Attracting FDI in the Knowledge Era*

Andrew Fraser

It is a great privilege to be with you and also a great privilege to be seeing, as always, the speed and scale of the recovery here in Korea and to hear what you are doing to adjust to the circumstances that came about at the end of 1997 across the whole of Asia.

What is very striking to me are the similarities between our own situation and that in Korea. Interestingly, Invest UK was formed the year after the IMF came in to look at the British economy in the 1970s and the investment agenda we set then, particularly the focus on deregulation of markets and labour markets, has really underpinned all the work we have done since.

Perhaps I can just say something about the organisation itself. Invest UK is the single government agency which promotes the whole of the UK as an inward investment location. Our aim is simple: to attract, retain, and add value to UK investment. Many of our greatest investors have been in Britain so long that the British community does not really know that they are foreign owned. Siemens has done business in Britain since 1840, the first Ford built outside North America was built in Dagenham, the first General Motors car, Vauxhall, was built in Luton in the early 1920s. So, we have a society in which the existing base of inward investment has been well embedded in the UK economy for well over a century, and the retention and adding value to that investment, in a fiercely competitive globalised environment, is something that is a very high national priority.

A couple of organisational points, we are co-owned by the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and I report to Ministers there through a new organisation, British Trade International (BTI). Within that organisation there are twin pillars; one is Trade Partners UK, which focuses on helping British companies compete outside the UK; the other is Invest UK, which works to attract, retain and add value to investors coming into Britain. I think that is the right structure and BTI is led by its own board, which is a public/private partnership

* A presentation at IGE Distinguished Lecture Forum Sepmtember 14, 2000

with a number of senior as well as small businessmen sitting alongside some government officials and Ministers. So, even for us, it is a new development and a unique experiment in terms of building a public/private partnership to support commercial activities worldwide. We, in turn, are heavily dependent on our teams to operate in international markets and with our UK partners.

We now offer something unusual, in addition to the national UK organisation, Invest UK, every single part of the country now has its own development agency. We regard that as extremely important. I was on a platform in about 1990 with the Chairman of Nestle. He said "my company is completely global, 99% of our business is outside of our home market [Switzerland]. But in my company, the more we become global, the more we constantly remember that every sale is local."
I think that is a good phrase. Investment decisions are made on a very local basis. Our development agencies can support investors with planning issues, with relationship with suppliers, relationships with customers, infrastructure issues, training and development issues so that our development agencies can work with companies to anticipate their needs and ensure that the skills base is there. I think at the heart of our organisational strength is the best relationship between national and devolved administrations, certainly of any European country. In the US there is no federal equivalent of our organisation, they only operate at state level.

We intend to have all our services online within the next 12 months, so that we will be able to communicate online with all our clients and with our stakeholders in the development agencies. So, it will genuinely be a web-enabled investment service that will operate seamlessly across the world. We have a regional office, led by John Rutherford, working with all our Asian teams outside Japan and they in turn develop their own website (www.investukasia.org) and that again manages a "one-stop shop" for investors at the Asian level.

I want to talk about some of the national implications brought about by globalisation. There is a fundamental point that I want to address directly, which has great relevance to Korea. Attracting capital, attracting technology and attracting talent from around the world is in my view the mark of a successful society. All the evidence we see in a world economy is that the attempt to go it alone is rarely successful and is not a measure of national success. Perhaps our experience as a very open international economy (historically 40% of our GDP has been trade related) has helped us embrace foreign investment and regard it as a measure of British success and not as a measure of British failure. This next quote from Robert Reich, Clinton's labour secretary, makes this point more formally:

> "As corporations of all nations are transformed into global webs, the important question - from the standpoint of national wealth - is *not* which nation's citizens own what, but which nation's citizens learn how to do what, so they are capable of adding more value to the world economy and therefore increasing their own potential worth."

