

SELLING OFF CANADA: COMPLETE SURVEY RESULTS

Note: Not all respondents answered all questions. Response 1 to one question is not necessarily from the same respondent as response 1 to another question.

1. Does it matter who owns our natural resources, banks, manufacturing and retail operations?

YES 89.4%

NO 10.6%

Comments:

1. If we do not own these we are unable to control our own destiny and direction and we ultimately cede our sovereignty as a nation.
2. Our natural resources are precious and are poorly managed. Banks are too rich and greedy and refuse to invest in the little guy. Retail operations are like banks and simply care about their next acquired property and not about the local customer or what town they are in. Profits, profits, profits and waste, waste, waste.
3. Independents are able to understand and respond to their customers much quicker than other types of ownership. The ownership of natural resources and the ownership of retail operations are two completely different questions with completely different answers.
4. Ownership & control are two mutually exclusive issues. Non-Canadians can own but don't necessarily control. However, it is important that the ownership benefits Canadian nationhood in spite of who owns the company.
5. There needs to be some management
6. It is important that a percentage remain in Canadian hands, in particular our natural resources.
7. We should be masters of our own destiny!!! - For good or bad.
8. Hopefully Canadian owners would put Canadian interests ahead of other considerations, when possible.
9. In all the above areas we need a system of checks and measures. So sometimes it is in the best interests of the private sector to be an owner and sometimes government does a better job.
10. Ownership=influence.
11. PEOPLE SHOP FOR THE BEST PRICE NOT NECESSARILY THE BEST VALUE OR QUALITY
12. Should be controlled by Canadians.
13. Quality especially, and costs

14. Loss of economic control
15. Let's regulate how much foreign takeovers
16. Some high profile Corporate icons should remain in Canadian hands but the industries should not be over-protected
17. So long as they keep us competitive and keep reinvesting.
18. NEED TO PROTECT THE NATURAL RESOURCES FROM OVER USE AND THE RETAIL OPERATIONS FROM GIANTS SUCH AS WALMART WHO ARE LARGE ENOUGH TO SERIOUSLY AFFECT OUR MARKETS, WITH BENEFITS MOVING TO OTHER COUNTRIES. MOREOVER THERE IS A POINT AT WHICH ANOTHER MACDONALDS, OR HOME DEPOT OR WALMART BEGINS TO AFFECT OUR WAY OF LIVING, CHANGING IT FROM PEDESTRIAN DOWNTOWNS INTO SPRAWLING SUBURBS, ADDING TO POLLUTION BY PROMOTING VEHICULAR TRAFFIC RATHER THAN PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENT.
19. Majority ownership should remain in Canada for the benefit of our country.
20. Our natural resources should be solely Canadian owned. It's too late to stop foreign-owned banks, etc..
21. Such things as mentioned above should remain in the hands of Canadians.
22. Not sure
23. Once we give up our ownerships to other countries, we are controlled by them.
24. Should, if at all possible, be Canadian majority ownership. We are already under too much control/influence from the USA.
25. We need to keep control over our natural resources.
26. Things like water are going to be valuable resources in the future and banks etc. need to have a Canadian perspective.
27. All should belong to Canada
28. To keep the Canadian dollar strong there should be many Canadian owners.
29. Canadian resources should be owned by Canadians! If not, we will soon find ourselves asking "How high?" when the Americans, Chinese, Japanese say "Jump!"
30. A financial institution should not own natural resources
31. Of course, Canada needs this ownership to determine our destiny and needs.
32. Yes, but as long as the government sets limits on maximum foreign ownership.
33. We have been led to believe that our short term gain is worth long term pain. Walmart and other big box stores have led us down a path of slow destruction.
34. If we sell it off, we will be totally at mercy to outside markets
35. Foreign investments are more likely to occur in sales markets than in supply chains. Resulting benefits are not comparable
36. Absolutely our ownership should always be over 80% Canadian
37. This is a part of our heritage to pass on to our children, and grandchildren.
38. I would rather have a Canadian company owning businesses in Canada because

they are more aware of the values and needs of Canadian consumers. Also, more money stays in Canada.

