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# ASEAN-US INITIATIVE: THE PHILIPPINE PERSPECTIVE* 

## Erlinda M. Medalla and Rosario G. Manasan**

## I. INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to provide country inputs to the Joint study on ASEAN-US Economic Relations whose main objective is to "identify policy reforms and actions producing mutual benefits for ASEAN and the U.S." in the area of trade in goods, trade in services and investment.

Along the lines of the objective of the study, the paper is divided into three main parts. First, a discussion on trends and
*This is a draft of the Philippine country report for the over-all study on the ASEAN-US Initiative which was commissioned by a Joint ASEAN-US steering committee on July 1988. The authors gratefully acknowledged the support of the united Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Institute of southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) which respectively funded and coordinated the ASEAN part of the study.
**Research Fellows, Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS).

The views expressed in this study are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute.
policies on trade in goods, trade in service and foreign investment is presented in section 2. Section 3 outlines the medium term prospects for Philippine economy in general, and other factors such as U.S. protectionism and the possible outcome of the Uruguay Round which may affect the ASEAN-US economic relations. This section also looks at other salient issues such as the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), intellectual property rights, and issues in agriculture. Finally, the last section analyses the implications of findings in the previous sections on ASEAN-US economic relations from the perspective of the Philippines and some possible recommendations.

## II. TRADE AND INVESTMENT PATTERNS AND POLICIES

This section provides a background on the three areas of concern -- trade in goods, trade in services, and investments. Structure, patterns and policy environment are examined, all with the view of linking the findings with Philippine-U.s. economic relátions.

### 2.1 Trade in Goods

Global trade issues are increasingly becoming more complex with the emergence of new developments and new areat of concern. These pertain, most particularly to the new issues regarding services trade, global intellectual property rights and foreign investment. Still, especially for developing countries, priority lies in the settlement of issues and impediments to trade in goods.

### 2.1.1 Trade Structure


weakness in the apparently healthy growth of nontraditional exports.

Such flow could be discerned in the growth of nontraditional exports is manifested in the import structure as well. While the share in exports of electronics and garments grew, the share in imports of raw materials for garments and electronic's correspondingly rose. (See Tables $3 a$ and $3 b$ ).

Imports share of mineral fuels and lubricants increased as expected before declining starting 1986 when oil prices went down. The share in imports of food, beverage and tobacco remained stable in the $1970 s$ to 1980 s . Imports share of machinery and equipment declined, from 34 percent in 1970 to only 16.6 percent in 1987 , as the economy plunged into a deep recession in 1984 and 1985. (See Tables 3a and 3b).

There is some change in the direction of trade as well. The US share in Philippine exports has fallen from an average of more than 43 percent in the 1960 s. Still, it has maintained its share of around one third as destination of philippine exports and around a quarter as a source of Philippine imports during the 1980s. (See Table 4a). In contrast, the share of Japan in Philippine trade has gone down from around 24 percent in the 1970s to 17 percent in 1987 of total Philippine exports. Meanwhile, the share in Philippine trade has grown for ASEAN. Hongkong, South Korea and Australia. In particular, there appears to be a trend towards larger trade with developing
countries. Table $4 b$ presents the Philippine exports and imports to and from the $U . S$. and other countries.

Despite some success in diversification, both in products as well as markets, on the whole, the Philippine merchandise trade balance remained negative, except for a few years, in the last two decades. Imports and exports peaked in $1980 / 81$ then declined in the succeeding years until 1986. Merchandise exports fell from U.S. $\$ 5.788 \mathrm{~B}$ in 1980 to U.S. $\$ 4.629 \mathrm{~B}$ in 1985 due mainly to a fall in primary commodity prices (particularly coconut, sugar and copperi). As a result, the share of exports in GNP went down sharply from 53 percent in 1980 to 24 percent in 1984 . Exports started to pick up in 1986, growing by more than 25 percent in the first half of 1988. Imports declined even more sharply from U.S. \$7.946 B (f.O.b.) in 1981 to U.S. \$5.044 B (f.o.b.) in 1986 following the economic recession during the period. The Tables presented also show the bilateral trade between the U.S. and the Philippines. For the large part, Philippine trade with the United states has been growing steadily and has been affected less severely by the 1983-84 economic crisis. Imports from the United States grew from only U.S. $\$ 274 \mathrm{M}$ in 1965 to U.S. $\$ 1.485$ (f.o.b.) in 1987. Exports to the United states grew from U.S. $\$ 349 \mathrm{M}$ to U.S. $\$ 1.976 \mathrm{~B}$ during the same period. Also, for the most part during the period, the Philippines has been enjoying trade surpluses with the United states. The United States remains to be the Philippines' mo'st important trading partner. The trend in the philippine bilateral trade with the United States followed in general the overall trend of philippine trade
with the world. There is also a significant shift away from nontraditional exports.

Among traditional exports, sugar and mineral products registered a sharp decline while the export share of pineapples (canned juice and concentrates) has more or less remained unchanged. Coconut products remained important although their share dropped from around 15.9 percent in 1980 to 9.9 percent in 1987.


```
electronics and garments rose sharply from only U.S. $26 M in
1970 to U.S. $417 M, which is more than one third of total
imports from the United State!, in 1987. Food imports,
particularly wheat, are also important, accounting for around 13
percent in 1970, down to around 9 percent in 1987.
    2.1.2 Philippine Comparative Advantage
    Table 5a shows some broad indicators of Philippine resource
endowments relative to other countries.
Data on land area and density suggest that the philippines
is less endowed with natural resources than the United
States. Clearly, however, the type of land differs between the
philippines which is tropical and the U.S. which is in the
temperate zone. This difference is an important determinant of
the type of goods that the countries could produce, for e.g.,
bananas against apples, hardwood against softwood, etc.
    In terms of data on per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
and per capita Gross Domestic Capital Formation (GDCF), the
Philippines, as expected, has very scarce supply of capital even
compared with Greece, the poorest among the developed countries
shown in the table.
    Using data on population size and growth and labor force
growth, the Philippines had ebundant supply of workers. Labor
supply is presumably le'ss skilled as indicated by education data
which show that although enrollment in primary school is
proportionately comparable to that in the U.S. (Japan and other
```

```
industrialized countries), enrollment in secondary schools is
proportionately much lower.
    Looking at the structure of production, disparities between
the Philippines and the U.S. are also very marked. The
Philippines is still basically agricultural with the sector
accounting for 22 percent of GDP in 1983 (compared to 2 percent
to the U.S.) and manufactured food and agricultural products
accounting for 39 percent of manufacturing value=added in 1982
(compared to }12\mathrm{ percent in the U.S.). (See Table 5b).
    The Philippines appear to have much more in common with
other ASEAN countries (especially Thailand and excepting
Singapore). They share similarities in the production
gtructure.
    Given such differences in rebource endowments, Philippine
comparative advantage could thus be expected in tropical
agricultural products (coconut, tropical fruits as bananas,
mangoes and pineapples), agro-based food manufactures, some
specific natural resource-ubing exports and labor intensive light
manufactures as garments and textile.
Table 6 generally validates these expectations.
Classifying for simplicity the SITC one-digit groups into
resource intensive (SITC \(\varnothing\) to 4) and manufactured (SITC 5 to 8)
and the latter further by labor intensity (Categories I to III
with I being most labor intensive), exports are accordingly
grouped.
```

```
As expected, a larger proportion of Philippine exports to Industrialized countries are resource based (compared for example with ASEAN). Furthermore, data on manufacture exports categorized by labor intensity also confirms same expectations.
```


### 2.1.3 Policy Environment

In 1950, the Philippines imposed strict foreign exchange controls in response to a severe balance-of-payments difficulty resulting from a drop in U.S. economic assistance. Foreign exchange was rationed according to "essentiality." Virtually only producer goods could be imported as foreign exchange could hardly be obtained for "non-essential" consumer goods. The system became a permanent policy feature for the rest of the decade, fully entrenching an import substitution policy, which, even with the reforms in the 1980 s is proving difficult to reverbe.

Continuing foreign exchange controls did not offer a longrun solution to the balance-of-payments problem. By 1960 , the government had to devalue the peso and opt for a relaxation of import controls. The decontrol program was completed in 1962. The tariff system which was promulgated in 1957 then became the effective tool of protection, replacing but, in general, preserving the protection structure of the 1950 s control system. With the same biases in the protection structure, foreign exchange earnings remained dependent on primary exports while foreign exchange saving through import substitution increasingly became more costly. Thus, the country remained vulnerable to
balance-of-payments problem. In the late 1960 s , import controls were restored.



#### Abstract

By the late 1960s, government planners have become more aware of the bias of the protection system against exports. Instead of reforming the protection structure, however, export promotion measures mainly through the Board of Investments (BOI) fiscal incentive's, started to be adopted in the 1970s. Clearly, however, such an offlyet approach could only have a limited reach. While nontraditional exports grew, these were mostly concentrated in semi-conductor's and garments.

By the end of the 1970s, the inherent biases of the protection structure and the inadequacy of an offset approach through various incentives became more apparent. Thus, in 1981, the government finally launched the first major reform of the protection system. The 1981-1985 Tariff Reform Program (TRP) was implemented and a schedule of import licensing liberalization was formulated. Except for the uniform additional import surcharge which was eventually removed, the TRP proceeded as planned. Import liberalization had to be shelved, however, following the 1983-84 BOP crisis.

Tables 8a and 8 b summarize the change's made under TRP. As can be gleaned from Table 8a, before TRP, 27 percent of all tariff line's had tariff rates of 70 and 100 percent, 16 percent with $40-5 \emptyset$ percent tariff, 57 percent with lø-3 percent tariff, and only three tariff lines with zero or 5 percent tariff duties. After TRP, no tariff lines had tariff rate's above 50 percent, 31 percent were imposed $4 \emptyset-5 \emptyset$ percent tariffs, 68 percent had 10-3ø percent tariff and 17 tariff lines had zero to 5 percent duties.


```
    The Tariff Commission computed the simple average statutory
tariff rates of tariff codal lines by Input/Output (I-O) sector
before and after TRP. Table 8b presents the results. The
largest change occurred in the agricultural sector - from 56
percent in 1979, the pre-TRP period, down to 33 percent in 1985,
the end of TRP. The average statutory rate in manufacturing went
down from 42 percent in }1979\mathrm{ to 28 percent in 1985. Minimal
changes occurred in the mining and quarrying sector, which in
general, had low duties even before TRP. Table g presents the
changes in average tariffs due to TRP using different
classification i.e., by type of commodity (consumer goods,
intermediate goods, raw materials, etc.). Consumer goods
received the highest reduction in average tariff from 67.7
percent before TRP to 38 percent after TRP. Average tariff for
capital goods stood at around 2l percent, while average tariff
for intermediate goods and raw material went down from 33.3 and
35.6 percent to 24.1 and 2l.7 percent respectively. standard
deviation went down substantially from 32.6 percent to 15.1
percent.
    Thu's, as the tables indicated, the TRP effected not only a
fall in average tariff rate but also a movement towards greater
uniformity. In this regard, the program could thus be considered
to have achieved substantial reforms towards leveling
protection and reducing distortions from tariffs. However,
although the cascading nature of the tariff structure is
diminished, there still remains even after TRP a progression of
rates according to the degree of processing.
```
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    Perhaps even to a greater extent than tariff, the Philippine
import licensing procedure imposes additional barriers to trade.
For a majority of cases, the purpose has been to protect local
industry. Table løa presents the frequency of restrictions by
commaty at the 3-digit level. The total number of items by
commodity group is shown, then the number of items regulated by
year of implementation. Not a few product categories were fully
regulated. Almost all product categories were subject to some
form of import restriction. Textiles were previously
unregulated. They started to be regulated in 1979, covering 50
to 90 percent of all items by 1983. A similar observation could
be made for artificial resins and plastic products. Only a few
product categories remained relatively with few regulated items
(e.g., inorganic chemicalb).
    Table lob shows the frequency of restrictions by type of
commodity-capital goods, intermediate goods, mineral fuels and
lubricants, and consumer goods. In 1977, consumer goods had the
largest percentage of regulated items at }62\mathrm{ percent, Eollowed by
intermediate goods. By 1984, 1256 out of 1552 consumer itemb
were regulated. Indeed, during these years, total consumer good
imports accounted for only around 4 to 6 percent of total
imports, out of which barely l percentage point belong to NEC/SEC
category.
Achievements derived from the TRP would be totally nullified
if no similar efforts were done in import liberalization.
Reduction of tariffs in the continuing presence of import
barriers would not only retain the old protection structure but
```

also shift the foregone tariff revenue to private rents. Thus a schedule of import liberalization was planned simultaneously with the TRP.


As a proportion of total imports, the liberalized items accounted for 12.2 percent in 1986 and 16.9 percent in 1987 . These are substantially larger than the previous years' figures
which are 0.42 percent in $1981,0.97$ percent in 1987, 0.88 percent in 1983, 0.61 percent in 1984 and 2.51 percent in 1985.

Some 673 items remain regulated representing less than 12 percent of the total number of items. The product groups, regulating agency and nature of regulation are presented in Table 12. List $A$ covering some 104 items, has been recommended by the Subcommittee on Tariff and Related Matters for liberalization. Originally, the products in the list were scheduled to be liberalized in three groups-- 30 June 1988, 31 December 1988, and 30 June 1989. Recently though, a strong lobby against import liberalization seems to be gaining some ground. No CB circular has been issued to deregulate these items under List $A$, supposedly pending tariff adjustments requested by affected firms.

List $B$, totalling 455 items, has been recommended for review by the Subcommittee. It cover's mainly the BOI Industry Programs as well as agricultural commodities. Finally, List $C$, totaling 114 items, has been recommended for continued regulation mainly for reason's of health, safety and national security.

Some tariff adjustments have been made to help smoothen the impact of the recent import liberalization experience. On the whole, however, these appear to be minimal as indicated by the almost unchanged (unweighted) tariff average shown in Table 13.

### 2.2 TRADE IN SERVICES

2.2.1 A Profile of the Philippine Service sector and Structure

The service sector comprises a large share of the Philippine economy, in terms of both output and employment. If defined to include transportation, storage and communication, trade, finance, housing, government services and private services as used in the national accounts, it contributes the largest share in real output at around 40 percent. (See Table 14). It employs more than a third of the total labor force, becond only to agriculture. It is the single most important source of employment for women, employing more than half of the total female labor force in 1985. (See Table 15).

Table 16 shows measures of forward and backward linkages from the interindustry accounts. Except for government services, forward linkages of the service sectors are all greater than one, implying that services are intermediate inputs to other sectors. The backward linkages, though, are weaker for services than for the other sectors. This means that the service sectors are relatively less dependent on inputs from other sectors than the rest of the economy.

Definitional problems arise when it comes to traded services. Unlike goods or commodities, services are intangible and cannot be stored. For the purposes of this paper, we take the Balance-of-Payments definition of traded services. This
means that domestic sales of foreign affiliates are considered part of the national accounts.

Table 17 shows the payments and earnings for non-merchandise trade for the Philippines. The balance between earnings and payments has been negative for many years, the trend workening up to 1982 and then improving, until it became zero in 1985 and even registered a healthy surplus in 1986. The improvement in trend seems to hold in the last three years as the net non-merchandise trade became only slightly negative in 1987. Even for the deficit years, surpluses in travel and tourism, government, personal income and "others" category are generally recorded. The "others" category is mainly composed of construction activitie's, operating expenses, commissions and fees, etc. The deficit in investment income largely accounts for the over-all deficit in non-merchandise trade. Indeed, excluding interest payments would yield a huge surplus for the sector. Net freight and merchandise insurance have also been consistently negative.

Table 18 shows the ratio of non-merchandise trade to merchandise trade from 1976 to 1986. Non-merchandise trade has been faring better than merchandise trade during this period. The ratio of non-merchandise receipts to exports steadily robe from 33.8 percent in 1976 to 78.3 percent in 1986 . On the other hand, the ratio of non-merchandise payments to imports rose to only 59.6 percent in 1986 from a similar ratio of 31.3 percent in 1970.


#### Abstract

What these data suggest is that there are services sector where the Philippines has comparative advantage. Of course the surplus and the rising trend in the ratio of nonmerchandise to merchandise trade could also be a manifestation of more pervasive regulations in services. Still some sectors stand out which clearly indicate comparative advantage. Congtruction activity is a case in point. Labor export is another example.

The Central Bank records data on foreign exchange invisible acquisitions and dispositions by country and by category which could indicate the direction of trade in services. This data set is presented in table 19 (data are missing for certain years). The Balance-of-Payments accounts differ from this recorded foreign exchange acquisitions and dispositions in that the former include transactions not just "payments" while the latter include only "payments" passing through and reported by $C B$ and its agent banks. Still, Table 19 gives an indication of the direction of trade in services. The United states is by far the mo'st important trading partner of the philippines in services, accounting for around two-thirds to three-fourths of total trade in services. Thus, while the philippines has achieved some diversification of markets in the trade in goods, philippine services trade is still highly concentrated in the U.S. market. Japan's share is even declining, from 4.5 percent in 1981 to only around 2.8 percent in 1987 on the acquisition side. The share of other ASEAN on average is around 1.3 percent on the acquisition side and 2.1 percent on the disposition side during the period




General Banking Act to closely monitor and examine all banking institutions with the primary objective of maintaining monetary security and stability. There are similar laws and regulation in the other bervice sectors, e.g., the Insurance code, overseas Shipping Act, Inve'stment Houses Law, and the securities Act. In essence, however, the majority of these regulations is general in nature, applicable to both foreign and domestic entities (although perhaps non-uniformly in some cases but still with similar objectives). In many cases, liberalization could mean deregulation. As such, since in many cases, they are considered to be part of the country's sovereign rights, there would be strong resistance against liberalization involving deregulation.

Perhaps the main regulation which affects international trade in service in general is the restriction in foreign equity participation. The Philippine Constitution contains a provision which limits foreign equity to 40 percent in general, allowing certain exceptions for specific areas in line with some national developmental objective. (This is discussed further in the section on foreign investment). There are more specific regulations affecting services trade such as requirements of certificates of authority to be issued by certain government agency, depending on the particular sector involved. Arroyo (1986) has identified some requlations on services by sector

### 2.3 Foreign Direct Investment

2.3.1 Growth of Foreign Direct Investment

The growth of foreign direct investment (FDI) in the Philippines in the decade ending 1987 may be divided into two distinct segments. The years 1977 to 1983 is characterized by an accelerated phase during which the yearly inflow of foreign equity grew at an average annual rate of 34.3 percent from US $\$ 45.7$ million to $\mathbf{U} \$ \mathbf{2} \mathbf{2 6 8 . 0}$ million. The latter period witnessed a definite downtrend as the annual inward flow of FDI declined by 33.7 percent yearly on the average between 1983 and 1986. The decade ended on a bright note as the inflow of foreign capital recovered from the slump and increased two-fold in 1987 (Table 22). These movements faithfully mirror the ups and downs the country experienced during the period both from the economic and the political perspective. Note that the Philippines suffered a severe balance of payments crisis in the last quarter of 1983 that culminated in a more generalized economic recession in 1984 and 1985 concomitant with a period characterized by extreme political instability.

While the contribution of foreign investment to the country's gross domestic capital formation has expanded in the last ten years, it is by no means large. FDI represented approximately 2 percent of GDCF on the average during the period.
2.3.2 Sectoral Distribution of Foreign Direct Investment

The sectoral distribution of $F D I$ has remained stable through the years. The manufacturing sector received the lion's share of foreign equity in flows accounting for more than $5 \emptyset$ percent of the total for most years. The services sector ranked second garnering approximately 23 percentage points in the 19805. Agriculture, mining and trade had significant shares (5 percent or more) in at least one year during the period (Table 23a).

Within the manufacturing sector, electrical and electronic products and processed foods were the two most important sectors in terms of share in the total inflow of FDI in 1981-1987. The share of electrical and electronic products in the manufacturing FDI rose markedly between 1981 and 1985 but appeared to have tapered off in 1987. The amount of FDI attracted by basic industrial chemicals, drugs and pharmaceuticals, textiles, machinery and equipment, fertilizers and pulp and paper products was not negligible during the period. On the other hand, wearing apparel expanded its share noticeably in 1987. (Table 23b).

### 2.3.3 Sources of Foreign Direct Investment

Given the long history that binds the Philippines and the U.S., it is not surprising that the U.S. has consistently been the single most important source of $F D I$ in the former over the years. The U.S. share in FDI in the Philippines peaked in 1983 at 68.1 percent and declined monotonically to 21.6 percent in 1987 (Table 24).


### 2.3.4 U.S. Foreign Investment in the Philippines

After a period of relatively rapid growth in 1978-1983, U.S. FDI in the Philippines declined in 1983-1986 for the same reasons we have outlined above. However, it increased by 60 percent in 1987, reflective of the Philippine economy's turnaround (Table 25) .
U.S. foreign direct investment in the Philippines was largely concentrated in manufacturing. Manufacturing share to total U.S. FDI fluctuated between 39.0 to 87.0 percent in 19811987. The services sector and trade also received significant
amounts of $F D I$ in the period. Within manufacturing, food processing and chemical products were the more important sectors as far as the inflow of U.S. FDI is concerned (Table 26).
2.3.5 Policy Environment for Foreign Direct Investment in the Philippines

The official stance towards foreign direct investments is best described as open subject to certain limitations. Generally, foreign ownership is limited to 40 percent of total equity. However, the ownership requirement is relaxed if the project satisfies anyone of the following conditions: (l) it proposes to engage in a pioneer activity, (2) it exports at least 70 percent of its production, (3) it is located in an export processing zone; and (4) it obtain's prior approval from the Board of Investments.

Since the fifties, investment incentives are made available to qualified foreign investors. In 1987, the Omnibus Investments code (Executive order 226 ) was promulgated, amending an earlier incentive legislation. One of the main objectives of the shift to the new Invelstment Code is to enable the Philippines to offer incentives that are at par with those granted by the other countries in the region. The code replaces the admittedly performance-oriented incentives provided by the previous law with the income tax holiday and the exemption from dutiek and taxet on


[^0]```
treaties with Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, Pakistan,
```