I think we no longer live in an age of change. In the way business is being done through corporations of all nations transforming into global webs, we live in a revolutionary age. The relationship with businesses and their consumers, businesses and government, and the nature of the business itself and the ownership of that business is radically transforming the relationship between companies and their historic national base. I genuinely believe we are now close to the end of corporate nationality as we used to know it. If we had been meeting here ten years ago, we would have been surprised to predict that the largest single shareholder in Nissan would be the French government. We would have been surprised to hear that Chrysler, the symbol of American economic nationalism and the Jeep of the US military, would be in the same company as that symbol of German engineering, Mercedes-Benz and that great Japanese corporation, Mitsubishi. That is all one company, who owns it I do not know and it does not matter. What does matter, is where they decide to locate their functions and which nations are going to be able to add value to that business. We are very proud, for example, that the Daimler-Chrysler-Mitsubishi Group has to come to Britain for its value-added development and all their Formula One work, because that is where the state-of-the-art worldwide of automotive engineering lies. We think that is a measure of success and take great pride in the Daimler-Chrysler-Mclaren vehicle being a British product. It is who adds value, not who owns what.

These global corporations and the webs they are creating around the world are accelerating quite remarkably. If anything we are seeing a continuing acceleration of the globalisation phenomenon along with FDI growing at some 16% per annum. By contrast, world trade is growing at a little over 5% and world GDP just over 2%. As the UN constantly reports now, the key driver in global commerce is investment. One third of all world trade is inter-company, fewer than 40,000 companies now account for two-thirds of all world trade. In my judgment, the ability of a society to respond to this phenomenon and to be truly open in embracing the scale of this change will be the determinant of success in the years ahead. Looking at those numbers a different way, the global stock of overseas direct investment over the last 20 years has multiplied tenfold. Again, all the indications are that this is accelerating. The stock figure is now a sharply rising curve on the chart, and rather than plateauing, it is accelerating. I think the successful societies will be the ones that attract a disproportionate share of that stock and in a phrase that I heard the other day “many of us will always be better than any of us.”

Much of the driver in this growth is merger and acquisitions and it has been quite interesting to see the flows of British investment into Korea, much of it on a joint venture basis, where we see companies like Tesco working with Samsung and BT working with LG Telecom. In this global environment we are going to see more such partnerships as people with expertise geographically and technically link together to face the global challenge. It will be much harder for companies, like countries, to go it alone and the merger and acquisition growth will continue. In Britain, we are quite relaxed about this. Right now the ownership of the London stock exchange (LSE) is under dispute, but there is no public outcry that perhaps there may be a linkage with the German stock exchange. Indeed, the latest bidder for the LSE is a Swedish company and we are completely relaxed about that. We are completely relaxed about the fact that Sweden’s largest company, Ericsson, which is 40% of the stock market of Sweden, is headquartered in London because the key international functions have moved. That is a measure of how companies are disengaging from their countries of historic origin.

So, what is happening in terms of countries? The United States is the world leader in both inward and outward investment and I believe it is the mark of the health of an economy if these are in reasonable balance. The UK is second to the US, and way ahead of Japan on both attraction of inward and promotion of outward investment. Our government actively supports and endorses companies which are looking for outward investment opportunities. We are well ahead of Germany and France, Germany having quite an imbalance between inward and outward investment. Interestingly, I think the Japanese figure tells a huge story. There is very little inward investment into Japan, whose corporations are, in many ways, going it alone in terms of the intellectual capital base in Japan. When one thinks of the relative economic performance of Japan over the last decade versus the United States, there is perhaps an important message there.

The Hong Kong and China figure are often more difficult to decipher, but we have been very interested to see the beginnings of serious outward investment from China. The Chinese President made a remark recently that if our companies and enterprises are going to compete globally, then we must become early investors in the world economy so we do compete with the leading technologies and leading markets in the world. So, the Chinese government is now actively promoting outward investment, not only to secure resources, but also to secure markets and technology access. Two years ago I was with MOFTEC in Beijing and they told there were 35 registered enterprises in the UK from China. The figure is now well over a hundred in only a two-year period. That includes a full branch of the Bank of China and 4 Chinese companies listed on our stock exchange.