39. You bet it matters. There isn't enough room here for all of my thoughts. Read Maude Barlow about the loss of our water.
40. Canadians should own if operations are located in Canada.
41. Canadians lose power and control
42. I prefer to see the profits generated by business remain in the country/community. Natural resources should be controlled.
43. Natural resources and manufacturing are not quite the same as banks and retail operations. Natural resources if not managed correctly could hurt our lifestyle. Manufacturing has to be responsible to the Canadian people - therefore should be Canadian owned.
44. Of course, we'd like for everything to be Canadian. But, of course, it's about who can offer more.
45. It doesn't seem to matter where the product is coming from as far as price differences. If the item is made in Canada and goes to the US for selling, the price (on some things) is still cheaper, i.e. cars.
46. Duh...
47. For manufacturing it makes their growth more difficult. But in another way retailers must take advantage.
48. Canada has its own culture of how business is conducted. It is similar to the Europeans ~ and not like the rapacious manner of the US, which is the pursuit of profit at any cost
49. We are part of the world now.
50. Canadians should own at least 50% of our resources. We are the ones that have a vested interest in our country's well being.
51. It influences how the environment is affected.
52. CANADIANS SHOULD OWN A CONTROLLING INTEREST IN THEIR RESOURCES
53. I absolutely think it is key that Canada maintains control over its natural resources, banking institutions, manufacturing operations and retail operations. Canadian businesses have a hard go of it with so many large American Corporations opening up shop.
54. Let's keep Canada Canadian as much as possible, but be aware that it is a global economy these days.
55. Locally owned businesses ensure that a greater percentage of dollars generated stay in our country
56. As long as it is a Canadian!
57. These should stay Canadian, all the way.
58. Canadian resources-Canadian control

59. We are a country, why sell off our resources

2. What do you think are the benefits for Canadians when a major Canadian company is foreign-owned? Explain.

1. There is capital injected into the economy.
2. Most times benefits do not exist in any meaningful way unless the company is Toyota. Quality product, which retains its value and is almost worth the asking price. Canadian companies lack the integrity to devote themselves and their product(s) to the customer in quality and good price for good value.
3. None
4. Foreign owned institutions may benefit Canadians through international economic links and greater economies of scale. It may also benefit the Canadian economy by grooming a management talent that would not be exposed to world talent and experiences.
5. They may have a stronger backing.
6. It depends on the industry, but in many instances there are no Canadian individuals or companies that can or will compete when a foreign company looks to buy a Canadian company. Some benefits can include deeper pockets, more diversity and stronger competition.
7. Other than the need sometimes for outside capital to develop our resources, no benefits.
8. New money for investment is one benefit; but, there is always uncertainty as to the self interest of the foreign company.
9. Don't know.
10. Wouldn't that depend on who the foreign owner is? Where they live, spend money, pay taxes? Foreign ownership is obviously not good for Canada if none of the revenues stay in the country, but it is a reality that we need investors, employees and a wake up call to our future as we are unable to be all things to ourselves.
11. I don't really know of any at this time.
12. International connections. Would prefer if Canadians made the connections on their own, however.
13. There are none
14. No benefit as profits will be exported
15. Other than keeping the business up & running to create jobs. Not sure.
16. Expertise, high standards, willingness to adopt new technologies, better competition to complacent local firms
17. NEW PRODUCTS
18. Broader ideas

19. ALLIANCES WITH LARGER COMPANIES CAN LOWER COSTS OF PRODUCTION AND ACCESS MORE MARKET SHARE.
20. None
21. Potentially increased working capital. - Increased exposure to foreign markets.
22. I'm not sure.
23. Don't know.
24. ?
25. can't think of any
26. I'm not sure there are any.
27. Perhaps the international sales opportunities are broadened; increased investment; etc.
28. None
29. N/A
30. I do not think there are benefits.
31. I don't see many.
32. Not much!
33. none
34. Cash influx
35. New investment
36. Not too much, other than hiring Canadian staff
37. It shows others who want to invest in Canada, that Canada is a safe place to invest.
38. If the Canadian company is on the verge of closing, and a foreign owner bails it out, jobs will be preserved for some period of time.
39. Who cares?
40. there aren't
41. Potential access to broader base of assets of all kinds
42. We may appear to benefit from lower prices but they are not contributing to our social programs which we hold so dear!
43. None
44. No comment
45. None
46. I can't think of any significant benefits.
47. More money
48. NONE!!!
49. I think the US are for the most part experts at retailing, particularly their standard of service and in the area of logistics. Canadians had a lot to learn in those areas but

now I think US owners help set the Canadian retailing standards higher.

50. Depends on where it is. If a product comes from overseas (not the US), I think we are on more of an even plane.
51. I do not know.
52. Can't think of any ~
53. More investment if they have the money to do so
54. I haven't seen any.
55. NONE....PROFIT LEAVES THE COUNTRY
56. I don't see any.
57. Can't think of any particular benefits.
58. In some cases we would be without the volume of product, pricing etc...more choice of products, if foreign companies did not invest in Canada
59. I don't know that there are any, other than it might make the foreign country more aware of what Canada has to offer - may increase some \$\$ in the travel industry.
60. Possible international markets expanded
61. None
62. Can't think of any
63. NONE