Brazil. Denmark, Norway and Italy (Table 28).
3. Medium-Ferm Prospects and Other Salient Issues Affecting ASEAN-US Rconomic Relations: The Philippine Perspective

This bection provides some projections on the medium-term prospects of the philippine economy, us protectionism, possible outcome of the Uruguay Round and the ASEAN-economic cooperation. This section alko attempts to discuss other salient iskues which are within the interests of ASEAN-US economic relations, particularly the, Generalized System of Preference (GSP), intellectual property rights (IPR) and some issues in agriculture.

### 3.1 Outlook for the Philippine Economy

AS enunciated in the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan 1987-1992, the gross national product (GNP) is expected (and targetted) to grow by an annual average of 6.5 percent. (See Table 29). Such a growth target is not excessively high. It would bring back by 1991; which was set back by $1 g$ years in 1985 after the economic downswing in 1984 and 1985 , the real per capita income to the 1981 level, the highest attained. With the structural reform and greater political stability, this target is deemed reasonably within expectations.

[^1]This growth target is premised on expected development in both external and internal environment. On the external factork, growth is expected to be supported by a favorable world economic environment characterized by relatively stable oil prices and real interest rates and moderate world inflation. The u.S. is expected to grow by around 3 percent.
In the medium term, government policies would follow an employment-oriented, rural-based development strategy. Along this line, structural reforms have been set forth. The essential elements of these reforms could be summarized as follows. Fiscal reforms are aimed at more progressive taxation and more local autonomy. In the monetary policy area, modest growth in domestic liquidity at around 15 percent will be maintained and policy reforms which are intended to reduce intermediation cost (which could entail some financial liberalization) are being implemented. Trade reforms have been launched and more reforms being reviewed towards further trade liberalization, A more flexible exchange rate policy will be followed. steps towards greater decentralization and privatization have been significant and will be pursued more vigorously in the future. There has been the legislation on land reform whose implementation could last longer than the mediun-term.
The problems for the philippines are far from over. It still has to contend with a huge external debt and a heavy debt service burden. The assumptions underlying the targetted growth rate are that the growth of the outstading external debt would be linited to 4 percent annually and that the debt service burden as a
percentage of current account receipts would average around 27.5 percent during the Plan period.


On the aggregate, both exports and imports are expected to rise. Total exports are expected to increase by around 9 percent during the period. With merchandise export growing faster at 10.1 percent than non-merchandise export at 5.8 percent. (See Tables 31 and 32).
3.2 US Protectionism

United States' tariffs are generally low with respect to products imported from the Philippines. Using 1985 value of exports and 1986 applicable tariff data, around two-thirds of Philippine exports entered the U.S. market duty-free -- made up of around 48 percent MFN zero duty and 18 percent GSP zero duty.

In terms of number of tariff lines, 228 items are under GSP zero duty, 112 items under MFN zero duty and 572 items are dutiable. Out of the dutiable items, 161 lines have rates below 15 percent, 241 have rates 14 percent and above and 170 lines have specific rates. Furthermore, 109 items out of the 241 lines with rates 15 percent and above, and 75 out of 170 lines with specific rates fall under garments. (See Table 33).

Table 34 gives a weighted tariff average by CCCN category for the U.S., Japan and the EEC (weights used are country imports from the philippines). Only textile and textile products (including garments) and footwear stand out with the higher average tariffs of 12 to 18 percent respectively. for the rest, most tariff duties are below 5 percent.

Table 35 summarizes the non-tariff measures (NTMs) imposed by the United states on Philippine exports based on an UNCTAD inventory in 1985. Around 48 percent of Philippine exports are found to be affected by NTMS. Indices such as the import coverage index, of course, have limitations. For example, it assumes that all forms of NTMs have uniform restrictiveness, i.e., they are equally binding. Most of the NTMs used by the U.S. are in the form of health and sanitary regulations and Consular and customs formalities -- non-tariff measures which have a different nature and different "force" of rettriction compared with others (e.g., quotas). Only around 21 percent are subject to quantitative regtrictions like global or bilateral
quota. Furthermore, this figure (21 percent) is composed mainly of sugar, garments and textiles, and footwear.


The Philippines has not been very much affected by U.S. anti-dumping ( $A D$ ) or countervailing (CVD) duties compared to say, Thailand and singapore. There was a celebrated case against canned tuna exports which was eventually lifted. It has been worried, however, by some other developments like the proposed labeling requirements and the U.S. soya bean advertisements which were to the detriment of Philippine Coconut oil exports. There have been complaints from processed food exporters about unfair treatment by the United States with regards to "sugar content" of food seasoning and ethnic food mixes. Exports of these products were subjected to import quota because they had more than 10 percent sugar content although these could not really be considered "sweeteners."


#### Abstract

On the whole, then, it is the ever-present threat that new forms of protectionism would be imposed that creates uncertainty and poses the greater trade barriers. This protectionist tendency is likely to remain in the future, even if the Republican candidate is projected to win the coming elections. This attaches a special importance to the creation of an ASEAN-US economic cooperation. Although the Philippines would welcome an increase in quotas and/or tariff concessions for meaningful garment items, it is generally perceived by trade officials and exporters that one of the most important element of cooperation is a U.s. commitment not to impose new trade barriers. 3.3 The Uruguay Round of the GATT

The Uruguay Round Multilateral Trade Negotiations (MTN) is basically a response to a conceivable degeneration of the GATT as a multilateral framework governing world trade. Trade barriers outside GATT ambit appear to be escalating. These include, for example, the MFA in textile, the orderly marketing arrangement (OMA), voluntary export restraint (VER), countervailing and anti-dumping duties, etc. The Uruguay Round is not expected to achieve a monumental success in transforming GATT into an ideal framework for enforcing discipline in world trade. Still, all member countries are aware of the possible deleterious consequences of a GATT breakdown. The Uruguay Round is estentially a reconfirmation by member countries of their commitment to non-discriminatory trade. Thus, although the Uruguay Round is not expected to dramatically mend GATT's


weaknesses, it is nonetheless considered to be a first and
necessary step towards preventing the breakdown of GATT. It
could at least put on hold further erosion of the multilateral
framework of disciplinary world trade before a more final
solution could be found.

GATT, or a multilateral framework such as GATT, remains to be the superior and most efficient vehicle for promoting and disciplining world trade. Bilateral agreements, in a sense, undermine the GATT mechanism. Bilateralism promotes trade diversion rather than expansion. still, it could become a second-best solution if the great majority of countries engage in it. Thus, an ASEAN-US economic cooperation could berve as a hedge against GATT degeneration. On the other hand, if the Uruguay Round succeeds in putting discipline to world trade, an
ASEAN-US economic cooperation should consider eventually
multilateralizing the relevant agreements made within its bilateral framework.

### 3.4 ASEAN Economic Cooperation



```
and smoothen some of its structural adjustment to Einally
implementing trade reform across the board.
    With regards to intra-ASEAN investments, the policy
environment in the Philippines is a conclusive one. Tne tax
treaties between the Philippines, on one hand, and Singapore,
Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia all contain a tax sparing
provision. In addition to this, work on various schemes to
promote ASEAN economic cooperation in the area of investments
like the ASEAN industrial projects, ASEAN industrial
complimentation and ASEAN industrial joint ventuxes have been
going on in the last decade. To date, nowever, tne empirical
evidence suggest that except for a surge in other ASEAN
countries' investments in the Philippines in 1984 the cole of
intra ASEAN FDI in the Philippines has peen rather small.
Suriyamongkol (1987) attributed this development to unresolved
conflicts in the national interests of the countries concerned.
    It will be mutually beneficial to the ASEAN countrles if
they will undertake cooperative efforts towards tne harmonization
of their investment incentives. This is not a new idea. It is
disheartening to note though that no initiative in this direction
have been made so far.
    3.5 Other Salient Issues
        3.5.1 Generalized System of Preferences (GSP)
        With regards to the Philippine experience with GSP, data
show that the country has not taken advantage of this mechanism
```




### 3.5.3 Iskues in Agriculture

The U.S. Agricultural Adjustment Act which was passed in 1933 poges the main barrier to U.S. imports of agricultural commodities. Under this Act, restrictions can be imposed on imports of agricultural commodities covered by any program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. To date, restrictions effected under this act continue to be in force against sugar and syrups, peanuts and some cotton products among others.
4. Conclusion, Implications on the ASEAN-US Economic Relations and Possible Recommendations: the Philippine Perspective

This section provides the conclusion and analyzes the
implications of the findings on the ASEAN-US economic relations

```
from the perspective of the Philippines. It attempts to derive
possible recommendations on the elements of an ASEAN-US economic
cooperation, again from the Philippine perspective.
```

4.1 Trade in Goods
Looking at the postibilities for exchange of concessions
between the Philippines and the United States, the Philippines
seems to have more to offer. For the past four years, the
Philippines has had a favorable merchandise trade balance with
the United States. The United Statels already takes up a good
share of Philippine trade. And with the exclusion of garments
and textiles, sugar and footwear, the U.s. market is relatively
free and open. Also, the philippines has just recently
liberalized a number of items. Thus, it is understandable for
Philippine government trade officials to view the philippines as
most possibly holding the losing end of a two-way bilateral
agreement.