Let me just briefly summarise the UK position. *The Economist* recently wrote a piece saying the latest numbers are the most recent chapter in what has a been a remarkable success story for the British economy. Britain is currently a magnet for foreign investment and in 1998 attracted more than any country in the world, except for the US. We continue to attract more investment than the whole of China, which given the stage and speed of China's development says something. Around a quarter of foreign investment in the 15-member European Union comes to the UK. To put some figures on that; more than 40% of US investment, 46% and rising of Japanese investment, 50% of Canadian investment, 80% of Australian investment, 80% of Taiwanese investment into the EU, is in Britain. And German investors have put more money into Britain in the last decade than any market, other than the US. So we lead also within the EU. Inward investment is not the icing on the cake of an economy these days, it is an essential part of baking the cake of a modern economy, because inward investment is bringing with it best practice and best technology from literally around the world.

Our figures are, in a sense, paralleling the international growth, but if anything, we are seeing acceleration. In the last two years we have had the fastest rise of growth in the stock, which is the most reliable number, and we have a stock of over 250 billion UK pounds, roughly US$400 billion. It has more than doubled in the time I have been in this job. In the last five years we have seen more investment into the UK than in the rest of history. And given our long history of attracting investment, that is a measure of the scale of its importance.

Like so much else in the world economy today, it is being led by North America. America does matter when it comes to investment, as in so many other things, and we find that roughly, at current rates, about half our business comes from North America. Canadian investment, particularly in niche businesses like telecommunications, is tremendously important to us too. But the North American figure and the European figures are still the major sources of inward investment as the consolidations happen. However, we do not underestimate the potential from this region, because I think the great corporations from this region, as they become truly global operations and become part of global partnerships, will also be looking to invest out of the region. About two-thirds of investment into the UK from the region comes from Japan.

We are also seeing now quite rapid growth from India. The presence of so many Indian IT and software people in Britain, many now with British nationalities, is of key importance. There has inevitably been a slowdown in Korean investment since December 1997, though interestingly we are seeing signs that that is now beginning to change. In terms of South Korean investment, based on the Bank of Korea and the Korean Federation of Banks' figures, 48% of Korean investment in the EU since 1968 has focused on the UK.

The British economy now is one of the great success stories of the modern world and it is rooted in a competitive position that is well articulated and which was dramatically transformed by the reform programmes of the 1980s under the Thatcher governments, which if anything, the Blair government has extended and consolidated.

Absolutely central to our position is our presence in the European market, which is extraordinarily dynamic. The scale of the European market is sometimes underestimated in this region, but it is a population of around 400 million with the expectation of growing by another 100 million within the next ten years. The GDP is already larger than the US and Japan combined, and annual growth of 2.8%. Compared to the growth rates you are used to here that may sound small, but 2.8% growth in the EU adds a GDP the size of Taiwan on an annual basis. This is a European market that functions as a real market, Korean investors in Britain can reach any part of the EU within 48 hours. The manufacturers distribute their products through the most container ports in the world, run by another Asian investor, Hutchison Whanpoa Limited.

In a brief summary of the issues that we believe are critical to investors, our labour environment is constantly talked about, not just the skills, technology and creativity of the British workforce, but the fact that there is a new form of consensus in British industry. Toyota, Nissan, Honda have never lost an hour to a labour dispute in the UK. Asian as well as North American investors, because of the compatibility of working methods and styles, constantly talk about the labour environment and the flexibility of the UK labour market, at a time when continental European countries are moving towards formal restrictions on working practices. For example, the French are trying to restrict the working week to 35 hours and nobody will be allowed to work more than 35 hours. Our environment is going to remain much more flexible. In addition, we lack enthusiasm for paying taxes and we have a much lower percentage of GDP spent on government expenditure and our tax regime is effectively very similar to that of the US. A top rate of personal tax at 40%, a standard rate at 20% and one has to be earning around US$50,000 before it moves above 20%. This is radically different to other countries. On what Ernst and Young calls the "tax misery index" in Europe, we are very proud to constantly come bottom. So, the tax regime, at the corporate level as well as the personal level, is the most favourable across all the major European countries. As I said at the start, countries are going to have to compete on these factors with global corporations that are benchmarking countries on an almost daily basis.

What has been interesting has been the deregulation and privatisation of all our key industries, which may have a special resonance in Korea. Our markets are open. There is no distinction based on national ownership; anyone doing business in Britain is a British company. Many areas that were effectively regulated and controlled by government as recently as 1980, are now completely in the private sector. For example, the impact of the financial services deregulation has created an environment where London now has more American banks than New York and more Japanese banks than Tokyo. It is an environment where the whole world can do business.