3. What are the drawbacks? Explain.

1. The profits are drained from our cities, provinces and the country. Some wages and taxes are collected but the lion's share leaves the county. Often the foreign outfits are here to take our natural resources and move them directly out of the country for value added processing elsewhere. Ultimately in this case we are subsidizing the US market.
2. Foreign ownership sometimes strips Canadian resources for use in their own country. Unfortunately that generally means second class products for Canadian companies that are overpriced, which cause sub par product being produced and pricing which leaves the retail market feeling ripped off. A no win situation.
3. Decisions are made and profits are returned to owners who are not necessarily interested in the betterment of local communities.
4. Business does what benefits business. This is a commonality amongst national and non-national business corporations operating in Canada. It would be irrational to conclude that a Canadian foreign corporation acts more or less responsibly than a foreign-owned corporation.
5. The profits go out of the country as well.
6. Canadians may have decisions made that are not in the best interest of Canada. Dollars that might have stayed in Canada do not.

7. Outflow of money from the country in salaries and profits. Loss of a Canadian influence and control.
8. ...see above.
9. Purely Canadian interests are likely less important.
10. Already answered above, somewhat.
11. Rise of global monopolies is intensely disturbing.
12. The biggest drawback is a foreign-owned company will always look after its home country interest first. In times of prosperity the effects are minimal in times of recession the effects become extreme. i.e job pull outs
13. Not sure
14. Loss of inspirational examples for other smaller Canadian companies, loss of executive level top positions
15. DRAIN OF MONEY SOUTH OF COUNTRY
16. WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN KEPT HERE IN TERMS OF FINAL PROFITS WILL MOVE ELSEWHERE. THE TENDENCY SEEMS TO BE TO SEND JOBS TO CHEAPER VENUES AFFECTING OUR EMPLOYMENT LEVELS AND QUALITY OF WORKPLACE
17. Profits leave the country
18. Profits are sucked out of this country.
19. Again not sure, other than our hard-earned money is going out of the country.
20. Foreign control of our assets.
21. A foreign company just takes the profit out of the country. They do not care what happens to Canada, or in most cases do not care about the employees.
22. Possible movement of jobs outside our borders
23. Loss of Dominion and the ability to chart our own future and have a strong handle on our own economy.
24. I'm not sure.
25. na
26. The drawbacks are that Canadians could be put out of work.
27. See number 1.
28. The profits do not stay within Canada
29. There is NO responsibility to keeping jobs and facilities in Canada.
30. Money that goes abroad and people who generally don't care about the community they invested in
31. Canadian sovereignty suffers and hence our destiny.
32. Investment goes out of country
33. Too often, governments offer too generous tax relief to those who want to invest in Canada.

34. Decisions become less based on what is good for workers and the local community. Profits and knowledge leave our country.
35. They control our economy in many ways and the day will come that we regret it.
36. Too many to mention, but we need to retain as much local ownership as possible. But Canadians I feel are much more timid investors than Americans or Europeans are.
37. no comment
38. Soon, we become second and third class citizens in our own country
39. Corporate management tends only to be influenced by the bottom line. This too often results in manufacturing/processing being transferred to an offshore location. Jobs are lost, but management compensation increases because it is based on the bottom line.
40. Not much interest in the welfare of the country or its' people
41. We are reverting to hewers of wood and drawers of water. Profits will be leaving this country as well as taxes.
42. Of course, the worst part is that the dollars earned from Canadian consumers are being ultimately funneled back into the US.
43. How about Wal-Mart? Comes in, destroys local retailers by undercutting them because they are purchasing low price crap from China in volume, by not paying their employees, and union busting. This is good for Canada?
44. Some of the profits can be spend outside the country
45. Job loss. Environmental issues.
46. AS ABOVE
47. We lose more and more of our Canadian heritage when we let businesses become owned by foreign investors. That said, I do understand there is a bottom line and that there is a price that any business should sell for. I just think it is sad to see it happen.
48. Less control over our own economy and resources.
49. The other side of the statement above, is that a Canadian company seems to have problems competing with the foreign-owned due to volumes etc....& probably workforce costs.
50. Decision-making may not reflect Canadian needs and priorities. There is a greater flow of cash out of the country.
51. Takes away pride of ownership, gives us a sense that we don't matter in the big picture.
52. Profits leave Canada and usually there is always a possibility that the foreign ownership that has no nationalistic ties will go where the product can be produced for less.

