of total U.S. costs in 1984. In 1982, the last year of available Canadian interest-rate data, Ganadian unit payments were 65 per cent below U.S. lévels, However, this factor only accounted for 3.6 per cent of total Canadian costs in that year.

⁷ To avoid having an endpoint outlier skew the calculation of average annual growth, the calculation was based on a Least Squares regression against a monotonically increasing series called TIME.

The Canadian dollar improved Canada's position after 1976, and, on an exchangerate-adjusted basis, domestic farmers were cost-competitive until 1980. In 1984, however, total unit costs for Canadian producers still remained 22 per cent above U.S. levels.

<u>.</u>

А, Ч (4 %)

د ک

FORESTRY

Although total unit costs for the U.S. industry fluctuated above and below Canadian levels over the 1970's, U.S. producers held a distinct cost advantage over the early 1980's (pre-exchange-rate-adjustment). This was the result of more rapidly increasing material costs in Canada from 1980 to 1982, and substantially higher labour costs from 1980 to the end of the period.

Historical expenditures on these two items as a share of total expenditures differed substantially between the two countries. In 1982⁸, Canadian material and labour costs represented approximately 61 and 32 per cent of total unit costs respectively. In the U.S., in the same year, they accounted for 78 and 13 per cent of total costs. While domestic unit material costs remained below similar U.S. costs in most years, they increased at a much faster pace from 1980 to 1982, eliminating all of the cost advantage for domestic producers by 1982. Canadian costs grew at a much more moderate pace over the last two years of the interval relative to U.S. costs, however, and by 1984 were close to 19 per cent below U.S. levels.

Canadian unit labour costs were far higher than those in the U.S. throughout the entire geried, despite the fact that Canadian productivity levels were 90 to 100 per cent of U.S. values from 1978 onwards. The worst year for domestic producers was 1975 when unit labour costs were three times as high as those in the U.S. That was also the year in which labour productivity levels dropped to about 50 per cent of the U.S. value. By 1984, Canadian unit labour costs were still 196 per cent above U.S. expenditures.

Unit interest and depreciation payments accounted for approximately 6 per cent of total costs in both countries in 1982. Canadian unit costs in 1982 were 15 per cent higher than in the U.S.

⁸ Since Canadian interest and depreciation data is only available to 1982, Canadian shares of total costs are not available after this time. On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers were competitive in every year from 1978 onwards except 1982. In 1984, Canadian costs were 24 per cent below U.S. levels.

۰.

1. 1. 1.

FISHING, HUNTING AND TRAPPING

This industry maintained a substantial competitive edge over the U.S. sector from 1971 to 1981. By the end of the period, however, total unit costs in Canada were 4 per cent above U.S. levels.

Unit material costs accounted for 57 per cent of total Canadian costs and 78 per cent of total U.S. costs in 1982. Throughout the 1970's, Canadian unit material costs were on average 47 per cent below U.S. expenditures. This cost-gap began to narrow after 1980, however, and by 1984 Canadian unit material costs were 28 per cent lower than in the U.S.

Canadian unit labour costs were significantly higher over the entire period, increasing to a level of 274 per cent above U.S. costs by 1984. The average annual rate of increase from 1971 to 1984 was 11.1 per cent in Canada, compared to 6.2 per cent in the U.S.

Unit interest costs plus depreciation increased by 83 per cent in Carada from 1980 to 1981 accounting for almost 9 per cent of total domestic expenditures. In 1982, Canadian costs in this area were 30 per cent higher than in the U.S.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, domestic producers were more costcompetitive than U.S. producers over the entire period. In 1984, Canadian total unit costs were 24 per cent below U.S. levels.

METAL MINES

Total unit costs for the Canadian Metal Mines industry were 25 to 30 per cent below those for the U.S. throughout the 1970's. Although domestic producers maintained their cost advantage in all years except 1983, the cost-gap between the two countries narrowed over the 1980's, and by 1984 Canadian unit costs were only 5 per cent lower than those in the U.S.

In 1971, domestic unit material costs were 42 per cent below U.S. levels. They grew at an average annual rate of 13.9 per cent, however, compared to a rate of 8.6 per cent in the U.S. While both countries experienced very large cost increases for a number of years, U.S. costs decreased by 18 per cent from 1980 to 1984 while Canadian costs jumped by 62 per cent during the same period. Consequently, unit material costs were 22 per cent higher in Canada by 1984.

Although unit labour costs were lower in Canada over the entire period, the advantage held by domestic producers began to diminish in 1981 as Canadian costs increased on a year-over-year basis by 17.2 per cent more than in the U.S. From 1982 to 1984, however, Ganadian expenditures in this area decreased by 20 per cent, compared to a 2 per cent increase in the U.S. This left Canadian unit labour costs 32 per cent lower than U.S. costs by the end of the interval. Canadian labour also proved to be more efficient than in the U.S. from 1973 onwards, with productivity levels that were approximately 10 per cent higher than in the U.S. in 1984.

While unit interest payments only accounted for 6.7 per cent of total Canadian unit costs in 1972, this share had increased to 13.6 per cent by 1982. The average annual rate of growth for domestic costs over this period was 18.3 per cent, with incredible increases being posted in 1981 and 1982. In 1982, Canadian unit interest payments were 241 per cent above U.S. levels.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers maintained their cost advantage throughout the period. Although cost differences between the two countries began to narrow from 1981 to 1983, Canadian costs were still 36 per cent below U.S. expenditures in 1984.

MENERAL FUELS

The Canadian Mineral Fuels sector has been at a total cost disadvantage relative to the U.S. industry since 1975. Faster rates of growth in both unit material and labour costs over the period raised domestic costs to a level of 32 per cent above U.S. costs by 1984 (pre-exchange-adjustment).

Unit material costs accounted for 65 per cent of total input costs in Canada and 38, per cent in the U.S in 1982. While material costs grew at a rapid pace over the interval in the U.S. (with average annual growth of 15.3 per cent), they increased even more dramatically in Canada (with average annual growth of 20.7 per cent). By 1984, Canadian unit material costs were 90 per cent higher than in the U.S.

Unit labour costs accounted for 12 and 23.5 per cent of total factor costs in Canada and the U.S. respectively in 1982. Over the 1970's, domestic unit labour costs were, on average, 50 per cent below U.S. levels. While both countries experienced very high increases in this area throughout the period, the average annual rate of growth in Canada (1971 to 1984) was 2.1 per cent higher than in the U.S. While domestic producers retained their competitive advantage over the entire period, the cost-gap narrowed from 1980 onwards. In particular, in 1983 and 1984 unit labour costs declined in both countries, but by a more significant amount in the U.S. This left domestic costs only 28 per cent below U.S. levels in 1984. Canadian labour was very productive relative to labour in the U.S. levels in 1984, and only increased had dropped to about 90 per cent of the U.S. level by 1981, and only increased gradually over the remainder of the interval.

Unit gross indirect taxes accounted for 18.6 per cent of total U.S. costs in 1982, compared to only 5 per cent in Canada. Unit tax payments escalated dramatically in the U.S. in 1980 and 1981 (212 and 116 per cent respectively over the previous year). They fell approximately 22 per cent in each of the following two years, however, and by 1984 were 60 per cent higher than similar Canadian payments.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, this sector was slightly less cost-competitive than the U.S. sector in 1983 and 1984.

NON-METAL MINES AND QUARRIES

Total unit costs for the two countries were fairly comparable until 1977, when Canadian costs rose 12 per cent above U.S. levels (pre-exchange-rate-adjustment). Domestic producers remained at a cost disadvantage for the remainder of the period, and in 1984 faced total unit costs that were almost 18 per cent higher than ... in the U.S.

Unit material costs, which historically accounted for approximately 50 per cent of total input costs in the two countries, increased at an average annual rate of 12 per cent in Canada compared to 10 per cent in the U.S. While domestic costs tended to be lower over the early 1970's, they were 7 and 3 per cent higher in 1985 and 1981 respectively. A large 18 per cent decrease in U.S. material costs in 1984 brought Canadian expenditures 46 per cent above U.S. levels in that year.

Domestic unit labour costs, which accounted for approximately 35 per cent of total Canadian costs each year, were below U.S. levels until 1975 when several years of phenomenal cost growth completely eliminated Canada's competitive position in this area. By 1983, unit labour costs were 22 per cent higher than in the U.S. This situation reversed in 1984, when Canadian costs declined 17 per cent while comparable U.S. costs increased 11.5 per cent. This left Canadian unit labour costs 9 per cent lower than U.S. Costs. Canadian labour was extremely efficient, posting productivity levels over the period that were two to five times as high as in the U.S.

Canadian unit interest payments increased 429 per cent from 1979 to 1982, representing 7.9 per cent of total costs in 1982. While the average annual rate of growth for comparable U.S. payments was also high over the same period, Canadian costs were 287 per cent above those in the U.S. in 1982. U.S. expenditures in this area only accounted for 2.5 per cent of total costs in that year,

Unit depreciation payments in 1982 accounted for 8 per cent of total input costs in Canada and 11.8 per cent in the U.S. In 1982, U.S. payments were 14 per cent higher than in Canada.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian total unit costs were lower from 1978 onwards and were 9 per cent below U.S. levels in 1984.

FOOD AND SEVERACES

The Canadian Food and Beverage industry lost its competitive edge in 1975, and total unit costs continued to rise above U.S. levels throughout the remainder of the the period. By 1984, they were 27 per cent higher than in the U.S. (pre-exchange-rate-adjusted).