In the sense of getting concessions in exchange for concessions, this is probably true. The philippines would probably gain more from the outcome of a RP-US rather than an ASEAN-US agreement, considering the special ties between the two countries and the US pronouncements of wanting to assist the new government (e.g., through unilateral trade concestions). This has, to a certain extent, happened as part of the outcome of the RP-US military tases agreement. The Philippines appears at the present time to have available channels for a more favorable bilateral agreement with the United states.
This is, however, a myopic view of postible benefits from an ASEAN-US agreement. In the first place, trade liberalization, though some domestic sectors would disagree, would, in itself, be beneficial for the country in the long-run. Furthermore, we have already embarked on unilateral trade liberalization and future plans, though temporarily shelved, are in the offing. The gains Erom a bilateral trade liberalization would be even greater. In other words the philippines' plans for opening markets tie in very neatly with an ASEAN-US economic cooperation. In the second place, to some so-called "nationalists", aligning with ASEAN rather than contracting an agreement with the $u S, b y$ itself, may probably be more acceptable. Hence, politically, an ASEAN-US agreement may be more palatable. Thirdly, an umbrella type of ASEAN-US agreement is not necessarily contradictory to philippine objectives in the context of an RP-US agreement. And Einally, the Philippines does not trade with the United States alone, and ASEAN as a group is not limited to contract agreement with only the United states, Other agreements leading to ASEAN economic cooperation with other countries, particularly the EEC and Japan, where the philippines could derive more benefits, are likely to follow. ASEAN, to be most effective should be unified. Although the U.S. market already seems open and free, there still remain significant scope for concessions the U.S. could grant that would benefit the Philippines considerably. These are in the areas of garments and processed food products with over 10 percent sugar content. Garments export is still an expanding sector in the Philippines. It is subject to generally higher
tariffs as well as import quotas in the U.S. The Philippines would welcome increases in quotas and/or tariff concestions for meaningful garment items. Very much affected by import quotas for products with over 10 percent sugar content are philippine food products, especially food seasoning and ethnic food mixes. There are new high-growth sectors exporting a large part of its output to the U.S.
Going back to Table 33 , the Department of Trade and Industry
(DTI) listed 572 dutiable items, out of which 241 tariff lines
are subject to 15 percent and above. Some 109 out of these
tariff lines have consistent philippine exports for the last 5
years and 132 tariff lines are considered by DTI to be potential
Philippine exports. These tariff lines would become even more
meaningful in the light of the recent trade reforms which reduce
the bias against exports and could open up opportunities for
exporting products previously unheard of. These are again
possible areas for U.S. concessions.

Aside from market access and tariff concessions, an important element which should be included, as suggested in earlier discussions, is a U.S. commitment to a standstill on all forms of NTMS. This includes, in particular, the newer forms of protectionism, e.g., $A D$ and CVD. Concessions, using infant industry arguments, to allow export incentives (which could be time-bound) for non-traditional exports without threats of CVD or $A D$ should be sought.


It is difficult to quantify the impact of granting and receiving market access. It is generally accepted that there are gains from trade as well as some accompanying adjustment cost in trade liberalization. There are past studies (especially by Power and Bautista in 1979) which have consistentiy shown and pointed out costs of protection - the serious distortions (especially on the real price of foreign exchange) bad kide
effects (biases against exports and forward linkages) and ultimately grave misallocation of resources. The over-all gains arising mainly from a more efficient allocation of resources provided the main rationale for the philippine trade reforms. The same benefits would accrue (and even more so since liberalization* would now be reciprocated).
For the Philippines, the process of reforms has not been
completed. Some wavering in purpose could be aiscerned from
recent developments. An argument that is often raised against
import liberalization is the protectionism in the west. with
promise of a quid-pro-quo in the international arena, some
strengthening of commitment to the liberalization efforts could
arise. That is, an AsEAN-US economic cooperation could perhaps
help the philippines in pursuing further the reforms it had
started.

Finally, the exchange of concessions in the area of trade in goods need not be constrained within that area alone. If exchanges in the area of goods are deemed lopsided, concessions in goods trade could possibly be made in exchange for concessions in the area of services, technology and/or investment, or vice versa, to even up the exchange.

### 4.2 Trade in Services

```
    Although very few countries ever really practice free trade,
there is general acceptance, at least in principle, that fewer barriers to trade in goods and commodities across countries would be beneficial to all.
```

```
    When it comes to trade in services, however, nothing near
such an agreement exists. There are grave apprehensions, valid
or not, about opening up trade in services, especially among less
developed countries (LDCs). These are related basically to the
following concerns:
    1. effect on development,
    2. case of infant industry, and
    3. national security and sovereignty.
    The first two are primarily concern's of the LDCs. The
discustion below hence take the LDC as the point of reference.
    Especially among lDCS, there is general apprehension that
opening up trade in service's would be detrimental to economic
development. This stems from a common perception that
comparative advantage lies mainly with the developed countries.
As such, liberalizing trade in services would greatly injure the
domestic service industries which comprise a large part of the
economy and consequently adversely affect economic development in
general. The LDCE are fated to forever be importers of high-
technology services and sources of cheap labor. This is directly
parallel to protectionist arguments in the case of the goods
trade about import liberalization causing serious injury to, if
not wiping out, the domestic industrial sector. The Third World
is doomed to be "hewers of wood and carriers of water."
    The second concern is also related to such perception of
general comparative disadvantage in services. It is argued that
protection is necetsary to nurture the infant service sector and
```

shield it from "unfair" foreign competition. Again, this is the same as the familiar infant industry argument for protection in the case of goods and commodities.

The third concern, which also applies to certain goods sectors (e.g., arms and explosives) is particularly pertinent to the service sector -- most especially the banking sector. The nature of trade in services is such that, unlike the goods trade, it could also, and often does, entail, not just a flow of output, but more importantly a movement of factors of production themselves. Labor, for example, could be directly exported or imported. So is capital, physical and financial, in many cases (e.g., transportation, shipping, banking). Opening up the service sector thus involves more than allowing port entry. In the case of the banking sector, for example, liberalization would imply some loss of control in money supply. In general, opening up the financial sector is seen to make it vulnerable to external manipulations.
Thus, all three concerns are echoes, perhaps louder refrains
owing to the different nature of services trade, of old
protectionist arguments against import liberalization. There is
validity in certain aspects of these concerns, but as in the case
of the goods trade, the theory of comparative advantage holds.
Although there is no doubt that liberalization would be
accompanied by short-run adjustment costs, dynamic gains from
liberalized trade are also undeniable.




position that, at the very least, tax concessions do influence the compotition, if not the level, of foreign equity,

Regardets of the efficacy of fiscal incentivet in attracting foreign capital, it is a fact that all countries in the ASEAN except Indonesia grant inducements notably in the form of tax concestions to foreign investors. Manasan (1988) examined the impact of the investment incentives of ASEAN countries in the context of their overall tax systems on the internal rate of return of prospective projects and concluded that the ASEAN countries are as competitive with each other before incentives as after incentives. This finding suggests that the widespread practice in these countries to use investment incentives as a bidding instrument to attract more FDI may be self-defeating. This implies that these countries are throwing away precious government revenues in exchange for an edge that is largely illusory. ASEAN economic cooperation in the area of investment incentives harmonization is, therefore, indicated.
4.3.2 Tax Sparing Agreements and Income Tax Holiday
Another area that should be reviewed is the intexaction of
the tax systems of capital exporting countries with the tax
concessions provided by the recipient countries in the light of
the existence of double taxation treaties between them. Most
nome countries tax their citizens and corporations incorporated
within their borders on the basis of a global income concept.
Some, like the us, the UK, West Germany, etc. provide for the
credit of foreign taxes paid on foreign sourced income against
like domestic taxes while others allow the deduction of foreign taxes in computing net income for domestic tax purposes. At the same time, a number of countries have enacted tax treaties on a bilateral basis with various host countries essentially for the purpose of eliminating double taxation and defining how tax revenues should be shared by the home relative to the host countries. Specifically, the Philippines is a party to such treaties with 22 countries. What is particularly significant is the absence of a tax sparing provision in the treaties between the Philippines and its major source of FDI like the US and Japan, coupled with Philippine use of the income tax holiday as the cornerstone of its investment incentives scheme. I/ In this case, while the treaties eliminate double taxation they do not prevent the capital exporting country from taxing the income that is 5pared from income tax by the philippines. Thus, this scheme effectively results not in increasing the after tax income of the foreign investor but in transfering revenues from the Philippine Treasury to the foreign Treasury. In particular, US investors benefit from the philippine income tax holiday only to the extent that the U.S. tax on their Philippine sourced income is deferred until said income is repatriated.
Thus, the agreement between ASEAN and the U.S. shall seek not only to eliminate double taxation but also to include a tax sparing provision.
4 Note that all Brunei grant income tax holiday of varying durations to new investments in promoted activities.


```
treaties with other nations and its own tax structure
specifically that part pertaining to the taxation of foreign
capital and services.
```


### 4.3.4 Trade Related Investment Measures

In the literature, there has been some concern that export performance requirements related to FDI is trade distoring. In the case of the Philippines, however, the more liberal treatment extended to FDI in export oriented activities should not be viewed as such. This is so because the export sector remains penalized by the over-all protection structure (i.e., tariff, non-tariff and exchange rate policy) despite recent efforts to move towards a more liberalized trade regime. Thus, there appears to be a need to counteract these biases against the export sector. The export performance requirement is just one of the tools that may be used in this regard. However, as trade liberalization progresses, the necessity for implementing these compensating measures eases up as well.

On the other hand, the complete elimination of the general $4 \emptyset$ percent limit on foreign equity participation would require an amendment of the constitution and may not be feasible politically. However, all these considerations do not preclude negotiating for attractive commodity markets in exchange for investment areas.

[^2]
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TABLE 16
PIILIPPIIE TANE YITP RSGIOMAL BCOC/COOMRRI
(1987 \& 1986 )
P.O.B. VALJE IN U.S. DOCLARS

| Regional Bloc/Country | Bxports <br> Value | Shate \% | [eporta <br> Value | ; Share \% | : Balance <br> : of Trude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sotal |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 5720238358 | 100 | 6236968618 | 100 | - 1016730861 |
| 1986 | 4841780491 | 103 | 5013597455 | 100 | -201816961 |
| A. USA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1887 | 1976191288 | 34.55 | 1485276128 | 22.05 | 490915160 |
| 1986 | 1651696567 | 34.11 | 1258816926 | 24.84 | 398879641 |
| B. JAPAM |  |  |  |  |  |
| $198 ?$ | 98149240 | 17.16 | 1121166242 | 16.64 | -139674002 |
| 1986 | 851084105 | 12.58 | 868858318 | 17.22 | -19174211 |
| C. ${ }^{\text {B }}$ SC |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 1082248893 | 18.92 | 781812072 | 11.61 | 300370821 |
| 1986 | 913990869 | 18.88 | 568602228 | 11.88 | 345108041 |
| D. ajestalia |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 88799693 | 1.55 | 201804206 | 3.60 | -113014519 |
| 1986 | 69169508 | 1.13 | 145009484 | 2.88 | -95839976 |
| B. HEN 2FALAMD |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 1122195 | . 20 | 4150035 | . 73 | -37928540 |
| 1986 | 9981703 | . 21 | 37064199 | . 73 | -29082 996 |
| 8. HOMETOM |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 279208811 | 4.88 | 312077640 | 4,63 | -32868829 |
| 1986 | 222681495 | 4.60 | 257929046 | 5.11 | - 35447551 |
| G. RORBA, REPUSLIT |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 107799808 | 1.88 | 198246626 | 2,94 | -904488i8 |
| 1986 | 112243328 | 2.32 | 170059042 | 3.37 | -57815914 |
| H. Pituh |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 144388545 | 2.52 | 372430385 | 3.53 | -228011840 |
| 1986 | 123666181 | 2.55 | 279662720 | 5.54 | -155996536 |
| I. OTEER ASEAN COUMRIRS |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. thacland |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 125592878 | 2.20 | 46601521 | . 69 | 78991357 |
| 1986 | 6729687 | 1,39 | 29017230 | . 59 | 38879614 |
| 2. ITIDONESLA |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 65424834 | 1,14 | 89852583 | 1.32 | -23829749 |
| 1986 | 2793313? | . 58 | 128327782 | 2.54 | -100394315 |
| 3. Malifili |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 118010053 | 2.06 | 138829183 | 2.06 | -20819130 |
| 1986 | 87058654 | 2.00 | 143886279 | 2.85 | -46827625 |
| 4. STMGAPORE |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 196611256 | 3.44 | 232246304 | 3.45 | -35635048 |
| 1986 | 157628400 | 3.28 | 123894281 | 2.47 | 33231119 |
| 5. BRJMEI |  |  |  |  |  |
| $198 ?$ | 452272 | .01 | 51356828 | . 76 | -50904556 |
| 1986 | 577026 | . 01 | 1305132? | . 26 | -12477301 |

Table sa


| Country | Population (ailliess) nid-1983 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ares } \\ \text { (thousames of } \\ \text { sq. tiloseterss } \end{gathered}$ | Deasity | $\frac{\text { dipergece }}{\text { of Labove }} \text { } 1965-7$ |  | 4versge Inder of Pood Production per capita (1974-76 = 100) 1981-83 | Hunber Broilled <br> in Prinary School <br> as percentage of <br> age Group | Mubber Rorolled in Secondary School as Percentage of Age Group | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gopp per } \\ & \text { Capita } \end{aligned}$ | Gross Capital Pornation per Capita |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Piilipines | 52.1 | 300 | 5.76 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 13 | 106 | 64 | 664.88 | 215.63 |
| USA | 234.5 | 9,363 | 39.93 | 1.9 | 108 | 180 | 91 | i3,968.87 | 2,129,34 |  |
| Japan | 119.3 | 372 | 3.11 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 91 | 100 | 92 | 8,889.22 | 2,889.84 |
| ${ }^{\text {B8 }}$ | 271.9 | 1,659 | 6.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relgiva | 9.9 | 31 | 3.13 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 193 | ${ }^{98}$ | 94 | 8,089,90 | 1,414.65 |
| Denark | 5.1 | 13 | 8.13 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 119 | 98 | 105 | 1i, 550.98 | 1,826.96 |
| france | 54.1 | 547 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 112 | 111 | 89 | $9,491.97$ | 2,073.71 |
| German | 61.4 | 249 | 4.06 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 113 | 100 | 50 | 10,636,48 | 2,288,98 |
| frece | 9.8 | 138 | 13.49 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 102 | 106 | 81 | 3,139.80 | 812.04 |
| Iceland | 3.5 | 10 | 20,0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 97 | 100 | 95 | 5,154,29 | 1,258.00 |
| $\mathrm{Ital}_{5}$ | 56.8 | 301 | 5.30 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 112 | 101 | ${ }^{74}$ | 6,21,97 | 1,42.99 |
| Metherlands | 11.4 | 4 | 2.85 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 118 | 98 | 98 | 1,880,56 | 1,768,46 |
| u.s. | 56.3 | 345 | 4,35 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 119 | 102 | 83 | 8,089.49 | 1,186.54 |


Table 5b

| Country | Distribution of Gross Dosestic Product (percent) 1983 |  |  |  | Distribution of Manufacturing Valve Added (percent; 1995 prices) 1982 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | hgriculture | Industry | ${ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ | Serrices | Food and agriculture | Pertiles and Clothing | Kachinery and Transport Bquipaent | Cheeicals | Other Manufacturing |
| Philippines | 22 | 36 | 25 | 42 | 39 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 30 |
| US | 2 | 32 | 21 | 66 | 12 | 6 | 32 | 12 | 38 |
| Japan | 4 | 42 | 30 | 55 | 1 | 5 | 39 | 8 | 41 |
| BBC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Belgiun | 2 | 35 | 25 | 63 | 19 | 8 | 28 | 13 | 32 |
| Denaratk | 4 | ${ }^{23}$ | 16 | 72 | 4 | 6 | 25 | 8 | 37 |
| Prance | - | - | - | - | 17 | 1 | 33 | 8 | 35 |
| Gerana | 2 | 46 | 36 | 52 | 10 | 5 | 38 | 10 | 37 |
| Greece | 17 | 29 | 18 | 53 | 21 | 25 | 9 | 9 | 36 |
| Ireland | - | - | - | - | 24 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 38 |
| Italy | 6 | 40 | - | 54 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 1 | 38 |
| Netherlands | 4 | ${ }^{33}$ | 24 | 63 | 19 | 4 | 88 | 13 | 36 |
| United Singdon | 2 | 32 | 18 | 66 | 13 | $?$ | 35 | 10 | 35 |

[^3]Table 8
PBRCCNTAGE SHARES OR PHILIPPINE BXPORTS, BI COUNTHY OR DESTINATION (IN PERCENT)

| Exports to: | Resource-Based Exports | Manufactured Bxports$\qquad$ |  | Proportion to Manufactured Exports** |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Including Goods on Consignment Basis* | Excluding Goods on Consignment Basis | [ | II | III |
| United States | 34.64 | 65.36 | 32.41 | 54.89 | 37.21 | 7.90 |
| BC | 49.70 | 50.30 | 29.23 | 57.25 | 32.46 | 10.28 |
| Aelgium-Lux | 49.63 | 50.37 | 45.76 | 45.17 | 49.80 | 5.03 |
| Dennarl | 58.12 | 41.88 | 39.59 | 97.50 | 2.15 | 0.33 |
| Prance | 55.64 | 44,36 | 29.92 | 73.37 | 24.70 | 1.93 |
| Geraany | 37.66 | 62.34 | 33.96 | 89.31 | 9.10 | 1.58 |
| Greece | 29.15 | 70.85 | 22.09 | 98.16 | 1.84 |  |
| Ireland | 20.91 | 79,09 | 26.67 | 84.16 | 15,30 | 0.54 |
| Italy | 44.68 | 55.32 | 51.74 | 33.26 | 17.93 | 48.81 |
| Netherlands | 66.82 | 33.18 | 13.00 | 32.98 | 36.99 | 30.03 |
| U.R. | 40.55 | 59.45 | 34.66 | 41.08 | 56.75 | 2.18 |
| Japan | 71.33 | 28.69 | 15.61 | 21.09 | 13.28 | 65.63 |
| ASEAN | 2. 23 | 92.77 | 21.17 | 10.82 | 54.18 | 35.00 |
| Indonesia | 26.78 | 73.22 | 45.36 | 8.85 | 39.54 | 51.49 |
| Nalassia | 3.54 | 96.46 | 10.42 | 13.14 | 66.03 | 20.81 |
| Singapore | 16.35 | 83.65 | 18.98 | 19.58 | 69.26 | 11.15 |
| Thailand | 9.13 | 90.87 | 48.71 | 13.16 | 41.38 | 45.46 |

*Special transaction not classified according to kind.
**Excluding goods on consigneent basis,
Source: UN Trade Statistics, 1983.