4. Do you agree with the government encouraging foreign ownership?

YES 20.4%

NO 79.6%

1. But is they do it has to be directed to businesses that we lack.
2. Yes, when it encourages spending and job creation along with foreign investment in Canada. No, when Canadian taxpayers foot the bill where so called foreign investors take the money and vanish or worst still take the money and keep asking for more.
3. The encouragement of foreign ownership must be selective. Certainly, industries that are essential to domestic security and long term viability must be maintained in domestic hands. Industry that is not important to national viability can be courted by local, provincial and federal governments to stimulate employment and economic well being. Hopefully, the entrepreneurial spirit of citizens will stimulate a strong domestic economy and provide the backbone of business in the immediate and long term.
4. Not enough Canadians to cover all the bases. Also in some cases does promote competition and growth.
5. Basically believe in a free market, not government influenced.
6.see above.
7. Don't know enough about that.
8. Explained above
9. Foreign investment yes. foreign ownership should be less than 50%
10. They have given away our country and are losing control daily.
11. Only as a last resort
12. Question not clear - foreign ownership OF Canadian companies or BY Canadians
13. FOR THE ABOVE MENTIONED REASONS. THE SAME ENCOURAGEMENT SHOULD BE FOCUSING ON CANADIAN ENTREPENUERS.
14. see #3
15. Not sure.
16. as stated above
17. It saddens me that organizations like The Bay are no longer Canadian owned.
18. Foreign ownership will occur without our government encouragement
19. In some ways, it may provide an opportunity to increase immigration, but not at the expense of our workforce.
20. THERE IS NO NEED TO ENCOURAGE.
21. Should not be necessary with a richer nation like Canada. Canadian ownership

should be encouraged and promoted.

22. It is not the government's responsibility to encourage foreign ownership. It is the government's responsibility to promote others to buy our services and products.....not our company's.
23. I'd like to know more before commenting.
24. We are giving others the right to control our economy
25. No comment
26. See above
27. While we need the capital - we have to protect what we have so I might change my mind if Canada would stand up and protect its' rights.
28. But I don't think you can help it. The world is so close together now.
29. I think there should be a balance. Some foreign ownership is OK.
30. Spend this effort in helping CANADIANS own and operate their own companies. Don't we want a nation of business owners rather than a nation of employees being directed by foreign interests and politics?
31. as long as we grow and that people work
32. I believe that foreign ownership makes us lose control of our country and is resources.
33. TO A 49% LIMIT
34. I believe the government should focus on encouraging people to buy Canadian products and services instead of this.
35. I do not want our business to be compromised...but sometimes competition is a good thing. Responsible choices of foreign ownership by the government (I still believe in miracles).
36. Competitive marketplace is best

5. The proponents for foreign investment say Canadian companies have poor productivity and that a foreign company can improve it. Do you agree?

YES 32.3%

NO 67.8%

COMMENTS

1. We are as good or better at what we do than anywhere else in the world. The difference in production is that we are not as advanced equipment wise. Our dollar's relationship to other currencies (other than American at present) keeps us from purchasing new equipment as much of it comes from Europe and Japan. We are just fine, just allow our businesses to update equipment with tax breaks or

incentives, that is how the government can help. Give us the tools to update then stand back and watch our productivity grow.

2. Depends on the individual company. There are examples out there in every province and territory that are Yes and No.
3. This is utter nonsense for that statement is not an absolute. There are good and poorly run businesses in this country and in all other countries. Canadian businesses have endured a tough economic reality for many decades. Largely due to the shadow of a Goliath economy to our south, Canadian business has had to improvise and adapt to foreign economic influences. However, our strong European heritage has proven that a quiet and diligent work style is respected around the world and is successful.
4. Depends what foreign country you are talking about. There are too many rules, regulations and unions here.
5. If a company has poor productivity it is more likely because of bad management not who owns the company.
6. We have to invest in research into new product and productivity improvements. We have great industries and creativity opportunities.
7. Possibly, but again, we're not that aware of the actual situation.
8. Somewhat, there will be good and bad Canadian productivity, owners, practices, and products, but the same could be said for foreign investors as well.
9. I HAVE RELATIONS WORKING IN THE AUTO SECTOR WHO ADMIT THAT PRODUCTIVITY IN THE AMERICAN AND CANADIAN PLANTS IS TERRIBLE
10. Absolutely not Canadian productivity is not lower than the U.S. Capital investment is less in Canada. The "higher" U.S. productivity is only a result of higher capital investment. If the Canadian government wants to be involved offer low interest free loans to Canadian Manufacturers. This would avoid the necessity of foreign investments and provide manufacturing jobs.
11. Unfortunately, I do believe a high majority of Union or Large Industry workers take their Jobs for granted and have poor work ethics and work pase. That is possibly why they want foreign ownership. They may be available to bring in people from around the world who want the job MORE than some Canadians. I think that a lot of Canadians have a ... well they think the government or someone will always take care of them mentality.
12. Sometimes our unions push too hard for securities etc. making it so expensive to operate...but our cost of living doesn't slow down.
13. MAYBE THEY CAN IMPROVE PRODUCTIVITY, BUT YOU CAN BE SURE THAT IT WON'T BE ACCOMPLISHED BY RETRAINING CANADIANS OR INVESTING IN NEW TECHNOLOGY TO ANY EXTENT IF THEY CAN DO IT FOR LESS ELSEWHERE. IN THE END THE GOVERNMENT WILL HAVE TO BEAR THE COST OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND ALL THE RELATED COSTS. OUR RESOURCES GET HANDLED BY A FORIEGN CO. THAT HAS NO SOCIAL CONNECTION TO OUR POPULATION.
14. - workers and management styles can all be adjusted to maximize productivity.
15. Not sure.