Unit material costs represented about 30 per cent of total costs in both countries over the period. While domestic producers held an advantage in this area in the early 1970's and were fairly competitive-from 1975 to 1978, relatively higher growth rates were posted for Canadian material costs from 1978 onwards. The average annual rate of growth over the entire period was 3.9 per cent in Canada compared to 6 per cent in the U.S. By 1984, unit material costs in Canada were 34 per cent higher than in the U.S.

Domestic unit labour costs were consistently above U.S. levels throughout the entire period. The cost-gap between the two countries continued to expand every year, and by 1983 Canadian unit labour costs were 60 per cent higher than in the U.S. In 1984, however, U.S. costs increased by 38 per cent compared to a 1 per cent increase in Canada, leaving Canadian costs only 16 per cent above U.S. levels. Canadian labour was less productive than in the U.S. throughout the period, fluctuating within a range of 55 to 60 per cent of U.S. values.

Canadian unit interest payments increased much more dramatically than in the U.S., but accounted for less than 3 per cent of total costs in both countries in 1982. U.S. tax payments were significantly higher than in Canada throughout the period, but like interest payments, only represented a small portion of total costs in both countries.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, costs were brought more in line between the two countries after 1976. In 1984, the Canadian industry held a slight cost advantage, with total unit costs 1.3 per cent lower than those in the U.S.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

This sector was very cost-competitive over the entire period, particularly from 1982 onwards. In 1984, total unit costs were 23.7 per cent below U.S. levels (preexchange-rate-adjustment).

Purchases of materials accounted for approximately 75 per cent of total input costs in Canada and 68 per cent in the U.S. in 1982. Canadian expenditures in this area were higher than in the U.S. until 1982, when cost increases began to moderate in Canada, but continued at double-digit rates in the U.S. By 1984, U.S. costs were 23 per cent above domestic costs.

Unit labour costs historically accounted for approximately 20 per cent of total costs in Canada and 10 per cent in the U.S. Canadian costs were consistently higher than U.S. costs throughout the interval and in 1984, U.S. producers had a 38 per cent advantage in this area. Canadian labour productivity was very low relative to the U.S. over the whole period and was only 50 per cent of the U.S. level in 1984.

In 1982, unit tax payments accounted for 13 per cent of total costs in the U.S. and less than I per cent in Canada. Costs were substantially higher in the U.S. over the entire period and by 1984, U.S. unit tax payments were 94 per cent higher than Canadian levels.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, the Canadian industry was in a very favourable position from 1977 onwards. In 1984, domestic producers held a 70 per cent cost advantage over the U.5. industry.

RUBBER AND PLASTICS PRODUCTS

This industry was more competitive than the U.S. industry until 1980, after which time domestic costs exceeded U.S. levels by approximately 3 to 10 per cent (preexchange-adjusted).

Unit material costs increased significantly in 1974 in both countries (33 per cent in Canada and 36 per cent in the U.S.) and began to escalate again in 1979. Canadian cost changes from 1979 to 1980 were more pronounced than in the U.S., however; and from 1980 to 1981 domestic cost increases were 3.3 per cent higher than in the U.S.

Domestic unit labour costs fluctuated above and below U.S. levels until 1981, after which time they remained above U.S. costs until the end of the period. From 1979 to 1982, costs increased by a rate of 57 per cent in Canada versus 18 per cent in the U.S., raising Canadián labour costs 23 per cent above U.S. levels in 1982. Canadian unit labour costs decreased in 1983 and 1984, however, leaving domestic costs only 6 per cent higher than those in the U.S. in 1984. Canadian labour productivity continued to improve over the period, and by 1984 was almost at the same level as in the U.S.

Unit gross indirect taxes were substantially higher in the U.S. over the entire period, but only accounted for 2 per cent of total U.S. expenditures in 1984. Canadian unit depreciation payments grew at a much higher rate than in the U.S., but accounted for a very small portion of total unit costs in both countries.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, the domestic industry maintained a favourable cost position throughout the entire period. In 1984, total unit costs were 23 per cent below U.S. levels.

- 21 -

LEATHER INDUSTRIES

This sector was at a distinct cost disadvantage over the entire interval, particularly from 1982 onwards (pre-exchange-adjusted). The average annual rate of growth over the 1971 to 1984 interval for total costs was 8 per cent in Canada and 6.6 per . cent in the U.S. In 1984, Canadian costs exceeded U.S. levels by almost 15 per cent.

Unit material costs accounted for about 60 to 65 per cent of total costs in both countries. Domestic expenditures in this area were above U.S. levels from 1973 onwards. While both countries experienced sharp increases in 1972 and 1979, the average annual growth rate over the entire period was 2.4 per cent higher in Canada. While Canadian costs increased moderately in 1982 (5.3 per cent), U.S. expenditures declined by 6 per cent that year, leaving Canadian costs close to 25 per cent above U.S. levels. U.S. costs continued to decline in 1983 and 1984, giving U.S. producers a 61 per cent advantage by the end of the period.

Unit labour costs were about 10 per cent above U.S. levels in the early 1980's. In 1984, however, Canadian costs declined by 10 per cent while similar U.S. costs increased by a rate of 42 per cent. This gave Canadian producers a 30 per cent cost advantage over their U.S. counterparts. Although relative Canadian labour productivity was low in the early part of the period, it had increased to over 90 per cent of U.S. values by 1984.

Canadian unit interest payments rose dramatically from 1979 to 1981, and were 245 per cent higher than similar U.S. payments in 1982. However, these costs only accounted for 3.5 per cent of total Canadian costs in that year.

After adjusting for the exchange rate, Canadian producers were cost-competitive from 1978 to the end of the period, with costs 13. per cent below those in the U.S. in 1984.

TEXTLE INDUSTRIES

The Canadian Textile industry was very cost-competitive on a total-cost basis (preexchange-adjustment) until 1977. Cost differences between the two countries began to expand after that time, and by 1984 Canadian costs were 24 per cent above those in the U.S.

Domestic unit material costs (which on average accounted for approximately 65 per cent of total outlays in Canada and 75 per cent in the U.S.) remained substantially below U.S. levels until the latter half of the 1970's. The average annual rate of growth over the entire period was 2.3 per cent higher in Canada, however, and, as a result, domestic expenditures in this area were 2 per cent above U.S. levels by 1984.

Unit labour costs in Canada remained above those in the U.S., and grew at a much faster pace over the entire period. A large dist increase in Canada in 1982, combined with a 20 per cent cost decline in the U.S. in 1983, brought domestic unit labour costs 123 per cent above U.S. levels by 1983. Relative Canadian labour productivity declined from 1979 onwards and was less than 70 per cent of the U.S. level in 1984.

Domestic unit depreciation payments were 106 per cent higher than those in the U.S. in 1932, and domestic unit interest payments were 278 per cent higher. These two costs combined accounted for 6.7 per cent of total Canadian expenditures in 1982.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers were cost-competitive in all years and total unit costs for the domestic indusity were 4.2 per cent lower than in the U.S. by 1984.

KNITTING MILLS

In the first half of the 1970's, total unit costs for Canadian Knitting Mills were in the range of 4 to 14 per cent below those in the U.S. costs (pre-exchange-rateadjustment). Canadian producers not only lost this advantage in 1976, but the cost difference between the two countries continued to increase after that time. By 1984, total unit costs for domestic manufacturers were 14 per cent above U.S. levels.

Canadian material and labour costs historically accounted for about 65 and 30 per cent of total expenditures respectively, as compared to 80 and 15 per cent in the U.S. Unit material costs were on average 23 per cent lower for domestic producers throughout the 1970's. Canadian unit material costs grew at an average annual rate of 5.3 per cent, however, compared to 2.9 per cent in the U.S., significantly eroding this advantage by the end of the interval.

Canadian unit labour costs remained more than 100 per cent above U.S. costs throughout the entire period. Canadian labour in this sector was not as efficient as U.S. labour; domestic labour productivity was less than 50 per cent of U.S. levels in 1984.

While overall growth in taxes and depreciation payments was relatively small in Canada compared to the U.S., interest payments in both countries increased substantially over the period. Interest payments accounted for less than 3 per cent of total costs in Canada in 1982, however, and only 1.3 per cent in the U.S.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers maintained a cost advantage in all years except 1976, with total unit costs being 14 per cent below U.S. levels in 1984.

CLOTHING

Canadian Clothing manufacturers have faced higher total costs since 1974 (preexchange-rate-adjusted). While domestic producers were only at a 5 per cent disadvantage relative to U.S. producers in 1974, total unit costs were 23 per cent higher by 1984. This was due to the fact that Canadian expenditures for labour and materials grow at average annual rates of 6.6 and 7.3 per cent respectively over this period, as compared to rates of 4.7 per cent for both categories in the U.S.

Unit interest payments grew at a rate of 252 per cent in Canada and 220 per cent in the U.S. from 1978 to 1982. In 1982, they accounted for 2.9 per cent of total Canadian expenditures compared to 1.3 per cent in the U.S.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers held a 5 per cent advantage over the U.S. industry in 1984.

#COD

The Canadian Wood industry was at a total cost disadvantage relative to the U.S., sector over the entire period, although the cost-gap between the two countries fluctuated substantially from year to year.

Total unit material costs accounted for approximately 64 per cent of total factor input costs in both countries in 1982. Changes in this area were quite erratic over the period, with very large increases being posted in some years and negative growth occuring in others. The average annual growth rate was approximately 9 per cent in both countries, and Canadian costs were 9.6 per cent above U.S. levels in 1984.

Unit labour costs increased at an average annual rate of 7.6 per cent in Canada compared to only 4.5 per cent in the U.S., leaving domestic unit labour costs 33 per cent above those in the U.S. in 1984. Canadian labour productivity improved over the years and was slightly above the U.S. rate in 1984.