Table 7
Real Effective Exchange Rate (1973-100)

| Year | Real Effective Exchange Rate Index (\%) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1973 | 100 |
| 1974 | 83.69 |
| 1975 | 92.17 |
| 1976 | 95.64 |
| 1977 | 98.04 |
| 1978 | 105.32 |
| 1979 | 93.72 |
| 1980 | 88.10 |
| 1981 | 85.91 |
| 1982 | 83.13 |
| 1983 | 102.36 |
| 1984 | 100.03 |
| 1985 | 88.37 |
| 1986 | 112.03 |
| 1987 | 111.10 |

## TABLE 8a

DISTRIBUTION OF TARIFF LINES BY NOMINAL RATE

| Tariff Levels |  | P.D. 1 Amen P.D. 1 | 64 Before TRP as ed by E.O. 521 00 and P.D. 1620 | Up to and E.O. 809, As of 1981 | Including 632-A and 1985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Specific |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2. | Free |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 3. | 5\% |  | 2 | 14 | 14 |
| 4. | 10\% |  | 319 | 380 | 334 |
| 5. | 20\% |  | 204 | 282 | 335 |
| 6. | 30\% |  | 218 | 194 | 284 |
| 7. | 40\% |  | 5 | 87 | 100 |
| 8. | 50\% |  | 203 | 151 | 331 |
| 9. | 60\% |  | - | 59 | - |
| 10. | 70\% |  | 119 | 139 | - |
| 11. |  |  | - | 2 | - |
| 12. | 80\% |  | - | 58 | - |
| 13. | 90\% |  | $\cdots$ | 29 | - |
| 14. | 100\% |  | 228 | 2 | - |
|  | Total tariff | I ines | 1,301 | 1,403 | 1,403 |
|  | Total tariff | levels | 10 | 14 | 8 |

Source: Tariff Commission

Table 8b
Average Statutory Tariff Rates*

| I/O Sector | Industry/Industry Group | 1979 | 1985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-14 | Agr iculture, Fishery and Forestry | 56.38 | 33.08 |
| 01-02 | Palay | 70 | 50 |
| 03 | corn | 70 | 50 |
| 04 | coconut including copra | 85 | 35 |
| 05 | Sugarcane | 70 | 50 |
| 06 | Banana | 100 | 50 |
| 07 | Other crops | 27.18 | 13.05 |
| 08-09 | Livestock | 53.57 | 26.47 |
| 10-11 | Poultry | 74.28 | 47.78 |
| 12-13 | Fishery | 93.75 | 33.08 |
| 14 | Forestry | 46 | 27.22 |
| 15-21 | Mining and Quarrying | 16.38 | 13.09 |
| 15 | Copper Mining | 10 |  |
| 16 | Gold and Silver ore mining | 10 | 10 |
| 17 | Chromium ore mining | 10 | 10 |
| 18 | Nickel mining | 10 | 10 |
| 19 | Other metal mining | 10 | 10 |
| 20 | Salt mining | 30 | 15 |
| 21 | Other non-metallic mining/quarrying | 18.12 | 14.7 |
| 22-58 | Manufactur ing | 42.38 | 28.06 |
| 22-30 | Food manufactures | 60 | 33.68 |
| 31 | Beverage industries | 78.46 | 50 |
| 32 | Tobacco manufactures | 65 | 42.3 |
| 33 | Textile manufactures | 53.53 | 35.44 |
| 34 | Footwear and wear ing appare 1 | 85.62 | 48.86 |
| 35-36 | Wood and cork products | 53.42 | 32.32 |
| 37 | Furniture and Fixtures | 82 | 45 |
| 38 | Paper and paper products | 55.71 | 30.7 |
| 39 | Publishing and printing | 56.25 | 24.16 |
| 40 | Leather and leather products | 64 | 30 |
| 41 | Rubber and plastic products | 37.43 | 26.35 |
| 42-45 | Chemicals and chemical products | 23.39 | 17.53 |
| 46.50 | Products of petroleum and coal | 20.55 | 17.5 |
| 51-52 | Non-metallic mineral products | 47.30 | 34.54 |
| 53 | Basic metal products | 21.2 | 16.13 |
| 54 | Metal industries | 44.75 | 35.24 |
| 55 | Machinery except electrical | 24.32 | 22.15 |
| 56 | Electrical machinery | 38.05 | 27.55 |
| 57 | Transport equipment | 26 | 23.66 |
| 58 | Miscell laneous manufactures | 46.66 | 30.85 |

Source: Tariff Cormission

Table 9: AVERAGE NOMINAL RATES OF PROTECTION, 1980-85 BY TYPE OF COMMODITY

| Sectors | 1980 | 1983 | 1985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer goods | 67.7 | 42.7 | 38.0 |
| Intermediate products | 33.3 | 25.4 | 24.1 |
| Raw mater ials | 35.6 | 23.0 | 21.7 |
| Capital goods | 21.1 | 19.2 | 21.2 |
| Autcmotive products | 35.3 | 33.6 | 33.6 |
| Miscel laneous | 42.5 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Overall average | 43.1 $(32.6)$ | 29.9 $(18.5)$ | 28.1 |

Source: SYNTIA Tariff File, World Bank

TABLE 10a
FRENURICY OF RBSTRICTIONS: MOERER OP ITCNS REGULATED AND/OR BANARE PGR YEAR, BP GROOS


| Group | Description of | Potal Ho. of Itens | $1979^{9 /}$ | 1978 | 1999 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 612 | leather nanufactures | 20 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |
| 613 | furskin | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 621 | rubber hose | 18 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 625 | rubber tires, etc, | 34 | 15 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| 628 | ather articles of rubber | 28 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| 639-635 | cork a wood nanufactures | 63 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |
| 841-642 | paper i paperboard | 184 | 55 | 1 |  |  |  | 88 | 17 |  |
| 651 | textile parn | 139 | 21 |  |  |  |  | 55 | 1 |  |
| 652 | cotton fabrics, Woven | 32 |  |  | 19 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 653 | woven fabrics of mannade fibers | 50 |  |  | 24 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 654 | waven fabrics of other fibers | 33 |  |  | 29 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 655 | knitted or cracheted fabrics | 9 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 656 | lace, ribbons, trimings | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |  |
| 657 | special textile fabrics | 70 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |
| 658 | nade-up textile articles | 33 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  |
| 659 | floor coverings | 48 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 661 | cenent, fabricated construction raterials | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |
| 662 | clays \& reftractory construction naterials | 13 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 3 |  |
| 663 | nineral manufactures | 49 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 7 |  |
| 664 | Elass | 39 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 9 |  |
| 665 | glassuare | 27 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 666 | pottery | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 667 | precious \& seai-precious stones | 10 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| 671-679 | iron 8 steel | 128 | 188 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 681 | non-ferous netals | I |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 8 |  |
| 695 | charcoal fed flatiron | 33 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 696 | cutlery | 33 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 697 | household equipaent, base netal | 46 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| 699 | other ranufactures of base netal | 150 | $1 ?$ |  |  |  |  |  | 29 |  |
| 713 | internal combustion piston engine | 43 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| 721 | lavm nower | 48 | 1 |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |
| 724 | household sering nachine | 42 | 1 |  |  |  |  | I |  |  |
| 228 | nechinery a equipaent for particular industries | 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| 736,737 | metalworking nachineries a tools | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| 74 | heating ${ }^{\text {a }}$ cooling equipment | 58 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 |  |
| 715 | other sob-electrical nachiner tools | ery 49 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| 151 | office nachines | 37 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 761 | tr receivers | 8 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| 762 | radio broadcast receivers | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |


| Group | Description $\quad$ Oo | Potal No. of Itens | $1977$ | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 763 | tv inage $\frac{1}{4}$ sound recorders | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |
|  | \& reproducers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 764 | telecomanications equipment | 53 | 1 | 21 |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |
| 771 | electric power amchineries | 23 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| 772 | electric apparatus | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| 773 | equipaent for distributing electricity | 14 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 174 | electro-nedical apparatus | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 775 | household type, electric e | 50 | 28 |  |  |  |  | 14 | 1 |  |
|  | non-electric equipnent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 996 | picture tubes, valves, transistors, etc. | 14 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |
| 778 | other electric nachioery | 90 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 7 |  |
|  | \& apparatus |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 781-785 | road vehicles \& parts | 73 | 59 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 986 | notorcycles | 13 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 793 | ships, boats | 21 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 818 | sanitary, heating, lightaing firtures \& fittings | 30 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |
| 821 | furniture \& parts | 37 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |
| 831 | travel goods | 14 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 842-848 | articleg of apparel \& clothing accessories | 239 | 205 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |
| 851 | footwear | 29 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 871-874 | professional, scientific $\&$ controlling instrusents | 68 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 29 | 1 |  |
| 883, 884 | cineratographic goods | 25 | $?$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 892 | printed atter | 43 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| 893 | articles of artificial resin $k$ plastic naterials | 43 | 10 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 25 |  |
| 894 | babs carriages, toys, sportin goods | $\text { ing } 66$ | 28 |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |
| 895 | office $\&$ stationery supplies | 860 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |
| 896 | work of art, antiques | 7 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 897 | jewelry | 11 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 898 | nusical instrunents | 39 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| 899 | other niscellaneous uanufactured articles | 96 | 64 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |
| 911 | postal-packages | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 931 A | special transactions-exports | \$ 18 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 931 B | special transactionsreplacenent | 18 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 941 | animals, live | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 951 | fighting vehicles, aras of war, annunition | 19 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOFAL | 4,626 | 1,629 | 32 | 94 | 10 | 3 | $289^{\circ}$ | 628 | 6 |
|  | ------- . | ---.-- | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- | ---- | ---- |  |
| a/ [ncludes itens restricted fron 1970 to 1976. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Conuodity Type | TOTALa/ |  |  |  |  | $19 ?$ | \% | $\underset{\mathrm{No} .}{19}$ | $180$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1981 \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | \% | $\begin{aligned} & 1988 \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ \text { Mo. } \end{gathered}$ |  | Ho. | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capital goods | 865 | 149 | 17.2 | 24 | 2.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 66 | 7.6 | 99 | 9.1 |
| [nternediate goods | 2,141 | 489 | 22.8 | 2 | 0.1 | 80 | 3.9 | 3 | 0.1 | 3 | 0.1 | 215 |  | 289 | 12.6 | - | - |
| Mineral fuels $\dot{\text { a }}$ lubricants | 41 | 10 | 24.4 | 5 | 12.2 | - | - | 5 | 12.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Consuer goods | 1,552 | 967 | 62.3 | 1 | 0.1 | 14 | 0.9 | 2 | 0.1 | - | - | 1 | 0.1 | 271 | 17.5 | - | - |
| a/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 11a

|  | NuMber of ITEMS REGULATED, LIBERALIZED AND NEWLY-REGULATED BY YEAR 1977 TO 1988 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Number Regulated | Newly Regulated | Liberalized | No. of Regulated Items or Percent of total number of PSCC lines (\%) |
| 1977. | 1892 | 47 | - | 33.5 |
| 1978 | 1926 | 34 | - | 34.2 |
| 1979 | 2031 | 104 | - | 36.0 |
| 1980 | 2032 | 1 | - | 36.0 |
| 1981 | 1771 | 2 | 263 | 31.4 |
| 1982 | 1438 | 277 | 610 | 25.5 |
| 1983 | 1988 | 598 | 48 | 35.3 |
| 1984 | 1994 | 6 | - | 35.4 |
| 1985 | 1924 | - | 70 | 34.1 |
| 1986 | 973 | - | 951 | 17.3 |
| 1987 | 802 | - | 171 | 14.2 |
| 1988 | 673 | - | 129 | 11.9 |

Table 11b. Regulated Imports Liberalized from 1986 to 1988

| CB Circular | Date | No. of Items | Items Included |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1096 | 24 Mar 86 | 61 | wheat \& wheat flour, soybean \& soybean meal, feedgrains \& feed substitutes, wines \& liquors |
| 1100 | 30 Apr 86 | 128 | hydrogen peroxide, waste paper, raw cotton, iron \& steel prods., synthetic resins, fish \& preps., fabrics \& textiles, fibers |
| 1105 | 6 Jun 86 | 429 | high tariff items, NEC, UC |
| 1109 | 18 Jul 86 | 263 | synthetic resins, STPP/ <br>  <br> steel prods., high-tariff <br> items, NEC items |
| 1117 | 30 Sept 86 | $\begin{gathered} 80 \\ \hline 951 \end{gathered}$ | synthetic resins, tires, iron \& steel prods., paper \& prods., synthetic fibers \& yarns, hightariff items, vinyl asbestos tiles, liquid caustic soda, comic mags. |
| 1128 | 9 Jan 87 | $2 \cdot 7$ | fresh fruits, glassware, pottery |
| 1149 | 30 Jun 87 | 12 | iron \& steel prods., synthetic resins, paper, cigars \& tobacco manufactures |
| 1150 | 23 Jul 87 | 21 | paper and paperboard, glass, iron and steel prods. |
| 1161 | 31 Oct 87 | 73 | polyester fiber, textile yarn \& thread, phenoplasts in primary forms |
| 1167 | 31 Dec 87 | 58 | paper and paper prods., glass prods., iron \& steel prods., food preps., tinplates |

Table 11a

|  | NLMBER OF ITEMS REGULATED, LIBERALIZED AND NEWLY-REGULATED BY YEAR 1977 TO 1988 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Number Regulated | Newly Regulated | Liberalized | No. of Regulated Items or Percent of total number of PSCC lines (\%) |
| 1977 | 1892 | 47 | - | 33.5 |
| 1978 | 1926 | 34 | - | 34.2 |
| 1979 | 2031 | 104 | - | 36.0 |
| 1980 | 2032 | 1 | - | 36.0 |
| 1981 | 1771 | 2 | 263 | 31.4 |
| 1982 | 1438 | 277 | 610 | 25.5 |
| 1983 | 1988 | 598 | 48 | 35.3 |
| 1984 | 1994 | 6 | - | 35.4 |
| 1985 | 1924 | - | 70 | 34.1 |
| 1986 | 973 | - | 951 | 17.3 |
| 1987 | 802 | - | 171 | 14.2 |
| 1988 | 673 | - | 129 | 11.9 |