16. I don't know enough to comment.
17. Maybe so but it is time that Canadian companies look at their own productivity. The big problem with Canada is that we give in to the unions. It is time to get rid of the unions so that management or ownership can manage again.
18. It is possible but not necessarily so. Would have to answer "not sure"
19. Sometimes
20. Try importing goods from India or China when you are a single unit store with small quantities. By higher productivity do they mean lower quality?
21. I believe all businesses can benefit from outside influences if management or ownership is willing to accept change. This usually happens from a loss of revenue or monetary wake up call
22. Why, because we don't support sweat-shops in Canada????
23. Foreign companies would generally try to save costs of labor which would make employees seek higher paying jobs leaving retail short on labor
24. Getting rid of Unions and their "over-the-top" demands would certainly help.
25. This is too general a statement - there are always examples to support whatever side one wishes to take.
26. Because we tend to be lazy!
27. This statement is only true on a case by case basis.
28. Again, I'd like to learn more before commenting.
29. Maybe but are we comparing ourselves to China?
30. Productivity is influenced by many factors, any of which can improve it.
31. True at this time but the answer is to give tax credits and help to strengthen our own manufacturing industries
32. I don't know
33. We lose jobs because the labor is then done by third world countries
34. Productivity can be improved by appropriate training - not by increasing labor costs every contract.
35. Canadians love unions. What is foreign ownership going to do about that? We also have WSIB and whatever to protect the employee so foreign investment is going to change this?
36. As explained above.
37. Right now, I have customers who are afraid of buying anything made in China.
38. Canadian companies need to work harder if they have poor productivity
39. Selling to a foreign company is GIVING UP! What is the logic? It may provide jobs ~ but the profits now disappear out of Canada.
40. Even if you can always do better I do not think we are not productive
41. The only way they seem to improve productivity is by moving the manufacturing

sector to a developing country.

42. I would say that the unions in Canadian companies are the cause of poor productivity and high prices.
43. LOOK AT HONDA
44. I agree that productivity should be looked at - but that can be done in other ways.
45. That's a pretty blanket statement. What is it based on?
46. Not sure
47. Canadians have such a diverse amount of skills to draw from, I think we could be very productive if things were handled differently.
48. The problem is at times we are too complacent and content. Unfortunately one must always progress, status quo will become your enemy
49. as above

6. A number of foreign-owned retailers have become dominant players in Canadian retail. Has the entry of retailers such as Home Depot, Wal-Mart, Zara, etc. helped or hurt Canadian retail?

HELPED 27.8%

HURT 72.2%

1. Cheaper prices by buying in bulk
2. Wal-Mart opened in our city and we lost 50% of our front end sales instantly. We were just starting to get over the effects and Staples opened and took most of the rest of our retail. This is evident in many other communities in our area as small businesses fall by the wayside. Profits that circulated many times before leaving our city now are gone in an instant.
3. Home Depot is a great example of great company in the early days and then greed and company infighting now make you want to see what LOWES will bring to the table. Wal-Mart, they make more in a day selling their wares than the mafia does in a month. What do they care about the small towns they pillage, customer service or anything else but the bottom line. If I was making that much money and I peaked in 2003 and was now in a downhill slide I would try to find the best wax for my skis so I could enjoy the ride.
4. Some smaller retailers are no longer in business. Their employees no longer have jobs and the communities' these small businesses supported no longer have that support.
5. Once again Canadian retailers have adapted to new economic realities as foreign retailers entered the market. However, it must also be recognized that foreign retailers have had to adapt to the Canadian reality. Wal-Mart now discounts from its everyday low pricing, Home Depot reacts to the social ethnic realities of a new

market. The Bay - well nothing much can help an organization that once controlled and lost much of the North American land mass. Canadian-owned retailers usually quickly learn and profit or fold. It is truly tragic when we lose a Bay, Woodwards, Consumers Distributing or an Eaton's from our tapestry.