U.S. unit depreciation payments were 27 per cent above those in Canada in 1982. They declined by 26 per cent in 1983, however, and by 1984 accounted for less than 4 per cent of total U.S. costs.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers held an 13 per cent costadvantage in 1984.

FURNITURE AND FIXTURES

After 1973, total unit costs (pre-adjusted) for domestic producers were higher, and grew at a faster pace, than those in the U.S. Total Canadian expenditures grew at an average annual rate of 3.5 per cent over the interval, compared to 5.6 per cent in the U.S., giving U.S. producers a 16 per cent cost advantage by 1984.

Material and labour costs accounted for close to 95 per cent of total input costs in both countries, thus dominating the picture. Costs for both categories were above U.S. levels' from 1974 onwards; in 1983, Canadian unit material costs were 18.7 per cent higher than in the U.S. The difference between the two countries was only 9 per cent in 1984, however, as U.S. costs increased 12.8 per cent in that year compared to 3.3 per cent in Canada.

Unit labour costs increased at an average annual rate over the period of 3.1 per cent in Canada compared to 5.4 per cent in the U.S. By 1982, Canadian costs were 36 per cent above U.S. levels. The cost differences between the two countries decreased the following pear as Canadian labour costs declined by 8 per cent compared to a decline of 1.5 per cent in the U.S. While costs in both countries continued to fall in 1984, these in the U.S. fell by a larger amount, making unit labour costs in Canada 31 per cent higher than in the U.S. in that year. Canadian labour productivity Improved over the period, rising from approximately 60 per cent of U.S. levels in 1971 to close to 35 per cent in 1984,

Unit interest payments were substantially higher in Canada throughout the entireperiod (444 per cent higher in 1982), and increased at a much faster pace. In 1982, interest costs accounted for 3 per cent of total Canadian costs while representing less than 1 per cent of total costs in the U.S.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers had lower total unit costs than the U.S. industry in 1985 and 1984. In 1984, domestic costs were (12) per cent below U.S. levels.

PAPER AND ALLIED INDUSTRIES

Total costs (pre-exchange-rate-adjustment) for the Canadian Paper and Allied industry were higher than comparable U.S. costs over the entire period. Purchases of materials represented the largest expenditure category in both countries, accounting for approximately 63 per cent of total costs in Canada and 45 per cent in the U.S. in 1982, Canadian material costs were, on average, 80 per cent higher than U.S. costs over the 1970's. The difference between the two countries narrowed somewhat in the early 1980's, however, and by 1984 domestic costs were 69 per cent above U.S. levels.

Unit labour costs for the Canadian industry were much lower than those in the U.S. throughout the period concerned, although they increased at an average annual rate that was 1.6 per cent higher than in the U.S. In 1984, Canadian producers still held a 32 per cent cost advantage in this area. Canadian labour efficiency rates were very close to the U.S. levels from 1971 to 1973. Productivity fell significantly, however, from 1973 to 1975, and did not reach U.S. levels again until 1980. Over the early 1980's, Canadian productivity levels fluctuated between 0 to 10 per cent below U.S. values.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, total costs were 9 per cent below U.S. values in 1984.

PRINTING AND PUBLISHING

Total unit costs were very similar between the two countries (pre-exchange-rateadjustment) until 1981, when Canadian material and labour costs began to increase more rapidly than these in the U.S. Unit material costs, which accounted for 51 per cent of total input costs in Canada and 60 per cent in the U.S. in 1982, were lower for domestic producers over the entire period. Both countries experienced high increases in this àrea in 1974 (of approximately 20 per cent) and again in the 1979 to 1980 period (of 10 to 13 per cent). Beginning in 1979, growth in Canadian material costs began to outpace that in the U.S., leaving domestic unit material costs only 2.3 per cent below U.S. levels by 1984.

Unit labour costs increased significantly in both countries in 1974 and 1975, and again in Canada in 1981 and 1982. In 1971, Canadian unit labour costs were only 5 per cent higher than in the U.S. while by 1983 they were 36 per cent higher. Canadian costs declined by 6.7 per cent in 1984, however, bringing domestic costs within 2 per cent of U.S. levels. Canadian labour productivity improved steadily over the 1970's, climbing from about 65 per cent of the U.S. value in 1971 to over 85 per cent in 1980. Canada lost ground in this area over the next few years, however, and relative productivity did not begin to improve again until 1983.

Both countries experienced high increases in interest and depreciation rates in the late 1970's and early 1980's. In 1982, total interest and depreciation charges were 60 per cent higher in Canada than in the U.S. These charges accounted for 7 per cent of total Canadian costs, and 5 per cent of total U.S. costs, in 1982.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers had a total cost advantage after 1976. In 1984, total unit costs for domestic producers were 31 per cent below U.S. levels.

PRIMARY METAL INDUSTRIES

Total unit costs for Canadian producers (pre-exchange-rate-adjustment) were higher than U.S. expenditures from 1975 onwards. This cost disadvantage began to increase in 1980 and by 1984 Canadian total unit costs were 22.6 per cent higher than U.S. levels.

Growth in unit material costs was fairly erratic in both countries over the entire period, although Canadian costs remained higher than U.S. levels after 1977. In 1974, material costs increased by 27 per cent in Canada and 38 per cent in the U.S. Similar increases were posted in 1979, but growth slowed substantially in both countries from 1981 onwards. The average annual rate of growth over the period was 10.2 per cent in Canada compared to 9.4 per cent in the U.S., bringing domestic costs in this area 22.6 per cent above U.S. expenditures in 1984.

Changes in unit labour costs were also fairly erratic over the period with large, double-digit growth rates being posted in a number of years in both countries: Canadian unit costs remained above U.S. levels throughout the entire period, however, and became significantly higher (50.5 per cent) in 1982 when costs jumped by 25 per cent over the previous year compared to an 8 per cent increase in the U.S. Canadian labour costs declined in 1983 and 1984, however, and were only 26 per cent above U.S levels by the end of the period. Canadian labour productivity fluctuated at levels between 60 and 75 per cent of U.S. values over the entire period.

U.S. unit depreciation payments increased significantly from 1979 onwards, growing by 42 per cent from 1981 to 1982. Canadian depreciation rates also increased rapidly, although not quite as dramatically as in the U.S. Unit interest payments in both countries grew rapidly from 1979 to 1982, increasing by 93 per cent in Cánada and 97 per cent in the U.S. Unit interest plus depreciation payments in Canada were 13.6 per cent below U.S. levels in 1982 accounting for 6.3 per cent of total domestic expenditures.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers were competitive from 1977 onwards with costs 6 per cent lower than in the U.S. in 1984.
METAL FABRICATING INDUSTRIES

Canadian producers were competitive in this industry until 1976 (pre-exchange-rateadjustment), when costs moved close to par with U.S. levels for a period of several years. In 1979, total unit costs in Canada jumped by 17 per cent, becoming 3 per cent higher than those in the U.S. This cost-gap continued to widen until 1983, when total Canadian unit costs were 15 per cent higher than in the U.S. Improvements in domestic material and labour costs eventually helped to reduce this upward climb, and by 1984 Canadian costs were only 9 per cent above U.S. levels.

Although both industries experienced high increases in unit material costs in 1974 (22 per cent in Canada and 33 per cent in the U.S.), Canadian costs continued to grow at double-digit rates in 1975, 1979 and 1980. As a result, by 1984 total unit material costs for domestic manufacturers were 38.5 per cent higher than in the U.S.

Canadian unit labour costs were below U.S. levels over the entire period, but Canada's cost advantage diminished significantly in 1982 when domestic unit labour costs increased 18 per cent over the previous year compared with a 5 per cent rate of increase in the U.S. Canadian costs showed moderate growth in 1983, but declined by 14 per cent in 1984, leaving Canadian unit labour costs 26 per cent below U.S. levels. Canadian labour productivity increased from approximately 65 per cent of the U.S. value in 1971 to over 85 per cent in 1981. Canada's position then deteriorated for several years, but Canadian productivity levels were back to 85 per cent of the U.S. value in 1984.

Canadian unit interest payments more than tripled from 1979 to 1982, while in comparison U.S. payments increased by 63 per cent. Interest payments only accounted for 4 per cent of total expenditures in Canada in 1982, however, and as such did not dramatically affect the industry's competitive position.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers were cost-competitive in all years except 1976. In 1984, Canadian total unit costs were 20per cent lower than those in the U.S.

MACHINERY

. .

4.5

2

480

2.00

.

To be forwarded when data anomolies resolved

TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

Canada's Transportation Equipment industry was very uncompetitive from 1971 to 1976, with total unit costs being in the range of 27 to 46 per cent higher than $U_{\rm e}S_{\rm e}^{-1}$ levels. In 1977, this situation began to reverse, and from 1979 onwards the Canadiánsector was at a competitive advantage with respect to U.S. producers. In 1984, total unit costs in Canada were 10 per cent below those in the U.S.

Unit material costs, which accounted for 72 per cent of total costs in both countries in 1982, were much more volatile in the U.S. and increased at a much higher rate over the period. In 1977, in particular, U.S. unit material costs grew at an incredible rate of 77 per cent over the previous year. The average annual growth rate was 9.2 per cent in Canada as opposed to 15.7 per cent in the U.S. As a result, Canadian costs went from being 90 per cent more expensive than U.S. costs in 1971 to .5 per cent more expensive in 1984.