Table 12. Products Upder Prade Control
1988

| LIST | PRover group | M0. OP Iters |  | fPPB OP rBELLAPIOH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | Brand new trucks and engives, special purpose vehicles | 20 | DII | Progran participants allowed |
|  | Yachinery $\&$ equipent for pulp a paper industy | 1 | BOI | Pulp \& paper companies allowed (participants in Ration'n. Pros.) |
|  | Glassuare, silver, dinnervare | 8 | $\mathrm{CB}^{8}$ | Banned HEC -UC; hotels, etc. allowed |
|  | Cinematographic film $k$ other works of art | 9 | CB | Banned VISC-CC; fila prod, allowed |
|  | Ganes and anuements | 4 | Сө | Banned |
|  | Others (gane cocks, telescopic sights, stapps, swords, title certificates, advertising antter, tie clips, gun stocks) | 9 | CB | Banned |
|  | Radio telecomunications equipnent | 8 M | National Telecon. Comission | Legitimate users allowed |
|  | Live aninals for breeding \& scientific purposes | 6 | BAI | Livestock producers allowed |
|  | Phonographs . | 2 |  | (An obsolete product) |
|  | Hometric reasuring devices |  | Burean of Product Standards | llonliniting--to check if iaports use the metric systen |
|  | TOTALS | 104 |  |  |
| B. | Animal and neat products | 31 | BAI | Heat processors allowed <br> Banned <br> Banned <br> Only the goverment may inport accredited inporters allowed Aanned; BPI allowa these for seedling purposes |
|  | Coffee | 9 | CB |  |
|  | Pish and fish preparations | 36 | BPAR |  |
|  | Sugar | 3 | HaStrea |  |
|  | Pertilizers | 19 | PPA |  |
|  | Potatoes, onions, garlic, cablage | 4 | CB |  |
|  | Cement \% cenent products | 5 | BOI | Ration'a Progran participants allowed to inport raventerials; governnent inport finished product |
|  | Antibiotics | 23 | OOH | Regulation is meant to ronitor the grades inported |
|  | Veasels and appurtenances | 14 | MMALCM | Regulation is reant to monitor the quality of inports |
|  | Radiation-enitting apparatus | 21 | DOH | Legitimate users allowed |
|  | Spare parts, anchinery and equipant for the iron \& steel, cenent, textile $\$$ coconut industries | 34 | BOI | Local industries allowed |
|  | Consuner durables/electric products | 33 | BOI | Progran participanta allowed |
|  | Ravi saterials, parts and conponents of CEP's | 93 | BOI | Progran participants allowed |
|  | frucks and buses | 10 | BOI | Progran participants allowed |
|  | Hotorcycles . | 2 | BOI | Progras participants allowed |





|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SECTOR | MEICRHES | UHEEIGTISD NVEREGB |
| Rood, Live Aninals-food | 16.4 | 38.8 |
| Beverater \& Tobacco | 50.0 | 46.5 |
| Crude Mat'ls, Inedible | 12.1 | 21.0 |
| Hinerail Fuels, Lubricants | 19.8 | 17.4 |
| Animal, Veg Dils, Fats.. | 18.8 | 88.8 |
| Cbericals, Rel Prod Nes | 17.6 | 22.9 |
| Hitd Coods-by Material | 31.4 | 35.6 |
| Hachinery, Transp Equip | 20.8 | 81.1 |
| Hisc. Mftd Articles | 24.3 | 46.6 |
| Commodities, Pransactas | 29.4 | 37.6 |
| Overall Average: | 21,3 | 31.4 |

Table 14
gross mational produce by inousfrial origin (in nillion pesos at constant 1972 prices: 1975, 1980, 1986 ) (Percentage Shares in Parenthesis)

| Industry | 1975 |  | 1980 |  | 1986 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. KGEICULTURR, PISAREI <br> - AND PORBSTRI | 18218 | (26.58) | 23732 | (25.62) | 27233 | (30.57) |
| II. IMDUSTRIAL SECTOR | 20710 | (33.11) | 33471 | (36.13) | 28204 | (31.66) |
| 1. Ninios \& Quarrying | 1445 | (2.11) | 2236 | (2.41) | 1558 | (1.75) |
| 2. Manufacturing | 16537 | (24.13) | 23175 | (25.02) | 21717 | (24.38) |
| 3. Construction | 4101 | (5.98) | 7139 | (7.71) | 3382 | (3.80) |
| 4. Blectricity, gas and vater | 607 | $(0.89)$ | 921 | (0.99) | 1547 | (1.74) |
| IIL. SERUICB SECTOR | 27453 | (40.06) | 35503 | (38.33) | 35333 | $(39.66)$ |
| 1. Tranaportation, Storage and Comunication | 3279 | (4.78) | 4827 | (5.21) | 5084 | (5.71) |
| a. Pransport \& storage | 2730 | (3.98) | 3937 | (4.25) | 3852 | (4.32) |
| Land | 1113 | (1.62) | 1957 | (3.11) | 2235 | (2.51) |
| Vater | 663 | (0.97) | 853 | (0.92) | 607 | (0.68) |
| Air. | 395 | (0.58) | 332 | (0.36) | 369 | (0.41) |
| Storage $\&$ gervices incidental to transport | 559 | (0.82) | 795 | (0.86) | 641 | (0.72) |
| b. Comunication | 547 | $(0,80)$ | 890 | $(0.96)$ | 1232 | (1.38) |
| 2. Trade | 8492 | (12.39) | 12224 | (13,20) | 14397 | (16.09) |
| 3. Pinance $\downarrow$ bousing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. Banks | 1519 | (2.22) | 2298 | (2.48) | 223 | (0.25) |
| b. Noo-banks | 657 | (0.96) | 1025 | (1.11) | 162 | $(0.18)$ |
| - c. Insurance | 731 | (1.07) | 983 | (1.06) | 886 | (0.99) |
| d. Real estate | 1102 | (1.61) | 792 | (0.86) | 482 | (0.54) |
| e. Ownership of dwellings | 2555 | (3.73) | 2023 | (2.18) | 2309 | (2.59) |
| 4. Services | 9120 | (13.31) | 11331 | (12.23) | 11850 | (13.30) |
| a. Government | 3963 | (5.78) | 4769 | (5.15) | 5811 | (6.52) |
| b. Private | 5157 | (7.53) | 6562 | (7.08) | 6039 | (6-78) |


| Industry | 1975 |  | 1980 |  | 1986 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Educational | 595 | (0.89) | 286 | (0.85) | 866 | (0.97) |
| Medical inealth | 935 | (1.07) | 992 | (1.05) | 1085 | (1.22) |
| Business | 789 | (1.15) | 1017 | (1.10) | 948 | (1.06) |
| lecreational | 441 | (0.64) | 477 | (0.51) | 420 | (0.47) |
| Personal | 631 | (0.92) | 956 | (0.82) | 599 | (0.67) |
| Hotels \& restaurants | 1020 | (1.49) | 140 | (1.55) | 1391 | (1,56) |
| Others | 948 | (1.38) | 1114 | (1.20) | 730 | (0.82) |
| Net factor incose fron abroad | 169 | (0.25) | -77 | $(-0.08)$ | $-1676$ | (-1.88) |
| GBOSS MTITOHLL PRODVGT at narket prices | 68530 | 100.00 | 92829 | 100.00 | 89094 | 100.00 |

Source: Philippine Statistical Yearbook 1997, 1984, 1986
mational Bcononic Developaent Authority (MEDAA), and additional data froa MBDA

## Table 15

## EXPLIOTBD PBRSOMS BY KAJOR INDUSTRY

(Percentage Share in Parenthesis)

|  | MAJOR INDUSPRY GEDVE | Male |  | 3rd Guarter 1985Reasale |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | agricuirugr, pishrry and porrstry | 7233 | (57.78) | 2465 | (33.85) | 9698 | (48.98) |
| 2. | InPUSTET | 1860 | (14,86) | 953 | (13.09) | 2807 | (14.18) |
|  | a. Kining and quarrying | 120 | (0.96) | 8 | (0.11) | 128 | (0.65) |
|  | b. Hanufacturing | 1003 | (8,01) | 919 | (12.62) | 1922 | (9.71) |
|  | c. Blectricity, gas and rater | 59 | (0.47) | 14 | (0.19) | 73 | (0.37) |
|  | d. Construction | 678 | (5.42) | 12 | $(0,16)$ | 684 | (3.45) |
| 3. | SBRVICES | 3427 | (27.39) | 3866 | (53.09) | 7292 | (36.83) |
|  | a. Wholesale and retail trade | 860 | ( 6.87) | 1751 | (24.05) | 2611 | (13.19) |
|  | b. Transporfation, storage $d$ connunication | 889 | (7.10) | 42 | (0.58) | 931 | (4.70) |
|  | c. Pinancing, insurance, real estate, $\downarrow$ business services | 232 | (1.85) | 111 | (1.52) | 342 | (1.73) |
|  | d. Comunity, social and personal services | 1446 | (11.55) | 1962 | (26.94) | 3408 | (17.21) |

4. indovtey mor adevuriely derined

TOFAL $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 12519 & (100.00) & 7282 & (100.00) & 19801 & \\ & 100.00\end{array}$

## Source: Philippine Statistical Yearbook 1986

National Bconosic Developaent Authority (MRDA)

Table 16
FORWARD AND BACKWARD LINKAGE EFFECTS - 1983

| Code | Input/Output 1983 | FORWARD <br> LINKAGE | BACKWARD <br> LINKAGE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Trad' 1 dom crops | 1.46441 | 0.66676 |
| 2 | Trad' 1 exp crops | 1.50662 | 0.63868 |
| 3 | Ntrad'1 dom crops | 0.98789 | 0.54128 |
| 4 | Ntrad' 1 exp crops | 0.59196 | 0.61318 |
| 5 | Livestock \& poultry | 1.28308 | 0.99314 |
| 6 | Fishery | 0.71267 | 0.68067 |
| 7 | Forestry \& logging | 1.16491 | 0.62900 |
| 8 | Mining | 2.35486 | 0.77 .353 |
| 9 | Rice \& corn milling | 0.63258 | 0.99686 |
| 10 | Sugar milling \& refining | 0.55987 | 1.00272 |
| 11 | Milk \& other dairy prods | 0.70109 | 1.23321 |
| 12 | Crude coco, veg./anml oils/fats | 1.31360 | 1.06013 |
| 13 | Refined, (ckg) oil \& margarine | 0.60846 | 1.22569 |
| 14 | Slaught'g \& pkg, meat \& prods | 0.77117 | 1.21984 |
| 15 | Flour \& other grain mills | 0.74449 | 1.09813 |
| 16 | Animal feeds | 0.85265 | 1.11438 |
| 17 | Misc food mfts | 0.79089 | 1.11064 |
| 18 | Beverage prods | 0.56825 | 0.96650 |
| 19 | Cigar \& tobacco mfts | 0.69963 | 1.04151 |
| 20 | Textile goods | 0.95295 | 1.07474 |
| 21 | Weaaring apparel \& ftwr | 0.49491 | 1.02590 |
| 22 | Lumber, plywood \& veneer | 0.85867 | 1.02196 |
| 23 | Other wood, cork \& cane prods | 0.48712 | 0.98025 |
| 24 | Furnitures \& fixtures | 0.47918 | 1.12860 |
| 25 | Paper \& paper prods | 1.08274 | 1.18581 |
| 26 | Publishing \& printing | 0.55255 | 1.11402 |
| 27 | Leather \& leather prods | 0.55282 | 1.22276 |
| 28 | Rubber \& plastic prods | 1.24935 | 1.16238 |
| 29 | Drugs \& medicines | 0.62278 | 1.13393 |
| 30 | Industrial chemicals | 1.54690 | 1.11688 |
| 31 | Fertilizers | 0.68904 | 1.16437 |
| 32 | Other chemical prods | 0.82854 | 1.10206 |
| 33 | Petroleum prods | 2.98780 | 0.99776 |
| 34 | Cement | 0.54801 | 1.09510 |
| 35 | Glass/other metal mine prods | 0.64061 | 0.96515 |
| 36 | Basic metal prods | 2.01527 | 1.27956 |
| 37 | Fabricated metal prods | 0.81278 | 1.25295 |
| 38 | Mach \& equip't exc elect'l | 0.59352 | 1.12434 |
| 39 | Elect'1 mach/appratus/applnc | 0.84158 | 1. 15380 |
| 40 | Transport equip't | 0.68885 | 1.15099 |
| 41 | Misc mfts, n.e.c. scrap | 0.69807 | 1.04433 |
| 42 | Construction | 0.54563 | 0.96369 |
| 43 | Utilities | 1.36830 | 1. 11565 |
| 44 | Trans/comm/storage | 1.56675 | 0.92266 |
| 45 | Comm' 1 trade | 3.23974 | 0.672 .42 |
| 46 | Fin/ins/real est | 1.01106 | 0.63409 |
| 47 | Gov't services | 0.47750 | 0.71220 |
| 48 | Priv services | 1.25790 | 0.87580 |

[^4]radie 11
\#OH-MERCHANISE TRAD
1998-198?

| ITB | : | 1978 | 1999 | 1980 | 1981 | 1988 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 986 | 1987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | ; | [ | : |  |  | : | : |  |  |  |
|  |  | -107: | -311: | -399 : | -309: | -1040 | -740: | -823: | 0 | 757 | -76 |
| Preniges. | : | 1484. | 165 | 2222: | 2896 : | 2983 | 3127 : | 2625 : | 3288 | 3291 : | 3492 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :Freight and Merchaodise Insurance |  | 82 : | 91 : | 100 | 106 | 191 | 100 | 138 | 167 | 120 | 11 |
| :Other Pransportation | ; | : |  | : |  |  | : | : |  |  | 62 |
| :Travel | : | 210 : | 238 | 320 | 344 : | 450 | 465 : | 368 | 506 | 647 : | 458 |
| :Investment Income | : | 181 : | 213 : | 341 : | 529 : | 369 | 375 : | 325 | 359 | 235 : | 345 |
| of wich: Interest incone | : | 179 : | 200 | 335 : | 519 : | 365 : | 374 : | 321 : | 346 | 229 | 339 |
| :Governent | : | 204 | 193 | 233 | 259 : | 281 : | 292 : | 257 : | 373 | 730 : | 489 |
| Persenal Incone | : | 291 : | 365 | 421 : | 546 | 810 : | 944 : | 659 | 694 | 696 | 809 |
| : of which: Contract uorkers |  | 209 : | 268 | 300 : | 384 | 642 | 660 : | 173 : | 598 | 572 | 671 |
| : Others | : | 518 : | 555 : | 807: | 1112 : | 972 : | 951 : | 884 : | 1189 | 1363 : | 1285 |
|  |  |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | : |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | \% | : |  |  | : | \% |  |  |  |
| :PRYMBITS: | : | 1591 : | 1966 : | 2621 : | 3205 | 4023 | 3867 : | 3449 | 3288 | 3034 | 3573 |
| :Preight and Herchandise Lasurance |  | 411 : | 471 | 568 : | 533 : | 596 | 495: | 358 | 340 | 351 | 45 |
| :Other Trangportation | : | 91 : | 170 | 192: | 248 : | 220 : | 167 : | 91 : | 38 | 52 | 110 |
| :Pravel |  | 51: | 74 | 108 : | 126 | 149 : | 221 : | 19 | 37 | 56 | 88 |
| :Investnent Expense | : | 587 : | 779 : | 1173 : | 1564 : | 2192 : | 2147 | 2359 | 2394 | 2184 : | 2415 |
| of utich: Profits,earnings divy | : | 85 : | 95 | 159 : | 128 : | 158 | 136 : | 87 : | 134 | 118 | 169 |
| Interest expense | : | 440: | 628 | 975 : | 1314 : | 1990 | 1985: | 2257 : | 2250 | 2046 : | 2226 |
| :Governaent | : | 104: | 92 | 121 : | 110 | 109 | 135 : | 45 | 28 | 21 | 31 |
| :0thers | : | 347 : | 380 : | 481 : | 624 : | 161 : | 702: | 578 : | 495 | 370 | 478 |
|  | : | : | : | : | : |  | : | : |  | : |  |
|  |  | : | : | : | : |  | : | : |  |  |  |
|  |  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |  | : |  |