6. Competition is a good thing
7. I believe these companies have just helped raise the bar, forcing some large retailers to become better organized. Foreign retailers such as Linens & Things, Williams-Sonoma, Bed Bath & Beyond do hurt the Canadian market. These retailers simply take from Canada, they do not buy in Canada. Stock is simply shipped from their warehouses in the U.S. No investment in Buying offices etc. they are looking and treating Canada and Canadians as the 51st state.
8. As a whole I think it helps the consumer but it definitely hurts many small independent retailers. It has also really hurt suppliers with several we know going out of business. We are not in a position to source products off shore like the big players.
9. We are an independent retailer in the kitchenware business. As we serve a loyal local market with product and service we do not feel the impact of the Big Guys as much as a Canadian chain would. However, we rely on the middle person in the wholesale-retail chain. This fact inevitability places upward pressure on our prices regardless of who owns the Big chains.
10. Ideally it would be nice to think Canadians could provide for themselves. It seems that the addition of these companies to our retail scene has reinforced the notion that the bottom line is everything.
11. It was inevitable that the big boys would come to town, they have given a range of price and product smaller retailers could never have achieved. Having said that, I don't shop at Wal-Mart, Home Depot, etc as I don't agree with their manufacturing or procurement practices, nor with their hiring policies.
12. Canadian companies have to be more efficient so everyone tries harder.
13. They have helped to create competitiveness but at the same time have such a huge buying power they are able to shut down smaller operators.
14. As we have seen that these large import retailers have eliminated a lot of the smaller independents such as hardware stores.
15. PEOPLE CAN GET ITEMS WITHOUT CROSSING THE BORDER
16. Neither
17. They are killing small retail. All your service grandfathers are closing, we cannot compete.
18. I think it depends on what industry and level you are talking about. Small specialty business yes. Large businesses, it may have lowered their price levels to make them more realistic.
19. Beginning of a monopoly system. once established they can regulate supply and pricing
20. Young people especially shop these places for one-stop shopping, leaving no extra money to spend at the smaller local shops

- 21.** THE BOX STORES HAVE NOT ADDED TO THE SHOPPING EXPERIENCE IN TERMS OF AN ATMOSPHERE OF PLEASANT AND UNSTRESSFUL SHOPPING. THEY HAVE ADDED ONLY LARGE UNATTRACTIVE WAREHOUSE TYPE SPRAWL USUALLY SITUATED IN AREAS THAT ARE TREATED AS WAREHOUSE FACILITIES ALLOWING THEM TO PAY LESS BUSINESS TAX THAN THE LOCALS WITH WHOM THEY ARE COMPETING. THEY HAVE HURT THE CANADIAN RETAILER BY BRINGING INTO OUR COMMUNITIES INFERIOR QUALITY AT ONLY SOMEWHAT LOWER PRICING. WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED EXTRA VALUE FOR OUR DOLLAR AND WE HAVE HELPED TO PROMOTE THE ABUSE OF LABOR IN COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NOT THE BENEFITS OF OUR CANADIAN LIFESTYLE. THERE IS HARDLY A DAY GOES BY WITHOUT THE MEDIA BRINGING THIS TO OUR ATTENTION.
- 22.** Look at Eaton's and Sears
- 23.** Both, because they do employ a lot of people but they also have hurt many small businesses because they offer lower prices.
- 24.** In the respect to small businesses
- 25.** It's raised the bar.
- 26.** Not sure
- 27.** Hard to compete with large big box stores as they can bring in larger quantities and receive price reductions.
- 28.** People seem drawn to these outlets for the convenience of "one-stop" shopping, most don't take the time to check local pricing and service. They "assume" they will automatically save money.
- 29.** I think that these large big box retailers have hurt independent retailers because they have distorted the value of products, we sell European products and it's hard when Winner's-Home Sense is selling items from the same suppliers cheaper to the public than we sell at wholesale
- 30.** We have become an increasingly price point driven market. There is little or no concern for quality and items made by hand. It is difficult to compete with low margin retailers. Not impossible, but challenging.
- 31.** As a mom & pop small retail store, it is very, very hard to compete with their preferential pricing from wholesalers.
- 32.** Too many points to write here...just read "How Wal-Mart is Hurting America and the rest of the world"...
- 33.** Prices are out of control the quality is compromised, too much competition e.g. leather goods- for the home, everyone has the same item from the same Country, but different prices.
- 34.** It increases competition
- 35.** Canadian retailers can not offer the prices offered by foreign retailers
- 36.** Their buying power leaves smaller retailers - like myself - scurrying to find another way of meeting my fixed monthly expenses.
- 37.** They have gained too much of the marketplace by reducing prices and trying to destroy locally-owned businesses.