Canadian unit labour costs rose substantially from 1979 to 1982, but then fell by 23 and 12 per cent respectively in 1983 and 1984. U.S. labour costs showed similarily high rates of growth, and on average increased by about 1 per cent more per year than Canadian costs. Domestic producers held a strong advantage in this area throughout the entire period, and costs were 41.5 per cent below U.S. levels in 1984. Canadian labour productivity improved significantly from 1982 to 1984, and was slightly above the U.S. value by the end of the interval.

The exchange-rate adjustment further improved the situation for domestic producers, and in 1984 Canadian costs for this industry were 4 per cent below U.S. costs.

ELECTRICAL PRODUCTS

<u>~</u>

1579 1 Although Canadian producers enjoyed lower costs from 1971 to 1974 in this industry, expenditures grew at a much faster pace than in the U.S. after that time. By 1977, domestic costs were 5.5 per cent above those in the U.S., and by 1984 they were 23 per cent higher (pre-exchange-rate-adjustment).

Unit material costs rose sharply in both countries in 1974 (21 per cent in Canada and 20 per cent in the U.S.) and again in 1979 (14 per cent in Canada and 12 per cent in the U.S.). On average, however, Canadian unit material cost increases were 2 per cent higher per year than in the U.S., and by 1984 domestic costs were 29 per cent above U.S. expenditures.

On the labour front, Canadian unit costs were below U.S. costs until 1977. They then began to fluctuate slightly above U.S. levels (5 per cent range) until 1982, when they increased by a rate of 13.7 per cent more than in the U.S. This raised domestic costs 19 per cent above U.S. levels in that year. Canadian unit labour costs declined in 1983, however, and increased by only 4 per cent in 1984, leaving unit costs only 16.5 per cent above those in the U.S. by the end of the period. While domestic labour productivity was close to the U.S. level in 1980, relative efficiency rates dropped dramatically over the next few years leaving Canadian productivity about 35 per cent of the U.S. value in 1984.

In 1982, U.S. depreciation costs were 41 per cent higher than in Canada, and they continued to grow at a very fast pace until 1983. They accounted for 6 per cent of total U.S. costs in 1982, and 3 per cent of total Canadian costs. Unit interest payments were substantially higher in Canada than in the U.S. from 1976 onwards and by 1982 were 337 per cent above U.S. levels. However, they only accounted for 3 per cent of total Canadian costs in 1982.

On an exchange-rate basis, domestic producers were cost-competitive in every year except 1976 and 1983. In 1984, Canadian total unit costs were 5 per cent lower than in the U.S.

NON-METALIC MINERAL PRODUCTS

Total unit costs for the Canadian industry were slightly more than 10 per cent below U.S. costs for the first part of the 1970s. This decreased to a 5 per cent advantage in 1975, and for the next several years costs were very comparable between the two countries. In 1982, however, U.S. producers began to gain a competitive edge and by the end of the period held a 6 per cent total cost advantage. This was principally due to the higher cost increases in Canada for material inputs, which accounted for 55 per cent of total Canadian costs in 1982. The average annual rate of growth over the period for material inputs was 11 per cent in Canada compared to 9 per cent in the U.S. By 1984, Canadian costs in this area were 18 per cent above U.S. levels.

Unit labour costs were lower in Canada until 1982, when domestic costs jumped by 17 per cent compared to a more moderate increase of 7 per cent in the U.S. Growth was negative in 1983 and very small in 1989, however, leaving Canadian costs 13 per cent below U.S. levels at the end of the period. Relative labour productivity was very good in this industry, with Canadian levels being over 96 per cent of U.S. values over the entire period. Canadian efficiency rates peaked in 1980 at about 6 per cent above the U.S. level, but had declined 10 per cent by 1989.

While Canadian unit interest payments only accounted for 2.5 per cent of total costsin 1972; this share had risen to 3.7 per cent by 1982. Costs for this factor increased dramatically over the 1974 to 1978 interval, and again from 1980 to 1982. While U.S. costs also increased sharply over this latter period, they only accounted for 2 per cent of total U.S. expenditures in 1982.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, the Canadian industry was in a very favourable position over the entire interval and in 1984 had a total unit cost advantage of 22 per cent.

- 33 -

PETROLEUM AND COAL

Canadian producers were at a distinct disadvantage on a total cost basis (preexchange-rate-adjustment) from 1974 to 1979, and from 1982 onwards. In 1984, total domestic costs were 64 per cent above U.S. levels.

Unit material costs, which historically accounted for close to 90 per cent of total costs in both countries, grew at an average annual rate of 18 per cent in Canada compared to 16.7 per cent in the U.S. From 1981 to 1984, U.S. costs in this area actually declined by 30 per cent, while Canadian costs grew by 25 per cent. By the end of the period, domestic material costs were 65 per cent above U.S. levels.

Unit indirect taxes grew at a phenomenal average annual rate of 37.4 per cent in Canada compared to only 1 per cent in the U.S. This reflected the impact of the Syncrude levy from 1978 to 1980 and other charges that were associated with the National Energy Program. Although they were 110 per cent higher than U.S. unit tax payments in 1984, they only represented 3 per cent of total domestic costs in 1982.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, the situation improved for domestic producers, but total costs still remained 21 per centrabove U.S. levels in 1984.

<u>.</u>

¢,

CHEMICAL AND CHEMICAL PRODUCTS

Total costs between the two countries were fairly comparable until 1981 when domestic costs jumped 11.5 per cent above U.S. levels. By 1984, total Canadian, costs were 25 per cent higher than in the U.S.

Unit material costs accounted for 73 per cent of total costs in Canada and 67 per cent in the U.S. in 1982. Over the 1971 to 1984 period, the average annual growth rate in Canadian unit material costs was 11.6 per cents compared to 9.3 per cent in the U.S. By 1984, unit material costs for domestic producers were 36 per cent above U.S. costs.

Unit labour costs fluctuated slightly above and below U.S. levels throughout the 1981 to 1984 period, and by the end of the period were 5 per cent lower than those in the U.S. Canadian labour productivity fluctuated between 60 and 70 per cent of U.S. levels over most of the interval, and was only about 65 per cent of the U.S. value in 1982.

U.S. unit depreciation payments grew at an average annual rate of 10.4 per cent over the period. In 1982, they were 33 per cent above Canadian levels. They accounted for 6.7 per cent of total U.S. costs and 3.7 per cent of total Canadian costs in this year.

Unit interest payments increased dramatically over the period in both countries, but were 93 per cent higher in Ganada in 1982. They accounted for a very small share of total costs in each country throughout the period.

After adjusting for the exchange rate, Canadian costs were 4 per cent below U.S. levels in 1984.

IRON AND STEEL

The domestic from and Steel industry was cost-competitive with the U.S. industry until 1980 (pre-exchange-adjustment). By 1984, total domestic costs were 9 per cent above those in the U.S.

Unit material costs accounted for approximately 60 per cent of total factor costs in both countries in 1982. The average annual rate of growth for this input was 11.5 per cent in Canada compared to 9 per cent in the U.S. While domestic material costs were lower than U.S. costs for most of the 1970's, this higher growth rate in Canada raised domestic costs above U.S. levels throughout the 1980's. Canadian costs increased by 10 per cent from 1982 to 1984, while U.S. costs only increased by 3.9 per cent. This raised domestic costs to a level of 21 per cent above U.S. values in 1984.

Domestic unit labour costs fluctuated above and below U.S. levels throughout the interval. In 1983 and 1984, however, Canadian producers gained an advantage in this area as domestic costs decreased on a year-over-year basis by 11 per cent and 1 per cent respectively in each of these years.

Unit depreciation payments increased dramatically in both countries over the period and were almost at the same level in 1982. Unit interest payments escalated at a much more rapid pace in Canada, however, and were 118 per cent above U.S. payments in 1982. They represented less than 5 per cent of total costs, however, and as such did not significantly affect Canada's competitive position.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, the Canadian industry was more costcompetitive than the U.S. industry over the entire period, with total unit costs being 19 per cent lower than in the U.S. in 1984.

SYNTHETIC TEXTILES

The Canadian industry was more cost-competitive than their U.S. counterpart until 1930 (pre-exchange-adjustment). Total costs were only slightly higher than in the U.S. in 1980 and 1981, but jumped 11.8 per cent-above U.S. levels in 1982. This was due to the fact that total unit material costs increased by 5 per cent in Canada in that year, while falling 9.7 per cent in the U.S. Total costs between the two countries were brought back into line in 1983, however, and total Canadian costs were only 3 per cent above U.S. levels in 1984.

Domestic unit interest phyments were substantially higher than U.S. levels (137 per cent in 1982) throughout the period and accounted for 4.6 per cent of total Canadian costs in 1982. On the other hand, U.S. unit depreciation payments were significantly higher than in Canada (100 per cent in 1982) and represented 8.5 per cent of total U.S. costs in 1982. The share fell to 5 per cent of total costs by the end of the period, however, as U.S. depreciation payments fell 40 per cent in 1983.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian producers held an advantage throughout most of the period, with costs being in the range of 17 to 2-6 per cent. below U-S--levels from 1980 to 1984.

1

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCESSORIES & PARTS

• - • •

.

<u>چ</u>

.

To be drafted when data anomolies are resolved

.

. . .

- 40 -

PULP AND PAPER

The Canadian Pulp and Paper industry was at a cost disadvantage vis-a-vis their U.S. counterparts from 1975 onwards (pre-exchange-adjustment). In 1982 and 1983, total unit costs for the industry were over 25 per cent higher than in the U.S. The costgap narrowed somewhat in 1984, however, leaving Canadian producers with total costs 20 per cent above those in the U.S.