Table 18
Gatio of noh-hrachandise prade, 1996-1986
([n Killion U.S. dollsrs)

| : | H8BCHALIDSES TRADE |  | HOH-HRRCHADISE PRAOS |  |  | Ratio of Hon-HT to HT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :Pbrioo | : Bxport | Lupoet | Balance | Inflow | Outflors | Het | (4) / (1) | (5) / (2) |
| : | :Shipnents | Arrivals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | : 11 | (2) | (1-2) | (4) | (5) | (14-5) |  |  |
| : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :1976 | 2574 | 3634 | -1960 | 891 | 1130 | -259 | 33.84 | 31,10 |
| :1979 | 3151 | 3915 | -764 | 1085 | 1333 | -248 | 34.43 | 34.05 |
| :1978 | 3425 | 4732 | -1307 | 1484 | 1591 | -107 | 43.33 | 33.62 |
| :1979 | 4601 | 6142 | -1541 | 1655 | 1966 | -311 | 35.97 | 32.01 |
| :1990 | 5788 | 7727 | -1939 | 2222 | 2621 | -399 | 38.39 | 33.92 |
| :1981 | 5722 | 1946 | -2224 | 2896 | 3205 | -309 | 50.61 | 40.33 |
| :1982 | 5621 | 7667 | -2646 | 2983 | 4023 | -1040 | 59.41 | 52.49 |
| :1983 | 5005 | 7487 | -4482 | 3127 | 3867 | -940 | 62.48 | 51.65 |
| :1984 | 5391 | 6070 | -679 | 2626 | 344 | -823 | 48.71 | 56.82 |
| :1985 | 4629 | 5111 | -182 | 3288 | 3262 | 26 | 71.03 | 63.82 |
| :1986 | 4812 | 5044 | -802 | 3991 | 3008 | ${ }^{293}$ | 18.29 | 59.64 |
| : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: CB Statistical fulletin (1986)
Table 19
FOREIGN EXCHANGE
(1991-1997)

|  | U-5 | 19 BI |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Јйค̄̄ก |  | OTHERE | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 28,753,041: | 3,512,730 : | 5. 56.593 : | 7,0945,319 : | 46,664;4297 |
| Sother tronsportition | -66.909:499 | 23:627,297 | 2,759:755\% | 31,0970, 759 |  |
| ITnuestmont Income | 154, 331 ; 930 | ${ }^{6,244,140}$ | 1,740;059 ; | 11; 3 21; 3939 : | 173,553,513 |
| :Othours ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Incone |  | -9,909,791: | 13,509:7987: | 108, 1054,19 \% | ¢ |
| ! | 1.391.432.545 | ө3.069,881 : | 24,877.911 | 352,990.727 | 2.053,171,064 |
| ipercentage shrre of countries to rotrl: | 75.08 | 4.53 | 1.34 | 19.05 | 100.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sicovornuont | ${ }_{89}^{20,948}$ | ${ }_{17}^{211.3575}$ | 201,070 | ${ }^{37}$. 610.4781 | 21.655.105 |
| jothor tr ensportation | 151.1970,37\% | 16:069:239 |  | ${ }_{76} \mathbf{3 6} 6651$ | 245,462, 567 |
| Siravol and fourism |  | 32;,665; 2394 : |  |  |  |
| ELabour O | 285, 3681.119 : |  |  |  |  |
|  | 992,051,943 | ө9,243,099: | 95,096,738 | 375,506,594. | 1.491.099, 174 |
| :PPERCEntage share of countries to total: | 66.50 | 5.9 | 2.35 | 17 | 100.00 |
| :NET: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stiole |  | (13,511.371): | (274.508) |  |  |
| Sother ${ }^{\text {itransportstion }}$ | (94.27\%,921) | (3.766.599): |  |  | (16, ${ }^{\text {che }}$ (121,073): |
| EInvostment Income | <227, | (32.720;9997: | 1.934,947 | (155:019,812) | <123,845,208) |
| \% Lothours Incone | 1779.047,545 | 86,5655;945: | (12.917, 4 .450): | 104,965, 379: | 297:057:314 <br> 520,887, 267 |
| - - С | 399,300,502: | (5,374,018): | (10.218, 827 ): | (22,515,067) ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 361,271.890 |


Tabl's 19 (cont'd)

Table 19 (cont'd)

Table 19 (ceont'd>

Table 19 (cont"d)

|  | 19\%Ē |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U.5. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2. ${ }^{12,597}{ }^{97}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | P.396.153 | 213.498; 497 | ${ }^{7.23}$. 26 |
| ion |  | 3.265.965: | 2. 1129.688180 | 93.273, 1554 ; | 456,7567:0939: | 15.46 |
| a Inviestment Imcome - Letuiur Income |  | (12.566,723; |  |  | 为 |  |
|  | 1,126;270,625 : | 52,157.820: | 11,079,644 | 345, 460,974: | 1,362, 120,992 | 23.55: |
|  | 2,246,877,110 = | 93.004.499 | 35,689,341 | 577,924,797 | 2,953,495,747 | 100.00 |
| Peeraentag Share of countries to totrl: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (inder |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 51.82 | 100.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ETraval and jouri sn | 37e,417,474; |  | (1, $1,589,9588)$ |  |  |  |
| Sinvostrent Incano |  |  | (15,170,245): |  |  |  |
| lasbur |  | 184,302,713 ; |  | -329,611,300: |  |  |
|  | 1,017.948,593 | (12,272,286) ${ }^{\text {! }}$ | 8,470. 188 | (880,294,879) ${ }^{\text {: }}$ | 133,851,607 : |  |

rable 19 (cont•d)


[^5]Table 20
invisible acelisitions/DISPositions: SBhices
NITH D.S.A.
Selected years: 1981-198?
((Ln D.S. Dollars)

| : | : | 1981 |  |  | 1983 |  | 1985 |  | 1989 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : |  | Valus |  | * | VALVE | $\%$ | VhLJE | 8 | VALUE | \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : ACQUISITLOH: | : |  |  |  |  |  | : 158 |  |  |  |
| :Governaent | : | 38,753,041,01 |  | 2.99 | \$3,062,514.24 | 3.22 | 156,298,258,39 | 7.46 | 188,485,000.00 | 10.17 |
| :Rreight and Imaurance |  | 29,840,199,89 |  | 2.14 : | 8,889,425.79 | 0.54 | : 7,757,960,59 | 0.38 | 1,121,596.40 : | 0.09 |
| :Other transportation | : | 66,909,448,77 |  | 4.81 : | : 13,108,889,26 | 0.99 | : 31,228,887.14 | 1.51 | 49,227, 071.00 : | 2.66 |
| :Travel and Pourisn | : | 252,322,658.67 |  | 18.13 : | : 361,479,336.33 | 21.31 | : 365,088,912.34 : | 17.66 | 261,290,000.00 | 14.10 |
| : Investrent Iocoire | : | 164,331,929,72 |  | 11.81 : | : 240,376,569.89 | 15.57 | : 277,882,309.58 | 13.44 | 170,616,000.00 | 9.21 |
| :Labour Incoae | : | 174,666,698.43 |  | 12.55 : | 283,699,983.03 | 13.56 | : 232,521,818.38 | 11.25 | : 307,314,000.00 | 16.59 |
| :Others |  | 654,608, 968.71 |  | 47.96 : | 758,668,632.07 | 46.00 | 998,593,017,18 | 48.30 | : 894,134,000.00 | 47.18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | : |  | : |  |
| :TOTAL: |  | ,391,432,545,10 |  | 100.00 | :1,649,285,330.31 | 100.00 | :2,067,465,103.60 | 100.00 | :1,852,787,667.40 | 109.00 |
| : | : |  | : |  | : : |  | : : |  | : |  |
| ; |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :DISPOSITLOH: |  |  |  |  | : |  | : |  | : |  |
| :Governient |  | 20,948,188,19 |  | 2.11 : | 522,619.84 | 0.04 | 119,466.22: | 0.01 | 1,853,063,60 : | 0.14 |
| :Preight and Iasurance | : | 83,497,627.45 |  | 8.41 : | : 61,948,079,58 | 4.85 | : 31,330,799.85 | 1.89 | : 46,792,503,85 : | 3.61 |
| :Other transportation |  | 151,187,390.21 |  | 15.24 : | : 130,412,237.93 | 10.22 | : 27,115,136.36 | 1.64 | : 59,490,195.85 : | 4.60 |
| :Travel and Tourisa | : | 54,337,346,02 |  | 5.48 | 114,829,430.85 | 9.00 | : 18,004,006.83 | 1.09 | 52,524,801.59 : | 1.86 |
| :Investaent Incone |  | 392,171, 299.04 |  | 39.53 | 569,653,564,92 | 44.63 | :1,142,196,875.76 | 68.97 | 694,764,563.34 : | 53.69 |
| : Labour Incoae | : | 4,608,953.01 |  | 0.46 : | 4,640,798,20 | 0.36 | 899,399.30 | 0.05 | : 1,147,069.03 : | 0.09 |
| :Others | : | 285,361,119,03 |  | 28.16 : | 394,103,083.06 | 30.90 | 436,297,490.28 | 26.35 | 437,826,512.54: | 33.82 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | : $\quad$ : |  |  |  |
| :TOTAL: |  | 992,051,912.95 |  | 100.60: | :1,216,409,814,10 | 100.00 | :1,655,963,114.60 | 100.00 | :1,294, 398,837,80 | 100.00 |
|  |  |  | : |  | : ; |  | : |  | : |  |
| : | , |  | : |  | : |  | ; ; |  | : ; |  |

Table 21

(Selected years: 1981-1987)
(In O.S. dollars)

| COUMPRY : | 1901 : | :\% Share: | 1983 | - ${ }^{\text {Share: }}$ | : 1985 | : 1 Share: | 1987 | : $\%$ Share: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| , |  | : | : | : | : | ; | : | : |
| :JAPAN: |  | : : | - | : $\quad$ | : | ; | : | : |
| : ; |  |  |  | : |  |  |  | : : |
| :Royalties and Tradenark | 3,505,181.52 : | : 14.89 : | : 2,390,743.52 | : 10.52 ; | : 1,253,372,55 | 7.81 | 2,050,571.30 | : |
| :Technical and Kanagenent Pees | 2,598,112.76 : | : 6.33 : | : 4,211,224.51: | : 15.19 | 458,013.05 | 5.79 | : 525,089.10 | 20.74 : |
| : |  | : : |  | : ; | : | : |  | : ; |
|  |  | : | : | : $\quad$ | : | ; | : | : |
| : - |  | : | : | : | : : |  |  | ; |
| :UNITED STATES: |  | : | : | : | : |  |  | : |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | : : |
| :Rojalties and Traderark | 15,983,668,95 | : 67.88 : | :16,187,380.41 | : 71.26 : | :10,701,252.68 | 66.66 | :11,930,124.00 | : ${ }^{\text {: }}$ |
| :Technical and Kanageoent Pees | 27,574,118.27 : | : 67.20 | :17,219,059,7! | : 63.33 | : 5,936,650.12 | 72.56 | : 1,569,838.18 | ; 62,01 : |
| : |  | : | : | : | - | : | ; | : |
|  |  | ; : | : | : | : | : | : | ; ; |
| : ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | : | : | : | : | : | : | ; |
| : ONITED RINGDOH: |  | : | ; | : | : | : | : | : |
| : |  | : | , | ; : | : | - | ; 450720 | : |
| :Rogalties and Tradenark | 648,262.50 | : 2.75 : | : 230,359,88 | : 1.01 : | : 285,393.92 : | : 1.78 | 555,720,86 |  |
| :Techaical and Kanagenent Pees | 2,533,685,02 | : 6.17 : | $: 1,852,650.04$ | : 6.81 | : 766,993.80 | : 9.70 | 20,281.84 | 0.80 : |
| : ; |  | : | : | : | : |  |  |  |
|  |  | : | : | : | : | ; | : | : |
| : ; | , | : | : | ; | : | : | : | : |
| :HOHGROHG: | ! | : $\quad$ | : | : | ; | : | : | : |
| : : | : | : | : | ; | : | : | , | : |
| :Royalties and Tradeastr | 296,093.37 | : 1.26 ; | : 265,755.32 | : 1.17 | : 6,541.86 | $: 0.04$ | 571,133.32 | $:{ }^{\text {: }}$ |
| :Technical and Managenent Pees : | : 1,080,342.22 | ; 9,94 : | : 1,109,284.50 | : 4.08 | $: 137,947.23$ | : 1.71 | 74,933,62 | 2.96 |
| : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| --- |  | : | : | : | : | ; | : | : |
|  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| :GBRYANY: | : | : | : | : | $: ~$ | : | : | : |
| , | : | ; | : | , | : ${ }^{\text {a }}$, 713,51 | : | : 91910.6 | : |
| :Rogaities and Tradenark | : 503,840.38 | : 2.14 | : 97,283.26 | : 0.43 | : 331,773.51 | : 2.07 | 607,940,60 | : 318 |
| :Technical and Hanagement Fees | 205,930,12 | : 0.50 | : 509,426.24 | : 1.87 | : 24,484.27 | : 0.31 | 85.595 .03 | 3.38 |
| : | ; | : | : |  | : | : | : | ; |
| -...-- |  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
|  | : | : | : | ; | : | ; | : | : |
| :OPHRAS: | : | : | ; | : | : | ; | : | : |
| : | , | : | : | : | ; | : | ! | , |
| :Royalties and Tradenary | : 2,610,110.61 | : 11.08 | : 3,545,456.26 | : 15.61 | : $3,175,354.19$ | : 21.65 |  | : |
| :Technical and Management fees | 9,415,141,36 | : 22.94 | : $2,289,035.21$ | : 8.42 | : 782,283,07 | : 9.89 | 255,716.17 | : 10.10 |
| . | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
|  |  | : | : | : | : | : | : | - |
| $:-10$ | ; | : | : | : | : | : | , | : |
| :T0TAL | : | : | : | : | : | , | $\cdot$ | : |
| TATAW: | ; |  | : |  | $: 10,053.092 .01$ |  | :* | : |
| :Rozalties and Tradenark | : $23,547,157.33$ | :100.00 | :22,916,978,65 | :100.00 | :16,053,692.01 | :100.00 | : $1,097,179.11$ | :100.00 |
| : Technical and Managetent Pees | : 11,035,572.64 | :100.00 | :27,190,680, 21 | $: 100.00$ | : 7,906,371.81 | :100.00 | 2,531,514,24 | :100.00 |
| : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
|  |  | : | - | : | ! | : | : | : |
| : | : | : | : | ; | : | : | : | ; |

* Partial estimate for the year

Table 23a
SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION OF

|  | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| :AGRICULTURE/FORESTRY | 4.5 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 5.4 |
| : FISHERY | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 3.6 |
| :MINING | 6.4 | 7.6 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| :MANUFACTURING | 46.6 | 61.1 | 75.7 | 57.5 |
| : ENERGY RELATED PROJECTS | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 3.4 |
| : TRADE | 8.0 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 8.5 |
| : SERVICES | 28.5 | 26.3 | 18.1 | 19.1 |
| : CONSTRUCTİON | 0.6 | 0.2 | -- | 0.7 |
| :FINANCIAL INSTITUTION | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| : REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 0.2 | 0.5 | -- | 0.3 |

-- less than . 1 per cent
Table 23 b
DISTRIBUTION OF FOREIGN EQUITY INFLOW TO MANUFACTURING
IN THE PHILIPPINES, $1981-1987$ ( $\%$ )

|  | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROCESSED FOOD | 13.5 | 26.2 | 12.3 | 12.5 |
| TEXTILES | 5.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 8.6 |
| FOOTWEAR | 0.3 | -- | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| WEARING APPAREL | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 11.4 |
| WOOD PRODUCTS | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 3.3 |
| PULP AND PAPER | -- | 2.4 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| LEATHER PRODUCTS | -- | 0.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| RUBBER PRODUCTS | 15.4 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 1.8 |
| BASIC INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS | 8.4 | 5.2 | 4.0 | 7.0 |
| FERTILIZERS | 33.2 | 3.9 | 0.0 | -- |
| PAINTS | 0.6 | -- |  | 2.1 |
| PLASTIC PRODUCTS | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 6.3 |
| DRUGS AND PHARMACEUTICALS | 4.4 | 4.8 | 1.5 | 2.6 |
| OTHER CHEMICAL PRODUCTS | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 3.5 |
| PETROLEUM PRODUCTS | 0.3 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 3.8 |
| CONSTRUCTION COMPONENTS | 0.5 | 0.5 | -- | -- |
| METAL PRODUCTS | 6.2 | 17 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| NON-METALLIC MINERAL PRODUCTS | 0.0 | 0.0 | -- | 2.1 |
| MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT | 1.2 | 1.0 | 4.6 | 4.2 |
| TRANSPORT AND EQUIPMENT | 0.8 | 3.6 | 22.4 | 3.2 |
| SHIPBUILDING | 0.0 | 0.0 | -- | 2.1 |
| ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS | 5.3 | 23.2 | 39.9 | 17.2 |
| OTHERS | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 4.9 |