38. Many of these companies have little respect for local amenities and do not support local activities with donations of prizes, etc. They require LOTS of staff - but often offer little training and low wages.
39. It can cause good competition and encourage domestic companies to compete in desperation to survive
40. We are being discounted to death, and not necessarily have good quality products anymore. Cheapest is not necessarily the best.
41. It has shown many of those Canadian based retailers other ways of improving the way they carry on their own affairs.
42. They come off sounding like the good guys because they offer what many perceive as lower prices. In many cases, however, my prices are better. They buy direct from the manufacturer and mark products up significantly more than independent retailers. Their products are often low quality and quickly end up in landfill sites. Perhaps we should start pointing the finger at them in our discussions about climate change. Environmentally it makes sense to buy quality. It consumes the same resources up front, but most often lasts longer. You don't have to spend more buying quality either. You replace things less often. Maybe a campaign directed at the environment and quality will be helpful in saving main street.
43. Creates better retailers
44. made Canadian stores less complacent and with it
45. I think it has hurt, Usually you get what you pay for and cheap products aren't saving money. They have forced many smaller businesses out.
46. The smaller retailer has had to change or go under. This has not been ALL BAD> Those that are changing I feel are doing quite well.
47. How can they possibly help the Canadian retailer when it is near impossible to compete with their prices.
48. Surprisingly it has made local retailer be more productive, more creative and inspired retailers to provide better customer service.
49. Shoppers are not loyal. They will shop where the better pricing is. Unfortunately foreign-owned retailers have bigger buyer power than perhaps the Canadian counter part.
50. Small- and mid-sized businesses cannot compete in that market place.
51. Foreign retailers want their money/their investment back. They tend to force out smaller domestic businesses and provide lower paying jobs.
52. Bottom line - we cannot compete with their buying leverage - small retailers pay the top price so we are not any competition - our strong suits are customer service.
53. Helped consumers
54. I think on one hand it's negative that they've taken away business from Canadian retailers, but these places have created many new jobs. My perspective is that, instead of focusing on what's happened, we need to realize that mass production/big box stores are a reality that retailers have to take and use to their advantage. There are many retailers that have advanced because they have filled the niches that big box stores will never be able to provide. I think it helps to

advance creativity and service.

55. Those retailers killing the equal currency by cutting price down because of their strong power of purchasing
56. Over retailed in Canada for the size of the country, so retailers are fighting for a market that has limits on its expansion. The consumer is benefiting to a very small extent, as fewer players would keep prices competitive because for many of the items from China the purchase cost is as low as it can go.
57. It is well known that Safeway does not pay corporate taxes in Canada because of charges from their head office in the USA ~ where their profits are taxed at a lower rate. Duh
58. More goods are available to consumer at better prices
59. Big Box retailers have hurt the retail industry. We do not have the economies of scale because of our smaller population base, yet our retail used to be more unique and interesting before they came along.
60. It is hard to compete with them on pricing for many items. It has made it necessary for smaller retailers to carry unique items that the box stores do not. Which is probably a good thing
61. WHEN THEY FOOTBALL PRICES OF PRODUCT AROUND BY WAY OF SPECIAL PURCHASES OR LOSS LEADERS, THE CONSUMERS NEVER REALLY KNOW WHAT THE ACTUAL RETAIL PRICE OF ANYTHING SHOULD BE.....
62. Canadian companies can not compete with the bottom line of these big players with big buying power. Canadian competitors have benefitted - if they are able to get better at what they do. They must change to align themselves with the new environment.
63. It has both helped and hurt. It may have hurt the small retailer, but the entry of more big box companies signals a growing economy. They make other businesses sit up and smarten up.
64. A bit of both...Canadian companies have to work harder to keep up with the foreign owned companies. Pricing, volume of products, etc.
65. It has HURT us immensely. I can't compete with the pricing, the wages etc, that a big corporation can offer. I think and I hope that consumers are starting to realize that service is the key, and we offer that. Someday, when Wal-Mart owns the world, people will finally wake up and realize that we've done ourselves a great disservice.
66. It has helped in whereas smaller companies specialize and as the Wal-Marts of the world target clients so can a Canadian specialized company.
67. Forced everyone to be better, more efficient, more focused on their business
68. By forcing everyone one in the market to be competitive.
69. Loss of profits to foreign centers for investment abroad