In 1982, unit material costs accounted for 61 per cent of total costs in Canada and 74 per cent in the U.S. While Canadian costs in this area were lower that those in the U.S. over the first part of the 1970's, they exceeded U.S. levels for the remainder of the period. Domestic expenditures for this category grew at an average annual rate of 10.7 per cent, compared to 9 per cent in the U.S. By 1984, domestic unit material costs were 9 per cent above U.S. levels:

Unit labour costs accounted for 26 per cent of total Canadian costs in 1982 and 19 per cent in the U.S. Canadian producers were burdened with significantly higher unit labour costs throughout the entire period. From 1980 to 1982, Canadian unit labour costs grew 22.6 per cent more than U.S. costs, leaving domestic costs in 1982 88 per cent higher than in the U.S. Unit labour costs for Canada decreased in 1983 and increased only marginally in 1984, however, leaving Canadian costs only 62 per cent above U.S. levels by the end of the period. Canadian labour was also far less productive than in the U.S., and efficiency rates fell from 85 to approximately 65 per cent of U.S. levels over the period.

Ganadian unit interest payments increased dramatically in 1981 and 1982, and were 899 per cent higher than U.S. payments in 1982; accounting for 7 per cent of total Canadian costs. U.S. payments accounted for less than 1 per cent of total U.S. costs throughout the period. Domestic depreciation payments were 68 per cent higher than those in the U.S. in 1982 and accounted for 5.3 per cent of total Canadian costs.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian costs were 7.7 per cent lower than U.S. costs in 1984.

METAL STAMPING

Canadian producers were at a cost disadvantage over most of the period, and total domestic unit costs began to increase at a much faster pace than in the U.S. from 1979 onwards (pre-exchange-adjustment). By 1984, domestic costs were 45 per cent higher than U.S. levels due to the fact that Canadian unit material costs increased by 41 per cent from 1979 to 1984 compared to a 19 per cent increase in U.S. material costs over the same period. By 1984, Canadian costs in this area were 147 per cent above U.S. levels.

Unit labour costs accounted for 23 per cent of total factor costs in Canada in 1982 and 45 per cent in the U.S. Canadian costs were 40 to 45 per cent below U.S. levels in all years except 1982 and 1983. This was due to the fact that U.S. costs decreased by approximately 2.5 per cent in each of these years, while Canadian costs increased by 21 per cent and 5.5 per cent in 1982 and 1983 respectively. Domestic costs for this input were once again about 40 per cent below U.S. costs by 1984, due to the fact that Canadian unit labour costs fell 20.7 per cent that year. Canadian labour was less efficient throughout the entire period, although domestic productivity rates improved substantially over the 1970's. Although Canadian productivity fell sharply relative to the U.S. in the early 1980's, domestic rates were close to 90 per cent of the U.S. levels by the end of the period.

and the second secon

Unit depreciation payments increased significantly over the interval in the U.S., leaving U.S. costs 45 per cent above Canadian levels in 1982. Depreciation payments accounted for 6 per cent of total U.S. costs in that year and only 2.4 per cent of total Canadian costs.

Unit interest payments grew much more rapidly in Canada, increasing 66 per cent in 1982 and bringing Canadian costs 126 per cent above U.S. payments. This category only accounted for 3 per cent of total Canadian costs at that time.

On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, Canadian costs were 12 per cent above U.S. levels in 1984.

.

-

APPENDEX

÷

---- ·

. .

.

CANADIAN DATA DEFINITIONS

Statistics Canada maintains annual, current- and constant-dollar Input-Output (I-O) tables for Canada covering the period 1961 to 1980. An I-O table provides a structural picture of inter-industrial transactions in the Canadian economy. The basic unit of the table is a sector or industry. Sectors use products of other sectors as inputs for their own manufacturing activity; these same sectors distribute their products either to other sectors, where they become inputs into additional production processes (known as intérmèdiate flows), or to a final consumer who uses the product as is.

A three-sector input-Output table is shown below.

ŝ

	(5) 1 Gross	•	
	I Gross ind Productio , Including hold Commoditi ption) Used Up	Productio Including Commodit	g ies
Agriculture	00 900.00		
Manufacturing	00 1,150.00		
ervices	00 750-00	750.00	
Primary Inputs e.g., Labour)	00		
Fotal Value. of Inputs	52,800.00	.52,800.00	9
	.52,80	.52,80	<u>00</u> .a

An Input-Output Table For Hypothetical Economy

Total final demands listed in column (4) require the intermediate levels of production in columns (1) to (3). Reading across a row shows all the uses of the product. Reading down a column shows all the inputs required to make the product.

The columns in the table show the value of inputs (or purchases) used for that sector's production process, and the rows list the value of outputs, (that is, that sector's distribution to other sectors or to final consumption). Each sector appears twice in the table — once as a purchaser and once as a seller. Since this is true, and since any increase in output implies a corresponding increase in inputs, an inputOutput table reflects the inter-relationships of industrial activity throughout the economy.

The tables also include a section for value-added, defined as the difference between the value of the goods produced and the cost of the materials used in producing those goods. Actual Canadian I-O tables are in the form of a 191 by 191 matrix. For each industry, data is captured on the following: inter-industry purchases of materials; expenditures on government goods and services; commodity indirect taxes; subsidies; other indirect taxes; wages and salaries; supplementary labour income; net income of unincorporated business; and, other operating surplus. With the exception of capital-related measures, all of the Canadian data used in the study were retrieved from this source.

- A3 -

To make the data set more manageable, the current-dollar tables were reaggregated into a 37-sector economy.

Sect	nrs Analyzed	Industries included*
1.	Agriculture	+ I.
2	Forestry	- 2
3.	Fishing, Hunting & Trapping	3
4	Metal Mines	4 -7
5.	Mineral Fuels	8-9
6.	Non-Metal Mines & Quarries	10-13
7.	Food & Beverage Industries	16-32
8.	Tobacco Products Industries	33-34
9.	Rubber & Plastics Products Industries	35-38
10.	Leather Industries	39-42
į1.	Textile Industries	43-55
12.	Knitting Mills	56-57
13,	Clothing Industries	58
14.	Wood Industries	59-64
15.	Furniture & Fixture Industries	65-6 8
16.	Paper & Allied Industries	69-72
17.	Printing & Publishing	73-74
18.	Primary Metal industries	75-82
19	Metal Fabricating Industries	83-91
20.	Machinery Industries	92-95
21.	Transportation Equipment Industries	96-102
22.	Electrical Products Industries	101-110
23.	Non-Metalic Mineral Products Industries	111-120
24.	Petroleum & Coal Products Industries	LZ1-122
25.	Chemical & Chemical Products Industries	123-130
	ars Not Analyzed, But ained in <u>Re-Defined Matrix</u>	
26.	Miscellaneous Manufacturing	131-137
27.	Censtruction	138-146
28.	Transportation & Storage	147-157
29.	Communication	158-160
30.	Electrical Power Utilities	161
31.	Other Utilities	162-163
32.	Trade	164-165
33.	Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	166-170
34.	Education, Health & Business Services	171-183
35.	Transportation Margins	1 87
36.	Office Operating, Lab. & Food	134-188,188,191
37.	Travel, Advertising & Promotion	189-190

Table 1 Canadian Industry Groupings

* See accompanying Table 2 on Aggregation Parameters.

ţ

TABLE 2

AGGREGATION PARAMETERS (INDUSTRIES)