[^6]Table 24
FOREIGN EQUITY INFLOY TO THE PHILIPPIMES,
BY MATIONALITY, 1981-1981

|  | LEVELS (US \$M) |  |  |  |  | * SHARE |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1981 | : | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1987 |
| :USA | 82.8 | 182.0 | 58.0 | 36.0 | : | 24.9 | 68.1 | 44.4 | 21.6 |
| : JAPAN | 28.5 | 5.1 | 25.8 | 28.8 | : | 11.3 | 1.9 | 19.8 | 17.3 |
| :OTHER ASEAK | 7.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 1.2 | : | 2.8 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| :OTHERS | 153.8 | 74.2 | 45.0 | 100.7 | : | 80.9 | 27.7 | 34.4 | 60.4 |
| :TOTAL | 252.2 | 268.0 | 130.6 | 188.7 | : | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Soupce: Board of Investments

Table 25
FOREIGN EQUITY INFLOW FROM THE US TO THE PHILIPPINES 1978-1987

| : | LEVELS | GROWTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : | ( In US\$M) | RATE |
| : |  | (\%) |
| : 1978 |  |  |
| 1978 | 38.5 |  |
| 1979 | 30.2 | -21.6 |
| 1980 | 37.7 | 24.8 |
| 1981 | 62.8 | 66.6 |
| 1982 | 120.8 | 92.3 |
| 1983 | 182.6 | 51.1 |
| 1984 | 102.3 | -44.0 |
| 1985 | 58.1 | -43.2 |
| 1986 | 22.5 | -61.3 |
| 1987 | 36.0 | 60.0 |
| :AVERAGE: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| : |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & : 1978-1983 \\ & : 1983-1986 \end{aligned}$ |  | 36.5 |
|  |  | -50.2 |
| :1983-1986 |  |  |

Table

|  | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGRICULTURE | 3.5 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 11.6 |
| : FISHERY | 0.1 | -- | 1.0 | 5.4 |
| :MINING | 0.3 | 8.9 | 1.1 | 0.2 |
| : MANUFACTURING | 39.0 | 55.3 | 87.0 | 47:8 |
| ENERGY RELATED | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| : TRADE | 8.2 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 30.8 |
| SERVICES | 48.5 | 33.6 | 5.1 | 4.0 |
| CONSTRUCTION | 0.2 | -- |  | -- |
| FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| : REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS | 0.2 |  |  |  |

## INVESTMENT INCENTIVES IN THE PHILIPPINES

I. Tax Exemptions
a. Income Tax Exemptions
b. Tax and Duty on Imported Capital Equipment
c. Tax and Duty on Imported Spare Parts

Exemption from 35\% income tax for 6 years from operation for pioneer firms, extendible for another hear (but not to exceed 8 years) in each of the following cases: (a) project meets prescribed capital-labor ratio; (b) utilization of indigenous raw materials; (c) net foreign exchange earnings of at least US $\$ 500,000.00$ annualiy during the first three years of operation. For expanding firms, the exemption shall be proportionate to their expandsions for a period of 3 years from commercial operations.

For new and expanding registered enterprises 100\% exemption from taxes and duties on imported capital acquired before August 12, 1992.

100\% exemption from taxes and duties provided that $70 \%$ of production is exported, such spare parts are not locally available at reasonable prices, sufficient quantity and comparable quality that all importations of spare parts shall be transferred only to the firm's bonded warehouse.

100\% exemption from taxes and duties for firms located in export processing zones and firms operating bonded manufacturing waterhouses 100\% exemption from breeding stock and genetic materials imported with in 10 years from the date of registration or commercial operation.
II. Tax Deductions
a. Investment Allowance
b. Labor Expenses
III. Tax Credits
a. Taxes and Outies on Raw Materials
b. Purchase of Domestic Capital Equipment \& Accompany ing spare parts
c. Access to bonded manufactur ing/trading warehouse system.

100\% of the cost of major structure undertaken in areas designated as necessary for industry dispersal or areas deficient in infrastructure (for less developed areas).
$50 \%$ of the incremental labor expense of a registered enterprise for the first 5 years from registration provided it meets tje prescribed ratio of capital assets to annual labor: 100\% of the incremental labor if located outside Metro Manila.

Equivalent to the National Internal Revenue taxes and customs duties paid on the supplies, raw materials and semi-manufactured product used in the manufacture, processing or production of export products and forming part thereof; exported directly or indirectly by the registered enterprise.

For purchase of domestic Capital equipment made before 8-12-92 tax credit equivalent to 100\% of the value of taxes and duties that would have been waived on the machinery and spare parts had these been imported. Provided, (1) that the said equipment, machnery, and spare parts ar reasonably needed and used exclusively by the registered enterprise unless otherwise exempted by the Board; and (2) that the approval of the Board was obtained.

Registered export oriented enterprises shall have access to the utilization of the bonded warehousing system in
d. Simplification of Customs Procedures
e. Unrestricted used of consigned equipment
f. Employment of foreign nationals
all areas required by project subject to sucn guidelines as may be issued by the board upon prior consultation with the Bureau of Customs.

Customs procedures for the importation of equipments, spare parts, raw materials and supply, and exports of processed products by registered enterprises shall be simplified by the Bureau of Customs.

Provisions of existing laws notwithstanding, machinery, equipment and spare parts consigned to any registered enterprise shall not be subject to restrictions as to period of use of such machinery, equipment and spare parts.

A registered enterprise may employ foreign nationals in supervisory position for a period not exceeding 5 years from its registration, extendible for limited periods at the discretion of the Board.

Table 28. Comparative Presentation of Philippine Tax Treaties

| Country | Effectivity | Dividends | Branch Profits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASEAN |  |  |  |
| Singapore | 1-1-77 | 15\% foreign tax credit with tax spar ing | - |
| Malaysia | 1-1-85 | 15\% foreign tax credit with tax sparing | 10\% foreign <br> tax credit with <br> tax sparing |
| Thai land | 1-1-83 | 20\% foreign tax credit with tax spar ing | - |
| Indonesia | 1-1-83 | 15\% foreign tax credit with tax sparing | - |

ASIA \& PACIFIC

| Japan | $1-1-81$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Korea | $1-1-87$ |
| Australia | $1-1-80$ |
| New Zea land | $1-1-81$ |
| Pak istan | $1-1-79$ |

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ll}\begin{array}{ll}10 \% \text { foreign } \\
\text { tax credit }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}10 \% \text { foreign } \\
\text { tax credit }\end{array} \\
- & \begin{array}{l}10 \% \text { foreign } \\
\text { tax credit }\end{array} \\
\text { 15\% foreign } \\
\text { tax credit }\end{array}
$$ \quad \begin{array}{l}15 \% foreign <br>

tax credit\end{array}\right\}\)| $15 \%$ foreign | $15 \%$ foreign |
| :--- | :--- |
| tax credit | tax credit |
| $15 \%$ foreign tax <br> credit with <br> tax sparing | $15 \%$ foreign <br> tax credit |
| with tax sparing |  |

North \& South Amer ica

| U.S.A. | $1-1-83$ | $20 \%$ foreign <br> tax credit | $20 \%$ foreign <br> tax credit |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Canada | $1-1-77$ | $15 \%$ foreign <br> tax credit | $15 \%$ foreign <br> tax credit |
| Brazil | $2-5-82$ | with tax <br> sparing | $15 \%$ foreign <br> tax credit |


| Country | Effectivity | Dividends | Branch Profits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EUROPE |  |  |  |
| Denmark | 1-1-74 | 10\% foreign tax credit with tax sparing | - |
| Sweden | 5-11-78 | 15\% foreign tax credit | 15\% foreign tax credit |
| Norway | 7-9-78 | 25\% foreign tax credit with tax sparing | 15\% foreign tax credit |
| Finland | 1-1-82 | 15\% foreign tax credit | 15\% foreign tax credit |
| U.K. | 1-29-78 | 15\% foreign tax with tax sparing | - |
| France | 1-1-78 | 15\% foreign tax credit | 15\% foreign tax credit |
| Belgium | 1-1-81 | 15\% foreign tax credit | - |
| Italy | 12-5-80 | tax spar ing | 20\% foreign tax sparing |
| Austria | 1-1-83 | 10\% foreign tax credit | 10\% foreign tax credit |

W. Germany 1-1-85
Table 29
AGGREGATE HACROECONOHIC TARGETS ar
$1987-1992$

|  | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | RNERAGE $1988-1992$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Mationsl Product (In billion P. at constant 1972 prices) | 94.7 | 100.8 | 107.5 | 114.5 | 121.7 | 129.5 | 114.8 |
| Growth Rate (a) | 5.7 | 6.4 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Gross Mational Product KIn biilion pesos. st current prices) | 706.3 | 812.9 | 937.0 | 1041.2 | 1172.1 | 1349.7 | 1062.6 |
| Inflotiom Rate Projections (i) | 3.8 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 5. 2 |
| Por Capita GNP (In P, at constant 1972 prices) | 1651 | 1715 | 1787 | 1860 | 1933 | 2014 | 1862 |
| Grouth Rate (z) | 3.2 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| Por Capita GHP (Im P, at current prices) | 12313 | 13898 | 15590 | 16931 | 18635 | 20990 | 17199 |
| SAWIMGS RND InUESTHENTS (\% to GNP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Donestic Inuestment | 14.6 14.6 | 17.3 15.5 | 19.9 17.3 | 21.5 18.6 | 22.5 19.6 | 23.6 21.1 | 21.0 18.5 |
| Gross National Savings | 14.6 | 15.5 | 17.3 2.6 | 18.6 2.9 | 19.6 2.9 | 21.5 2.5 | 18.5 2.5 |

[^7]Tsblo 30
SECTRRAL
CRnTual


|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1987 \\ & \text { คcruph } \end{aligned}$ | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | - ${ }_{\text {PUERRGE }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. ranufle percentage chrnge Hgriculture, Fistory and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industry | 8.4 | 9.6 | 3.4 | 9.0 | 3.88 | 4.0 | 3.5 9.1 |
| Mining and Quarrying | -2.4 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3 -0 | 3.2 |
| Construction | 17.2 | 22.7 | 20.1 | 15.7 | 13.8 | + 14.4 | ${ }^{7} \mathbf{7} .8$ |
| Services | 10.7 6.4 |  | 9.0 6.3 | 9.0 6.0 | 5.0 | 10.09 | 8.80 |
| gross domestic product | 5.1 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| B. PERCEMTRGE DISTRIBUTIOH Pigriculture, Fishory arnd$\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Industry | 32.0 | 33.0 | 33.9 | 34.? | 35.4 | 36.2 | 34.7 |
| Manufacturing | 24.2 | 24.6 | 24.9 | 25.2 | 25.4 | 25.9 | 25.3 |
| Construction | 4.1 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 5.9 |
| Servicos | 39.6 | 39.6 | 29.1 39.5 | - 39.1 | - $\begin{array}{r}2.2 \\ 39.1\end{array}$ | - | - 3.1 |
| gross dohestic proouct | 10.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: MEDA


| conmootre eroup | 1988 | 9 | 1930 | 19 | 199 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| İtraditional Exports | 1516 | 1536 | 1713 | 1984 | 2108 | 2181 | 211 | 530 |
| \％COLOMNut products： | ${ }^{618}$ | 588 | ${ }_{51}{ }_{5}$ | ${ }^{157}$ | ${ }^{825}$ | ${ }^{765}$ | ${ }_{665}^{65}$ | 909 |
|  | － | －404 | －476 | 5998 | ${ }^{603}$ |  | －435 | － 569 |
|  | ${ }_{5}$ |  |  |  | 13 | 14 | 14 | 15 |
| gCemtrit eqgi，refimed ：others | ¢ | 12 | ${ }^{1}$ | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ | ${ }^{13}$ | ${ }^{18}$ | ${ }^{10}$ | 15 |
| \％＇porest products： | 248 | ${ }^{26}$ | 411 | 438 | 560 | 638 | 725 | 82 |
|  | 14. | ${ }_{108}^{108}$ | 239 | ${ }^{29}$ | 334 | 375 | ${ }^{420}$ | 278 |
| Sothors sheets／Corestocks | 29 | ${ }^{29}$ |  | ${ }^{45}$ | ${ }_{10}$ | ${ }^{512}$ | ${ }_{14}$ | ${ }^{15}$ |
| \％in Meral metalitc products | 236 | 271 | $29 \%$ | －306 | 324 | 973 | ${ }^{362}$ | ${ }^{394}$ |
| ＝6old | $\begin{aligned} & 165 \\ & \left.\begin{array}{c} 165 \\ 18 \end{array}\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & \begin{array}{c} 15 \\ \hline 15 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 16 \\ & \hline 24 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ \hline 105 \\ \hline 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 109 \\ 108 \\ \hline 196 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 110 \\ 110 \\ 10 \\ 10 \end{array}$ | 118 48 48 |
| ifruits amo uegetables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Camed | ${ }^{9} 5$ | ${ }^{6}$ | 9 | ${ }^{109}$ | 118 | 129 | 14 | $1{ }^{12}$ |
| Eictherppl－concentrates | ${ }_{40}$ | ${ }_{46}^{23}$ | ${ }_{5}^{24}$ | ${ }_{61}^{27}$ | ${ }^{29}$ | ${ }_{80}$ | 95 | 106 |
| peetroleun proaucts <br> Entocs Fiborr inufactured | $\underset{98}{15}$ | （106 | － $\begin{array}{r}17 \\ 106\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}19 \\ \begin{array}{r}15 \\ 110\end{array} \\ \hline\end{array}$ | － | － $\begin{gathered}21 \\ 139 \\ 198\end{gathered}$ | － 23 | （ $\begin{array}{r}\text { 35 } \\ 125\end{array}$ |
| ĖNon traditional exports | 5036 | 5740 | 6538 | 7303 | 0534 | 9911 | 11645 | 13474 |
| Non rraditicina manufactures | ${ }^{4376}$ | 4997 | 5708 | ¢ 6452 | ${ }^{5472}$ | － 618 |  | （1185 |
|  | 1288 | 1496 | 1670 <br> $\substack{105}$ <br> 15 | － 1064 | 2093 | ${ }^{2335}$ | （106 | （ $\begin{gathered}2909 \\ 127 \\ 127\end{gathered}$ |
| Footuar | ${ }_{7}^{49}$ | －${ }^{45}$ | － 3 cis | （ ${ }^{62}$ | \％${ }^{3}$ | －610 | 1065 | （187 |
|  | － 16 | 边 2128 | － |  |  | \％${ }^{\text {519 }}$ | coid | 15150 |
| 代 | － | 边 25 | － 28 | Stis | 258 | － 265 | ， 12 |  |
| Nombler | －109\％ | （192 | ${ }_{2}^{185}$ |  | ${ }_{264}^{278}$ | 336\％ | ${ }_{383}$ | S428 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1565 \\ & 3565 \\ & 326 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{380}^{380}$ | ${ }_{443}$ | ${ }_{488}$ | cier | ${ }^{809}$ | 865 | ${ }_{1521}^{1517}$ |
| İMON TRADITIONAL UNHANUFACTURES | 650 | 743 | 83 | 931 | 1062 | 1223 | 1417 | 1648 |
| 隹 | ， 70 | ${ }_{153}^{78}$ | 15989 | －83 | ${ }^{197 \%}$ | 179 | ${ }_{165}$ | 193 |
| Menoreos rau not rossted | \％ | 近 | ${ }^{152}$ | ＋64 | ${ }^{59}$ | ${ }^{91}$ | ${ }^{106}$ | ${ }^{147}$ |
|  | 280 | 32 | 382 | 445 | 527 | ${ }_{178}^{628}$ | ${ }^{731}$ | ${ }^{\text {973 }}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPECIAL TRANSACTIONS | ${ }^{76}$ | 37 | ${ }_{89}$ | 43 | 102 | 109 | ${ }_{117} 5$ | ${ }_{125} 5$ |
| Tootht exportis | 56 | 39 | 8380 | 9sos | 10789 | 12250 | 14025 | 16185 |