7. Should there be legislation regulating or limiting the entry of foreign-owned retailers?

YES 71.4%
NO 28.6%

1. I guess you can tell I am a bit of a real life kind of guy and that getting government to make a decision is well just too much to ask. In my small town of Bayfield, getting local politicians and the Chamber of Commerce to come to agreement on whether or not public washrooms would benefit the town if placed in the middle of town (a two block area) is and has been a question that has lasted eight (that is 8) years and is yet to be resolved. Governments are bought and sold and then put legislation forward and are defeated. On some questions the answer is Yes on others it is No. See even I sit on a fence sometimes.
2. In the late 60's, I was a member of the Committee for an Independent Canada. This was a national committee comprised of mostly high profile Canadians such as Flora MacDonald, Ron Basford, Mel Hurtig, and Pierre Burton to mention a few members, who led the discussion about protecting Canadian sovereignty. Supported by a brief of our views and proposals which was presented to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, the Liberal federal government enacted the Foreign Investment Review Agency (FIRA). Although this agency grew out of fashion over the decades, it is interesting that you raise the question of legislating foreign control since it still operates in our political economic system. However, sadly it has become as impotent as opposing screw top wine caps on fine French wines.
3. The government already has too much control.
4. Not limiting, but certainly ensuring that they do more than just lease a retail space.
5. This is a conditional yes as we basically believe in a free market between countries. We really see a problem in the future if off shore sources (eg. China) are exploited in the name of reduced prices in the big box stores.
6. There should be investment in Canadian innovative solutions,
7. Perhaps, but again it is not something we really can make an informed comment on.
8. Like everything, we need to do the homework, the research, before the green light is given to any foreign-owned business, retailers, manufacturers, distributors, etc. Singling out retailers isn't the only answer.
9. Possibly limiting the number of retail outlets per 100,000 people. This might be better in long run. Because as we keep smaller retailers employed and employing we can have growth of business generations.
10. MORE VARIETY AND LOWER PRICES FOR CONSUMER
11. I believe in free market enterprise but the issue is that a foreign owned company has the resources to dominant the market and force small Canadians out. Therefore, some form of protection needs to be in place to protect the Canadian companies.
12. Compare to the car industry.
13. Should ensure fair competition, no undercutting to eliminate competitors
14. Enough is enough
15. SEEMS OBVIOUS THAT THEY SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TO PIGGY BACK OFF

THE COMPANIES THAT HAVE ALWAYS BEEN CANADIAN, PAID THE HIGH TAXES FOR THAT PRIVILEGE AND HELPED BUILD THE INFRASTRUCTURE THAT THE FOREIGN COMPANIES CAN NOW BENEFIT FROM. THE ROADS FOR THEIR TRUCKS TO HAUL PRODUCT, THE TELEPHONE POLES AND LINES , THE RAILWAY TRACKS, ETC.

16. Majority ownership should be Canadian
17. There should be some type of control over how many and what type of foreign companies come into our country.
18. We need to protect the Canadian companies that have built this country. We are selling out to foreign countries.
19. We must protect our Canadian identity and ideologies
20. I think we need to be mindful of the effect on the existing markets. Do we need another Wal-Mart-esque company?
21. Legislation should be in place to protect small local businesses from companies who set out to shut out the small shops.
22. If Canadian-owned companies focused on the right things such as, customer service, competitive pricing, clean stores, etc. the competition wouldn't affect us as much.
23. The more foreign ownership...the less Canadian ownership which will result in monopolies and eventually higher prices.
24. Everything should be done by the government to promote Canadian ownership and limit foreign ownership to a small percentage.
25. Only when it comes to natural resources.
26. Should we be attacking foreign owned businesses? Maybe we should be objecting to the Wal-Marts of the world. Ask Wal-Mart executives what their vision for local communities are? What downtowns should look like? What legacy do they hope to leave behind?
27. Only to give pause before there is a fire sale
28. Absolutely....What other country allows foreign ownership to the extent that Canada does? We'll have to dance to their tune...wait and see.
29. I think there should be a limit, especially if the retailers that wish to come here are in direct competition to Canadian retailers. If there is no direct competition, then they could be allowed in to better our society.
30. I don't know how it can be done, but management should be expected to provide some contribution to the benefit of the nation.
31. Please no more legislation - it only ends up in court - and the foreign owned retailers come in anyway
32. Market should control just like Canadian retailers going to the US
33. I think there should be more policies protecting smaller retailers, such as rent tax breaks. I think also there should be a policy that foreign owned retailers have to spend a certain percentage of their earnings here on things like labor for example.

34. Because too much is too much. They're starting a sale war between each other and small retailers can not follow this competition
35. Free enterprise
36. REGULATE THE DISCOUNT ANY PRODUCER OF A PRODUCT CAN GIVE ANY ONE PERSON, NO MATTER WHAT THE QUANTITY MAKE THE MARKET PLACE FAIR PREDATORY PRACTICES ARE AGAINST THE LAW, AND WHEN MANUFACTURERS AND RETAILERS GET TOGETHER TO CAPTURE THE ENTIRE MARKET, WE ALL LOSE
37. There has to be a limit! I believe in more protection of business by the government.
38. That is a good question...I would say yes, but would the government be receptive to guidelines submitted by Canadian business..or would they go willy nilly like they do with everything else?
39. Absolutely, Canada should keep foreign ownership down to a % of what Canadian ownership is.
40. Yes, it should be controlled
41. To some degree a portion of profits should be required for reinvestment in Canada