¢

	אטויקרא אדדע	L	ы	5	Land SIC	1875 310
 1921	4GRICULTURE	F				
300000 000000	PORTSTRY		i.	ij	ent <u>i≣</u> n enti-2247	511-129 941-047
3-0					월 쇼핑	031.053
00600		3	4		267	G261
2000 2011 - 20	BASE METAL & OTHER METAL MINES		1		061_069_009	054 654
0.000		· •	i	4	an 1	GEL .
	COAL HINGS		ę.	*	2003-3000 	
01.000 011.000	GX1月17月 AIN编	10 11	i i	-	ी में। सम्ब	5G 671
91. 220	SALT WINES	14	6		की नि	0779.1
61.300 61.400	CTHER MON METAL MUTEL) 1 14	1		१७% जन्म ८६७	<u>מיזין אבלית בייזים איזיים (זייא</u> י) מענגרי
41 STB	STRVICTS (NODENTAL TO MINHAG	LS.	i	4	2004 - 100 -	054.054.053
1, 50	SCALCHIERCHE A MEAT PROCESSORS	24 27	<u>t</u>	ذ ۲) (1) 1 (1251)	
r(1732) ⊂(2000)	POULTRY PROCESSORS	10		5	1994 107	1017 154
3) 900)	TISH PRODUCTS (NOUSTRY,	<u>i</u> #		÷.	111	197
3 2000 70700		20 12	1	5 5	112 12	103
	TED WIGRS	Ξ.	ī	1	114.325	104
(C. 30)	RIS	1482011128	2	•		<u> 071</u>
62-00 62-00	BAKERUTS CONTEL DAERY HEGRE	2	j	1	137	lorre toal
CT300)	SUCAR REFINERIES	74		5	122	(18 .)
177 (E) 179 (E)	VECT AALS ON MILLS NOUSTRIES	5	1	ŝ	(11) 139	10-00 10-00
12200		5	4	ī	141	70211
C 1 1 1		.	!	5	141	
43100 40000	8RE* 29155	끹		ŝ	(44 (47	LONG COSM
3170	LEAF TOBACCO PROCESSING	11		\$,	121	(5)
ومينين 1940 م	LEAF TOBACCO PROCESSING TOBACCO PRODUCTS MACRES	1	۹ لف	5	153 101	153
1000	TRE & TUBE MEGRS.	33 26	10	ŝ	145	1414 1922
	THE L TUBE AFGES	5	LØ	4 .	149	1429
2000 2000	PLASTIC FAARICA DMS. MES	`7 2	14 11	4	284 177	15
0.000	SHOE FACTORIES	4	11	2	174	274
Ca. (DC)	LATHER CLOVE FACTORIES	븮	11	5	173	1
04.200	COTTON YARN & CLETCH WILL'S	42 43	11 12	5	.(79 585	191 -
3 	WOOL, YARM & CLUTH HILLS		12	\$	192.017	12
(16.50) (16.60)	STATISTIC TEXTILE MILLS	45 44	12	2 5	271 21)	121 145)
C4120		17	121	3	112	1220 f
32.000	THREAD WILLS GINDUSTRY	<u>+</u>	12	5	191 21	1.8×
്രങ്ങൾ പ്രക്ഷാം	PARADO FASHIC WILLSU	40 22	は	\$		
an i⊂a	CARPET HAT & RUG POUSTRY	17 17 21	12	5	11.6	185
(A.200) (R.200)		11 11	12	5 5	千) 20 4 (1877)
05400	CDRDAGE & TWISE INDUSTRY	54		1	666	LITT.
2220		55 50	12	5	D	: #2.; 222.128#
Cail03 Cail03	CTARER KHARTING HILLS	57	13	1	11	
100	CLOT DIG NOUSTRES) (1)	44	\$	Tat, tag	144 149
	YENERA & PLYMOOD WILLS	50 	15 13	5	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	
26) (D	SAGH & DOOR & PLANING WILLS	61	خا	3	2	
1677E) (2577E)		2 2	اڪ دا	ŝ	34	
200		4 4	ŭ	ŝ	34	
00400	HOUSZHOLL ATTAINT INDUSTRY		l,≣	5		
	VENERAL & PUTMOOD MILS SARA & DOOR & VALMING WILLS VOODSH 30X FACTURES CONTRA & CASUER INDUSTRIES NOUSSENDLE ATRAFTICES INDUSTRIES NOUSSENDLE ATRAFTICES INDUSTRIES OFFICE RESART AS INDUSTRIES	ស ភ	16 14	ية. ج	284 284	2
	A STAR LAND & SHADE CHEVETRY	C	14	ž	1000	F _
1753 1753	PLTP & APER WOUSTRY	0 19	17 17	,	N	and The The Index
ភា(ចោ	PAPEN BOX & BAG MITCRS	#1	t i	ĩ		
07 200 17 200	PRINT A RESUSTING	흑	17	2	114	흔
174-10	5468.41046, STELET, 179946, BOD	74	14	3	787 787 788 787	<u> (1987</u>). 197
<u></u>	BOH & STEE ORUSTRY	2	L 1	4	<u>21</u>	97_ 21
رتينية منهون	RON FOR THE	7 .	1	1	81 194	
- 1	RON FORMORIDS		13	i	385.	
	ALCENNIM-ROLLENG & EXTRUDENG	77 62	볞	5	24 74	
99100	COPPER + ALLOY 201	61	5		201 201	
300	METAL CASTING & EXTRUSION NES	ᅽ	<u>1</u> 2-	ş	22	2 -
3000) 36433	BOBLER & PLATE WORKS		2	4	하) 1년	24 73 25 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27
196 20	ORMANIYTAL & ARCH METAL LYD	2	50	4	<u>50</u>	- <u>22</u>
80000 20702	NZTAL STANZ 27255 & COAT 200	29 FT	- F	6	ju Id	1 94
	ARCALAR TOOL & CATLORY MPGRE	67 64	불			224 22
0 10		20		i	207	20
- 100 - 100	MACHENE SHOPS	50 h	2 P	k j	75 734	고 꼬,
	እርዲሮቢ ፕ ንዲሬ <u>እምኒ ይ</u> ለሯሉ? ውወ	10	-	4	141	#1
6733E	MISE MACHENERY & SELEP KOVERS		드	÷.	22.5	334
	CENCE A STORE MACHINERY MERCES	14 16	п п.	1)(#]]#	314 413
Sinco	ADCENT & PARTS APCRS	44	Ŧ	5	F.2	111

AGGERGATION PARAMETERS (MOLSTREES)

r

,

2

. 2

Ì

_	<u>да</u>	CRECATION PARA	METER	SUMPLET		
	UNDUSTRY TITLE	L	M	5	1660 932	uno sic
a 1700	WITH VIEC Z MEGR			i		••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
	MOTOR VEHICLE MOGRA TRUCK GODY & TRAILER MEGRA MOTOR VEN PT3 & ACCES MICRS	14	Ħ	:		34
	MOTOR YEAL PTS & ACCESS MPCRS	,10) 1.00	nnabhddubbhhhhtere	2		
101.05		ίοι	5	:	고카	
1000	MISC TRANSP BERTY ING	192	2	1		
10400	MALL STRUCK APPLANCES	105	릌	B* 5	<u>コ</u> 」	anzan
(12.00		100	Ē	ŝ	4	F 4
	EINMANNEATIONS BRUUP MENT MOCRS	1 07	극	5		
10000) 10000)		100	튤	1		201
0000	WACKS OF ELECTION WORK & CABLE	178	겯	- 5		
11100	MPG2S OF MSC ELST, PRODUCTS	110 1(1		5	. 200 341	202
.11	LIME MITCHS	112	14	Ĩ.	343 347	256
1.000	CONCRETS FROMULTS MFGRS	117 114	24 24	2.	, 347 340	194 194
11-00	CLAY PRODUCTS MPGRS	113	24	š	25 (ゴL 、
11.000	SETRACTORIES MICAS	114	24.	4	112 113	
11730	STONE PRODUCTS MAGRA	117. 118	14 14	a S	<u>346 - 254 - 265 - 356</u>	151°
1,200	CLASS & GLASS PRODUCTS MEGRS	([5		i .	336	155
(2)399 (21 99	ABRASIVES AFGRS	(20) 171	12 P 12	ş	337 198	147 146
12200	OTHER PETROL & COAL PROD IND.		ŝ	3	38 38 11	363
1	MOTERS OF MIXED FRATELICERS	12	湖	5		122 122
(2 402)) (2 400)	METERS OF PLAST, & STATIS, MDS.	#24 기술:	18 -	1 1	173 174	272 274
1253	PAINT & YARNISH MFCRS	125	75.	. 5	3 73	275 278
13753	MPCRS OF SOAP & CLIAMING COMP	(27) 1720	(38) 342	<u>.</u>	.5 ¹⁵	मन्त्र मन्
1.3290 1.3290	ABRASIVES ANGLES PETROLEKUM REPHADURES OTHER PETROL & COAL PRED IND. MUTERS, OF PLAST, & SYNTH, RES MUTERS, OF PLAST, & SYNTH, RES MUTERS, OF SDAP & CLEANING COMP MUTERS, OF SDAP & CLEANING COMP MUTERS, OF SDAP & CLEANING COMP MUTERS, OF SDAP & CLEANING OTHER CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES SUTING & PROP BULL, MUTES	129	*****	š	- 202	
1,3300	OTHER CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES	129 L30 L11	별	5	an ann	<u> </u>
(3100) (3200)	JELENT & PROFE EQUIP. MPGRS	141 132	स ह	1	- 181) - 1221	-201 252
1 1 1 1 1		572 132	1	3	381	2001
13500 13500	SPORTING COODS & TOY INCUSTRY	13-		3	· 190	39. 1965
(10,000)	SIGNS' & DISPLAYS INDUSTRY	. 135	ž	ŝ	31	37
(3.30	MESC, MAUNUTACTURING IND. NES	1.	<u>.</u>	2	24. 34. 291. 351	2372.2294-2399
1,2000	REPAIR CONSTRUCTION	1.249 (.251	19. 21	5 5		
(400 B	MON RESIDENCIAL CONSTRUCTION	5 4 0	77	-	404-421	404 421
4.0	RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION NOR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION ROAD HIGHWAY AIRSTRUCTORST CAS AND OIL FACILITY CONST DAME AND CREIGATION PROJECTS	74L 141	にたいわれ	4	eld11 22+1	# <u>24-</u> +21, 424
14300 14303	DAME AND CRUGATION PROJECTS	1+1	2		600-42)	مراجع المراجع () المراجع ()
	DANG AND CONGENTION FRAMEWORE TO LEGRAPH CON OTHER SHOLKERING CONSTRUCTION CONSTRUCTION OTHER ACTIVITIES SERVICES INCOEVIAL TO TRANSP WATER TRANSPORT RALEWAY TRANSPORT TRANSPORT	144		-	604-4 <u>71</u>	c0e→2(
146063		i 45 1 44	1	1	494-421 494-421	eΩ±a2L #)=42]
14770	ADR TRAMSPORT	L4T	`	7	901-502 (501-507
(490)	SERVICES INCIDENTAL TO TRANSP	148 40	3		517,519	5(7,519 394,505
12020	RALEWAY TRANSPORT	(40	ŝ	÷	304-348 507	503
13100		151	nninn	. 1	M 07	¥28-307
15,350	URBAN TRANSP INTERURSAN & RURAL	151	3	-	509 500	309 509
وتصورا	TAXICAB OPERATIONS	154	10	÷	313	512
15500	HIGHWAY & SRIDCE MAINTENANCE	135 136	2	Ť ť	31 <u>7</u>	212
5.5600 1.2770)	STORAGE	(57		÷.	516 574 - 177	516
13.000	RADIO & TEL BROADCASTING	(32	3	÷	÷••1	لتغر
15000	COMMUNICATION INCOSTRUES.NES	149 1 40	20		<u>144_145</u> 344	ويدر نموا المرا
(4130	POST OFFICE	LELD	nnersa.	.5.	572	577
1 (223)	VATER & OTHER UTILITIES	142	31 31	:	574	574 476 x70
1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1		144	14 14 14	15	576-177 102-1-7	. 674-079 404-639
19000	RETAIL TRADE	(iii)	끈	11	di-101	C11-000
Lignado Lignado	COVT. ROYALTIES ON NAT RESOURCES	(22) 507	39	17	757	F
	BANKS AND CREDIT LINIONS	145	3	11	Tet	7011-7012-7016-7019
	OTHER FIRE INS. & REAL ESTATE	1,650° 1,770	ä	11	77): 782,794,794	771 1751 - 1752 - 1757 - 1757 - 1757 - 1757 - 1757
1710		171	ž.	13	10(-100)	telfering 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12
(7.00		17 2 . 173	DANKRIT	1	421	<u> </u>
17 4,20	MEALTH SERVICES	174.	÷.	12		621-67 84 (
1.300	OTHER RECREATIONAL SERVICES	175		13	MJ-496	143-845-14d
1,7200 1,7700	ADTION PICTURE THEATRES OTHER NOCREATONAL SERVICES	176 (77	16. 21	13 13	1947. <u>1964. andal</u> 1967	64) <u>ani est but</u> 861
17440	LAUNDRIES & CLEANERS	(14	43	(3	l∰T4_	87 4. JTB
17320	ACCOMMODATION & FOOD SERVICES	\$79 1 mil		13	SCLERE The second second	(3) - (4) - (3)
1.200000 101100	PHYTOCRA PHY	120) 146	2	2	10.10.10 - 201 205	611.372.67.573 883
10000	MISC REPAIR & MAINTENANCE	Ling	4	L31	10-1-17	All the second sec
((Cana)	MISC REPAIR & MAINTENANCE	5 10 114	3	3	DUMMY MOUSTRY	2011-242-257-227-201-201-201-201-201- 2011-242-257-257-257-257-257-257-257-257-257-25
19609 19609		164 (#5	14	. 5 14	DUMBY UNDUSTRY	NUMMY INDUSTRY
12670	CAPETERIA REDU	(app	4	(0	OCHMY CHICSTRY	CONNY RICUSTRY
57-0	TUANSPORTATION MARCINS	1977 1984	42	(4 13	DUNINY CHEUSTRY	DUMMY COUSTRY
17860	TRAVEL & RUTERIALNER, The second second	1.620	9	18	DUMBRY INDUSTRY	DUMMY DULYTRY DUMMY INDUSTRY
(90000)	ADVERTISING & PROMOTION	(\$9) 191	a	19	OUNDY INDUSTRY	DUMMY HUDUSTRY
(\$199	MACHINERY REPVIR SERVICES	:71		.a	DUMMY INDUSTRY	DUMMY (SOUTTRY