| COMmDOITH GROUP | : | 1968 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :CAFITAL GOODS | E | 1512 | 1762 | 2013 | 2279 | 2544 | 2807 | 3104 | 3437 |
| Eifuctorical Hichinery |  | 514 | 599 | 574 | 764 | -57 | 948 | 1050 | 1165 |
| Erramsport Equipuent | : | 200 | 235 | 275 | 312 | 351 |  |  |  |
| EAtrcreft, ships and boata | E | 30 | 36 | 41 | 49 | . 55 | 62 | $69$ | 75 |
| iprof., Scientific and Cont. Inst | : | E8 | 101 | 113 | 125 | 138 | 152 | 167 | 184 |
| ERAM MATERIPLS PND IMTERMEDIRTE BOOOS | : | 3995 | 4602 | 5215 | 5833 | 6524 | 7191 | 7972 | ©819 |
| : Whepet | \% | 125 | 154 | 149 | 164 | 191 | 198 | 208 | 226 |
| ECruce materisis. inectible | : | 370 | 413 | 468 | 539 | 610 | 680 | 764 | 65s |
| - cottom | : | 90 | 91 | 110 | 131 | 155 | 193 | 215 | 250 |
| ( Symehetic and frtificial Fibers | E | 91 | 99 | 111 | 127 | 143 | 161 | 183 | 207 |
| : Others | \% | 189 | 223 | 247 | 281 | 312 | 336 | 376 | 402 |
| : Andmal t Uegoteble oils a Fets | : |  | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| :Chemicelit | : | 1005 | 1193 | 1367 | 1549 | 1330 | 1879 | 2075 | 2267 |
| \% Chericiel compound prodt | : | 370 | 440 | 510 | 576 | 646 | 7 Pa | Pe1 | 856 |
| E Mraicimel a Pherme- prodts | : | 115 | 130 | 111 | 119 | 127 | 136 | 2015 | 155 |
| $z$ Fertilizer, Encl Uret | - | 23 | 25 | 26 | 29 | 29 | 31 | 33 | 35 |
| z Other chemicel: | - | 429 | 512 | 599 | 659 | 7516 | 922 | 915 | 1004 |
| a Menufac | $z$ | 1154 | 1333 | 1542 | 1735 | 1951 | 2174 | 2427 | 2707 |
| - Paper ${ }^{*}$ Peper Products |  | 112 | 129 | 145 | 152 | 191 | 203 | 229 | 253 |
| Y T*xtile Yarris Fsbrics | : | 320 | 584 | 465 | 530 | 615 | 688 | 780 928 | 863 1041 |
| - Metel products | : | 74 | 518 | 100 | 110 | 121 | 128 | 140 | 152 |
| = Other manufecturess | = | 191 | 220 | 250 | 278 | 306 | 330 | 360 | 392 |
| EEmbroideriez | : | 443 | 514 | 574 | + 642 | 719 | 1805 | -901 | 1009 |
| inetfficg For Mfr of Elect. Eqpt. | E | $\begin{aligned} & 632 \\ & 52 \end{aligned}$ | 924 | $\begin{array}{r} 1020 \\ 60 \end{array}$ | 1125 | 1241 | 1365 | 1502 | $1652$ |
| ITron bre not higionerated | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : $H 1$ MERAL FUELS PMD LUBRICANTS | : | 1188 | 1281 | 1344 | 1399 | 1492 | 1673 | 1810 | 1960 |
| : Coel Coke find Brinuettes | : |  |  | 41 | 45 | 49 | 1597 | 159 | 655 |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { a }}{ }$ | 1002 | 1079 165 | 1125 | 1.157 197 | 1230 | 1387 232 | 1500 | 1523 |
|  | : |  |  |  |  |  | 1353 |  |  |
| ECONSUMER BOODS Amimel | E | 545 | 89\% | 674 | 1014 | 1276 | 1255 | 1054 | 1149 |
| : Ditry Products | = | 206 | 221 | 239 | 255 | 274 | 296 | 318 | 342 |
| : Fish end Fish Prepieretions | E | 29 | 30 | 32 | 34 | 36 | 39 | 42 | 44 |
| : Rice | E | 35 | 0 | 0 | O | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| : Corr ${ }^{\text {Other }}$ Food the live emimals | \% | 293 | 345 | 403 | 478 | 554 | 620 | 694 | 764 |
| iBenerager frad robeced | - | 100 | 112 | 124 | 137 | 150 | 164 | 180 | 195 |
| Enisceli eneous | = | 80 | 92 | 102 | 110 | 122 | 134 | 145 | 157 |
| ESPECIRL TRANSACTITONS | : | 360 | 354 | 393 | 425 | 459 | 496 | 535 | 578 |
| ETOTAL I MPGRTS | : | 7900 | 8810 | 9065 | 10950 | 12155 | 13420 | 14800 | 16295 |



| I TEM | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| : Non-merchandise trade, net | -76 | -354 | -407 | -685 | -1023 | -11 | -1414 | -1599 | -1578 |
| : errmings | 3497 | 3525 | 3784 | 3511 | 4021 | - 4252 | 4498 | 4776 | 5092 |
| : Grouth Rate (\%) | -7.8 | 0.080 | P-068 | 3.69 | ${ }^{2} 181$ | 5.34 | ${ }^{5} 5$ | ${ }_{5}^{5} \mathbf{5}$ | 6.62 |
| :Freight sud insurance | 112 | ${ }_{96} 129$ | 143 | 102 | 105 | 110 | 110 | 115 | 120 |
| :rravel | 458 | 375 | 435 | 510 | 595 |  |  | 940 |  |
| : Grouth rate (\%) | -29.2 | -18.12 | 16.00 | 17.24 | 16.67 | ${ }^{15} 478$ | 16.67 | 527 | ${ }^{16.49}$ |
|  | 345 | 344 | 382 | 421 | 445 | 471 | 498 |  | ${ }_{5}^{56}$ |
| Intarest incone | ээ9 | э38 | 376 | 415 | 439 | 465 | 492 | 521 | 550 |
| Grouth Rate(e) | 48.00 | -r. 29 | 11.29 | 10.37 | 5.78 | 5.92 | 5.81 | 5.89 | 5.57 |
| ESovernmont | $\stackrel{3}{39}$ | 18 | 128 | ${ }_{12}$ | 425 | 13 | 12 | ${ }_{12}$ | 12 |
| :Personal incore | 809 | 952 | 880 | 305 | 930 | 960 | 990 | 1020 | 1055 |
| OStorth ratecis | ${ }^{16}$ | 5.32 | 3.29 | 2.84 | 2.76 | 3.23 | 3.13 | 3.03 | 3.43 |
| - Hithdrawal of 343/347 deposits |  | - 360 | - | ${ }_{95}$ | -950 | 100 | ${ }_{100}$ | 105 |  |
| (comstruction activity | ${ }_{10}$ | 10 | 10 | 19 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| :Oporsting oxponse | 933 | 378 | ${ }^{380}$ |  | 400 430 | 410 |  | 430 | 440 |
| :other strvices | -17.00 | -10.05 | 2.79 | 3.80 | 2.38 | 3.49 | 3.37 | 2.17 | ${ }^{3.19}$ |
| PPAYHENTS | 3573 | 3879 | 4181 | 4596 | 5044 | 5424 | 5912 | ${ }_{5}^{635}$ | 5670 |
| EGrouth rate | ${ }^{17} 9$ | ${ }^{8.56}$ | ${ }^{7}$ | 9.938 | 9.75 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |
| irreight and insur anco | 110 | ${ }_{175}$ | ${ }_{205}$ | ${ }^{635}$ | 270 | ${ }^{810}$ | ${ }^{\text {日980 }}$ | 410 | 475 |
| Travol | 88 | 96 | 115 | 140 | 170 | 200 | ${ }^{245}$ | 290 | 352 |
| =Investmont oxponso ${ }_{\text {Profe }}$ | 2415 | 2672 | ${ }_{\substack{2820 \\ 195}}$ | 3059 210 | 3294 225 | 3469 245 | ${ }^{\text {3707 }}$ | 3093 300 |  |
| Roinvested oarnings | 22 | 25 | 30 | 30 | ${ }_{35}$ | 40 | 40 | 40 | 45. |
| Intorest expenso | 2226 | 2467 | ${ }^{2595}$ | 2819 | 3034 | 3184 | 9397 | 3553 |  |
| :Non-merchandi se i i Surance | 31 24 | ${ }_{35}^{10}$ | ${ }_{40}^{10}$ | ${ }_{45}^{10}$ | ${ }_{60}^{15}$ | 15 55 | 15 60 | 20 65 | 70 |
| : Porsonal i incone | ${ }_{35}^{35}$ | 15 40 | 15 50 | ${ }_{65}^{15}$ | ${ }_{85}^{15}$ | 110 | +190 | 180 | 230 |
| (eanstruction octivity | 414 | 2 310 | 335 | ${ }^{2}$ | ${ }_{400}^{2}$ | ${ }_{435}$ | 480 | $51{ }^{2}$ | 550 |

TABLLS 33
us railip propile or phlippine Expors to tir usa

## I. Consistent Philippine, Rxports to the USA

A. Dutiable and Included in the CBI

1. Lov (1-7.9\%) 11 tariff lines
2. Mediun $* 8-14,9 x\} \quad 13$ tariff line
3. High (15\% and above) 25 tariff lioes
4. Specific 19 tariff lines 66 tariff lines
B. GSP
C. UPN Duts-Free
D. Dutiable and Bxcluded fron CBI
5. Low ( $1-9.9 \%$ ) 12 tariff line
6. Hediua ( $8-14.9 x) \quad 19$ tariff lines
7. High (15\% and above) 9 tariff lines
8. Specific
9. Garments
a. Lor (1.9.9\%)
b. Hediva (8-14.9\%) 14 tariff lines
c. High ( $15 \%$ and above) 75 tariff lines
d. Specific 55 tarifi line

144 tariff lines
190 tariff lines
Sub-Total - $\quad 129$ tariff lines
-----............
II. Potential ${ }^{\ddagger}$ Philippine Pxports to the U.S.

As Dutiable and Inciuded in the CBI

1. Lov (1-2 9y) 16 tariff lin
2. Hediua $(8-14,9 x) \quad 5$ tariff lines
3. Hith (15\% and above)
4. Specific
17 tariff lines
3 tariff lines
4 tariff lines
B. GSP
c. IPP Dutg-Pree
108 tariff lines
59 tariff lines
208 tariff lines
D. Dutiable and Bxcluded fron CBI

| 1. Lou ( $1-9,9 \%$ ) | 1 tariff lines |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2. Hediua $(8-14.9 \%)$ | 9 tariff lines |
| 3. High ( $15 \%$ and above) | 6 tariff lines |
| 4. Specific rates | 14 tariff lines |

## 5. Garments



The consistent exports have been exported by the Philippines since 1983.
Potential exports are new tariff lines the Philippines started exporting in 1985 and not in 1983.
**Carribean Basin Initiative
Source: \#ureau of International Trade Malations (Departaent of Irade and Industry) whose sources include:
PT 246/Annual 1985. US Inports for Consunption and General Iaports.
TSUSA Conaodity by Country of Origin. US Departaent of Comerce.
Bureau of Census.

TABLE 34
WEIGHTED TARIFF AVERAGE BY COMMODITY GROUP \& BY OOUNTRY

|  | Description | US | JAPAN | EEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5. | Mineral Products | 1.3829 | 2,1682 | 0.6000 |
| 6. | Chemical Proctucts | 4.1710 | 4.9852 | 5.5882 |
| 7. | Plastic, Rubber Products | 3.5863 | 3.3631 | 5.8498 |
| 8. | Hides and Skins | 7.6292 | 6.5905 | 2.8929 |
| 9. | Wood, Wood Articles | 1.6680 | 0.8148 | 2.5165 |
| 10. | Paper, Paper Products | 1.2716 | 2.3762 | 3.3663 |
| 11. | Textile, Textile Products | 12.1799 | 5.4218 | 8.6425 |
| 12. | Footwear | 18.8595 | 14.7644 | 12.7570 |
| 13. | Stone, Cement Products | 8.0297 | 3.7818 | 6.4896 |
| 14. | Pear ls, Precious Stones | 2.7093 | 2.0792 | 1.5779 |
| 15. | Base Metals Products | 3.9862 | 4.4233 | 3.4233 |
| 16. | Mach inery \& Equipment | 3.9922 | 4.4998 | 4.8604 |
| 17. | Vehicles, Aircraft | 7.7392 | 3.2180 | 7.6831 |
| 18. | Professional Instruments | 4.8637 | 5.0441 | 5.7927 |
| 19. | Arms, Ammunitions | 5.4851 | 10.9290 | 5.3372 |
| 20. | Misc. Manufactures | 5.5750 | 5.5205 | 6.1383 |
| 21. | Works of Art | 0.6661 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

Source: GATT (1977).
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[^8]

| Description | 1983 Value of x s Affected by HTM ('000 US\$) | $\%$ of HI Affected $X_{s}$ Fo Yotal Xs | Hon-Tariff leasures |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Description | * Share of Xs by Type of WITY to fotal IVI Affected ${ }^{1}$ s |
|  |  |  | Inport Restrictions | 0.57 |
|  |  |  | Phytosanitary Regulations | 2 |
|  |  |  | Inport Documentation | 3 |
|  |  |  | Bilateral Quota | 15 |
|  |  |  | Voluntary Export Reatraint | 3 |
|  |  |  | Pacraging Requiresents | 0.25 |
|  |  |  | Discrininating Sourcing | 2 |
|  |  |  | Restrictive Practices tolerated by Goverments | 2 |
|  | . |  | Inport Monitoring | 2 |
|  |  |  | Lsport Restrictions | 0.59 |
|  |  |  | Surveillance | J |
|  |  |  | Other Price Distorting Heasured | 1 |
|  |  |  | Lnport Licensing (Method Inspecified) | 13 |

Sources: a) Mins-Pariff Comission based on UNCTAD Study on Protectionisi and Structural Adjustaent, January, 1985.
b) Trade Data - 1) US Ceneral Iaports and Iaports for Consuption, 1983-1984
2) Japen's Rxports and Inports, 1982-1983.
3) Iaports for BEC, 1983.
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[^0]:    The previous incentive law provided for a tax credit equivalent to 5 (10) percent of net value earned of non-pioneer (pioneer) enterprises and lg percent of net local content of the exports of registered enterprises. While BOI-registered export producers were exempted from the payment of taxes and duties on capital equipment, non-exporting BOI-registered firms were granted a deferral on payments of these taxes and duties.

[^1]:    2/Tax sparing agreements allow the foreign investor to credit income taxes not paid to the host country because of the tax holiday against income taxes due in the home countries.

[^2]:    5/ As we have already pointed out, foreigners are allowed to own up to 100 percent of the equity of an enterprise as long as it exports at least $7 \emptyset$ percent of its production.

[^3]:    Hanufacturing is a part of the industrial sector but its share of GDP is shown separateiy beccuse it typically is the oost dpnanic part of the industrial sector.
    Source: YB, Yorid Developenent Report 198s,

[^4]:    Source: Taken from Joseph Lim (1987), original source of data The Interindustry Accounts of the Philippines: 1983 ypdate, National Economic and Development Authority.

[^5]:    
     of ionyy sid sond irfo not Paid fortin
     Source: DER, Central Bank of the Phils.

[^6]:    7иө๐ 1өd + पeप7 ssel
    -- less than 1 per cent
    Source: Board of Investments

[^7]:    of Updated Plan rargets as of July 1988
    Source: WEDA

[^8]:    * less than 1 percent.