- A6 -

A second matrix (5 by 37) was created for the five incustry sub-groups: Iron and Steel; Synthetic Textiles; Motor Vehicles Accessories and Parts; Pulp and Paper; and Metal Stamping, Pressing and Coating.

- AZ -

A. Total Material Costs

ः ४

Total material costs were calculated for each of the 30 industries under evaluation using the I-O data. A historical unit material cost measure was created by dividing total nominal-dollar expenditures for materials in each year by constant-dollar (1971\$) gross output for the overall industry. Since Cahadian data is only available to 1980, it was necessary to extrapolate material costs to 1984. This was done by accounting for both price and productivity changes.

Industry selling price indices and proxies thereof were selected from the CANSIM data base and the DRI Canadian model data base for each of the materials used (see Tables 3 and 4). Where necessary, these were re-based to equal 100 in 1971.

Table 3 Industry Selling Price Index 1971=100

INDÚSTRY	INDOSTRY	SZLING PRI	ICE INDEX	1971=100
AGRICULTIRE		NA NA		_
Porestry:		NA		
PISELTRAP		AR		
METAL MINES	i.	MA		
MIN FUELS		XA.		
OTHER MINING	_	<u>n</u> a		
Poddebev		D500001		
TOBACCO		D511200		
RUBBER		DS11500		,
LZATEER		D513400		
TEX MILLS	i i	D514500		
KNIT WILLS		D51,6660		
CLOTE ING		D517501		
WOOD IND		D519100		
FURNITURE		D523200		
PAPERA		D524200		
PRINT1POB		D627129		
PRIMARY MET		D527100		
METAL PAB		D529400		
MACE INERY		D532900	¢ -	
TRANS BOUP		D535801		
EL-ECTRICAL		D5373.00		
Mon-Metal		D541400		
PETECOAL		D544000		
CEENICALS		0545200		
SINTE TEX		.SA		
FULP&PAPER	_	DS24201		•
HETAL STAP	÷	D530301		
RV&PARTS		DS36401		
iron4ste <u>s</u> l		05;27101		
SOURCE: STATISTICS	CANADA MINI BA	SZ, MATRIX 6	55 TERODGE	574, 964

~ A'9' -

ı

Table 4 Miscellaneous Generated Prices

MISCELLANEOUS GENERATED PRICES

÷

.

, -

÷

.

e.į

: *: . *: .

GPCNPUEL GPCON GPEDEBAL GPPISR GPPOR GPMMISC GPOOLP GPPRNTL GPTAP GPTRLS	GENERATED PRICE - COMMUNICATION GENERATED PRICE - EDUCATION, HEALTH & BUSINESS GENERATED PRICE - FINANCE, INSURANCE & REAL ESTATE GENERATED PRICE - FORESTRY GENERATED PRICE - MISCELLANEOUS MANUFACTURING GENERATED PRICE - OPPICE, OPERATING, LAB & FOOD
GPTRADE GPTRMAR GPUTO	GENERATED PRICE - WHOLESALE & RETAIL TRADE
PAF PCNST PEL2C PFISB	PRICE INDEX - AGRICULTURE AT THE PARM (1971=100) PRICE INDEX - CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY PRICE INDEX - ELECTRICITY PRICE INDEX (CPI) - FISH
FWMIATL FWMINM SOURCE: DRI	WHOLESALE PRICE - METALS WHOLESALE PRICE - NONMETALLIC MINERALS MACROECONOMIC MODEL DATA BANK, @CANADA/QDATA

.

.

Shares of each of the 37 material input purchases to total material expenditures were then calculated by industry. The product of these shares, multiplied by the relevant industry selling price indices, were summed to produce a weighted material price index for each industry. This was set equal to 1 in 1980.

37

Weighted Material Price Index(1) (1980 = 1)

= $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \text{share}_{(j)}$ = price index_{(j)} j=1 where 1 = industries 1 to 30 i = materials 1 to 37

Technical coefficients, defined as ratios of total real material input costs to total real output by industry, were constructed from the constant-dollar I-O tables. These coefficients, which reflect the changing composition of material input usage across industries over time, were then regressed on an annual time trend over the period 1971 to 1980. Where significant statistical relationships existed, an equation was formed to project the coefficients over the 1981 to 1984 period. In all other instances, they were held constant at 1980 levels. All coefficients were then transformed into an index number set equal to 1 in 1980.

Over the period 1981 to 1989, unit material costs were calculated by multiplying the value of unit material costs in 1980 by the indexed coefficient and the weighted material price index.

- AII -

Unit Material Costs(iX1981 to 1984)

Unit Material Costs(i) (1980) * Indexed Coefficient(i) * Veighted Material Price Index(i)

where i = industries 1 to 30

B. Unit Labour Costs

Over the period 1971 to 1980, unit labour costs for all 30 industries were defined as being the sum of wages, salaries and supplementary labour income divided by real gross output (1971\$). Supplementary labour income includes employer contributions to health/welfare programs, U.I.C. contributions, payments in kind, or irregularly or infrequently paid bonuses, etc. All data was sourced from the I-O tables.

In all but three cases, the technique used to extrapolate these measures over the 1981 to 1984 interval first involved creating a proxy defined as average hourly earnings multiplied by the number of employees (to represent wages, salaries and supplementary labour income)¹ divided by real gross output.

	Average	Number of
Unit Labour Cost Proxy(i) (1981 to 1984)	= Hourly Earnings	(i) * Employees(i)
	Real Gross Out	put (1971\$) _(j)

where i = industries 1 to 30

Average hourly earnings and employment information was taken from the CANSIM base (see Table 5). Real gross output was assumed to grow at the same rate as the corresponding real domestic product measure available in the CANSIM base (see Table 6). Growth rates were calculated for the proxy over the 1981 to 1984 period, and these rates were applied to the 1980 I-O unit labour cost measure to extrapolate the data to 1984.

Data on number of employee hours was not available.

L

Ϋ.

INDUSTRY	GROSS	DOMESTIC	PRODUCT	CONSTANT	1971	PRICIS
AGRICULTURS		D141	941			
Porestry		D141				•
Píse (trap		D143				
HETAL MINES		D141				
AIN FOELS		D141				
CTHER MINING		D143				
POODABEV		D143		•		
TOBACCO		D141	•			
RUEBER		D141				
LEATEER		D143				
Tex MILLS		D14]				
KNIT MILLS		D141	•			v.
CLOTE ING.		D141				
HOOD IND		D141				
furniture		D141				
PAPERS	-	D14]				
Printefub		DI4]	-			
PRIMARY MET		D141				
hetal (PAB		D14:				
MACH INERY	-	_ <u>114</u> ;		-	•	
TRANS LOOP	•	DI4:				£
ELECTRICAL			2016			
MON-HETAL		D143	• •			
PETSCOAL		DI42				
CEEMICALS	··· · ••	D14		-		
MAN-MADE FIERE		D143				
POLPEPAPER		D14]				
METAL STMP		D14				
HV4PARTS		D141				
Iron asteel		Ð14)	1331			

Table 5

:

.

ļ

Ì

۰ م

.

SOURCE: STATISTICS CANADA MINI BASE, MATRIX 1126

.

- Ri3 -

INDUSTRY	AVG. HOURLY OLD	EARNINGS NEW	NO. OF EMPI OLD	LOŸEÈS New Teteeren
AGRICULTURE	9 D524	9	** D77;	2020
PORESTRY	na	ls 83	D700100	13
Fise&Trap	NA	NA	NA	NA
METAL MINES	D708301	15587	D700104	L7
MIN FUELS	D708305	LS593	D700108	L13
NON-MET MINES	D708307	L5596	D700111	L16.
POODABEV	D708314	LS670	D700118	L9
TOBACCO	D708329	1568 <u>1</u>	D700134	L101
RUBBER	D708331	15683	D700136	<u>L103</u>
LEATEER	D708335	15686	D700141	~ <u>1106</u>
TEX MILLS	D708338	15691 ·	D700144	<u>1111</u>
KNIT HILLS	D708345	LS701	D700151	<u>L121</u>
CLOTHING	D708348	15704	D700154	L124
WOOD IND	D708352	L5609	D700158	
FURNITURE	D708356	15616	D700162	136
Papers		L5711	D700165	L131
PRINTEPUB	C708363	15716	D700171	L136
PRIMARY MET	D708366	LS621	D700174	L41
METAL PAB	D708371	L5629	D700180	149
MACHINERY	Ð708380	LS639	D700189	<u>15</u> 9
TRANS EQUP	D708383	LS644	D700192	L64
ELECTRICAL	D708389	L5652	D700198	L72
HON-METAL	D708396	15661	D700206	L81
PET&COAL	D708400	15721	D700210	1141
CERMICALS		L5724	D700213	L1 44
MAN-MADE FIERE	D708341	15694	D700147	L114
POLPEPAPER	D708360	15712	D700167	L132
METAL STMP	D708375	15633	D700184	<u>د کی</u>
MVEPARTS	D708387	LS648	D700196	L68
IRONASTIEL	D708367	15622	D700147	L42

Table 6

SOURCE: STATISTICS CANADA MAIN AND MINI BASE

·•: ,

ŝ

OLD EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS AND HOURS SURVEY, AVERAGE HOURLY EARNINGS OF HOURLY-RATED WAGE-EARNERS AND EMPLOYMNET INDEXES, MATRIX 1432 & 1435

REVISED EMPLOYMENT, PAYROLLS AND BOURS SURVEY, AVERAGE HOURLY EARNINGS OF OF EMPLOYEES PAID BY HOUR AND NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, MATRIX 8003 & 8021

* D5249, WAGES AND SALARIES, AGRICULTURE, FISHING, HUNTING AND TRAFFING, MATRIX 1792

** D772020, EMPLOYED IN AGRICULTURE, MATRIX 2075, LABOUR PORCE SURVEY

Table 7

.

٢.

.

Indostry	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
OTHER MINING POOD BEVERAGES TOBACCO RUBBER LEATHER TEX MILLS KNIT MILLS CLOTEING NOOD IND PORNITURE PAPSRE PRINTEPUB PRIMARY MET METAL FAS	D185832 D185833 D185833 D185833 D185835 D185836 D185836 D185836 D185839 D185849 D185844 D185844 D185844 D185844 D185845 D185846 D185846 D185846 D185853 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185834 D185843 D185844D185844 D185844 D185844D185844	D187195 D187196	D187419 D187420 D187421 D187423 D187423 D187424 D187425 D187425 D187425 D187425 D187429 D187429 D187429 D187430 D187431 D187433 D187433 D187434 D187435 D187435 D187436 D187484 D187487	(4) D187638 D187639 D187640 D187641 D187642 D187643 D187643 D187643 D187645 D187646 D187647 D187647 D187659 D187651 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187655 D187659 D187659 D1877651 D1877651 D187659 D187659 D1877651 D1877651 D1877651 D187657 D187657 D187657 D1877651 D1877651 D1877717	D187874 D187873 D187873 D187874 D187875 D187875 D187875 D187877 D187878	D188097 D188098 D188091 D188100 D188101 D188101
FOOTNOTES: (1) MATERIAL; (2) BOND INT: (3) BORTCAGE (4) OTHER IN: (5) TAXES OTH (6) DEFRECIAN SOURCE: STAT:	5 1RFST INTEREST FERZST HER THAN DI FION	irect taxes Ada Main Ba	S ASE, MATRI		DGI 5265,	

- 820 -

e.

. ----

. . .

-

U.S. DATA DEFINITIONS

All U.S. data used in the study is collected by the U.S. Department of Commerce. Output and employment information is complied by the Bureau of Industrial Economics (BIE). This data is establishment-based and is consistent with the corresponding data used for Canadian industries. Indirect taxes, interest payments and depreciation are also establishment-based and comes from the Gross Product Originating (GPO) Tapes complied by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).

GPO data represents value-added and includes measures of: wages and salaries; supplements to wages and salaries; net allowances; non-corporate capital adjustment allowances; indirect business taxes and non-tax liabilities; business transfer payments; corporate profits before taxes; non-corporate income; corporate inventory evaluation adjustments; rental income of persons; government subsidies; and current surpluses of government enterprises.

Using the information on output from BIE and value-added from BEA, material costs for each industry were calculated as the difference between nominal output and value-added:

e e testi e e e e e e

A. Unit Material Costs

Unit material costs were defined as nominal-dollar expenditures on materials divided by real output (1971\$) for the industry in question.

8. Unit Labour Costs

Unit labour costs were defined as nominal-dollar expenditures on wages, salaries and supplementary labour income divided by real output (1971\$) per industry. As in the case of the Canadian data, supplements include pension and profit-sharing contributions, group insurance, workmen's compensation, supplemental unemployment, etc.

C. Labour Productivity

Labour productivity was calculated as the ratio of real output (1971\$) to total number of employees (millions).

D. Unit Gross Indirect Taxes

Indirect taxes include sales, excise and property taxes, and windfall profits on crude oil production. It also includes non-tax liabilities such as royalty payments. Unit gross indirect taxes were defined as the ratio of gross indirect taxes to real output per industry (19715).

E. Interest Payments and Depreciation.

Interest payments include interest from all sources including bonds and mortgages. Depreciation is based on the book-value of assets and consists of depreciation changes and accidental damage to business capital for non-farm business. For farms and non-profit organizations, it is calculated by BEA based on straight-line depreciation and historical costs. This data is taken from the GPO tapes and is establishment-based. Unit interest payments were calculated as the ratio of nominal interest payments to real output (19715) per industry. Unit depreciation was calculated as the ratio of nominal depreciation payments to real output (19715) per industry.

EXTENDING U.S. DATA

Since actual U.S. data is only available to 1983 for manufacturing sectors and 1982 for non-manufacturing sectors, it was necessary to draw forecast information from DRFs <u>U.S. Inter-Industry Service</u> to complete the data set². The Inter-Industry Service provides an interlocking set of mathematical models which are backed by extensive historical data bases, including the Department of Commerce information described above. At the core of the service is an input-output model that traces the flow of goods and services through over 400 industrial sectors of the U.S. economy. The model is linked to DRFs macroeconomic model to provide regular forecasts of output, employment, production costs and other key factors.

The model was re-aggregated to correspond to the 30 industry sectors under evaluation in the study to provide the 1983 and 1984 data required.

² The historical data was retrieved from the service as well.

GRAPHS ·

-- ____

7 15

ind.

- 54

121

بوديده، بيني)

יוסו בב לוונוא בבין ליואי

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Agriculture	1
Forestry	5
Fishing, Hunting & Trapping	9
Metal Mines	12
Mineral Fuels	16
Non-Metal Mines & Quarries	20
Food and Beverage Industries	24
Tobacco Products Industries	23
Rubber & Plastics Products Industries	32
Leather Industries	36
Textile Industries	40
Kaitting Mills	6 7
Clothing Industries	48
Wood Industries	52
Furniture & Fixture Industries	56
Paper & Allied Industries	60
Printing & Publishing	64
Primary Metal Industries	68
Metal Fabricating Industries	72
Machinery Industries	76
Transportation Equipment Industries	80
Electrical Products industries	34
Non-Metallic Mineral Products Industries	88
Petroleum & Coal Products Industries	92
Chemical & Chemical Products Industries	96
Iron and Steel	100
Synthetic Textiles	104
Motor Vehicle Accessories & Parts	108
Pulp and Paper	112
Metal Stamping, Pressing & Coating	116







Ļ





4








Percent

ю



.









i a









.17

Î

% Difference between Canada and U.S. Input Unit Costs

Mineral Fuels

Pre-Exchange Rate Adjusted Total (Line) Naterials, Labour and Taxes (Dat)





Percant .

ៗ









l







じる











Percant

E









Percent

_









こうりとうし












_ • . '







.































I Difference between Canada and U.S. Input Unit Costs Paper I Allied Industries

Pre-Exchange Rate Adjusted Total (Line) Materials, Labour and Taxes (Dat)
































I Difference between Canada and U.S. Input Unit Costs Machinery Industries

Pre-Exchange Rate Adjusted Total (Line) Materials, Labour and Taxes (Bot)













ູເບ





















E





Pencant















-







I













Parcent







;

114

÷













i

DOCS CA1 EA21 85T21 ENG Unit cost comparisons for Canadiar and American industries 16402698



.

ľ

.

.

· · · ·