The telecommunications market, the first market to be genuinely privatized worldwide in 1983, where over 400 licensed operators work and companies like Samsung are doing their next generation of digital development, is where the whole world is meeting to develop the new technologies. For example, Motorola will be developing its GSM standards for the world in Swindon. There are many such examples, but it is absolutely fundamental that all the key industries are open and available to global capital in order to create a genuinely globally competitive marketplace. So, the essential premise that enables countries to compete in this global environment is to ensure deregulation and privatisation of key industries at home.

London is emerging as the single truly global city. Our friends in New York concentrate understandably on the excitements of the US market, but London is increasingly where international business and services are managed. It is striking that over 20% of the top multinational HQs are in London and around 65% of American management HQs for Europe are in London. Heathrow and Gatwick are two of the five busiest airports in the world and our telephone environment is among the cheapest. We now have over 35 nationalities in London alone of over 10,000 natives and some of them are very large. The Chinese community is over 200,000, the American community in London is the size of Richmond, Virginia, and the Japanese community is the largest outside North America. The presence of a substantial Korean community is also very welcome as neighbours, not just investors.

Financial services are very critical too and London's position is key to financial services internationally. It is striking, for example, that London trades more Euros than the rest of the world put together. The London position as the global meeting point and service centre for financial capital is very critical to us. Interestingly, the rest of Europe has accepted that, for example, the Deutsche Bank and the Dresdner Bank have moved all their investment banking global functions to London. The head of the Frankfurt stock exchange said, "London will no doubt remain the leading center, thanks to its advantages of size, qualified people, and the attractive tax, legal and cultural environment."

Remember, it is not, "who owns what," it is, "who does what." We think of Citibank as British, Goldman Sachs runs advertisements in the Financial Times under the Union Jack talking of a great British bank and now have as many people in London as they do in New York. We see that as a sign of success.

The "New Agenda" is focused, as I know the Korean economy is, on building a knowledge driven economy. Central to that is bringing in the best ideas from abroad. In the knowledge agenda we believe the key determinant will be who attracts the best ideas from abroad. Therefore, our organisation is focusing its attention on high-value projects, including those that support strong sectoral or technology-based development or build on centres of scientific excellence. Only last week, I opened yet another Korean company in West London, Samsung's data systems company for Europe.

As we all compete to find the best ideas in a world that is truly open, what is accelerating this for all of us is access to the Internet. I understand Korea is closer than anyone in this region to the Scandinavians, who, in percentage terms, have set the pace on Internet adoption. But the UK figure is now closely paralleling the US in terms of business and residential penetration of the Internet and the fact that the Swedes and the Finns (through Nokia) are doing so much of their development work now in the UK has meant that we are benefiting from that Nordic experience.

However, the UK is considerably ahead of the other major European economies in terms of adoption of the Internet and its integration in business. This has become a very single-minded focus of the Prime Minister, who has established an e-envoy and an information society minister, as well as launching a programme branded "e-commerce@its.best.uk." That has the simple aim of making Britain the best place in the world to conduct e-commerce by 2002. A number of frameworks for that include: legislations for signatures; the minister I mentioned; web-enabling all our schools (only last week a further billion pounds was committed to that programme); IT centres; and the e-delivery of government services. The e-environment is something which we intend to promote and we benefit enormously from the fact that the essential language of the Internet and of software is English.

I think it is very critical to have a national consensus if you are going to support a long-term investment programme. Recently Tony Blair said:

> "I want Britain to be a modern and enterprising nation, at the forefront of innovation and creativity. A forward looking country that provides the ideal base for business - whether British or from abroad - to expand and develop into the rest of Europe."

I think national leaders have to lead the effort if we are going to promote our countries globally, and that applies to everybody. We have been privileged in Britain that there is no argument in the political spectrum about the benefits of investment. The entire political spectrum supports inward investment alongside indigenous investment. Our organisation has continued to manage its programmes under successive administrations.

Also, in the knowledge agenda and in the knowledge environment, the words ‘innovation’ and ‘creativity’ are going to be key.

When we look at the history of the IT revolution or the pharmaceutical revolution, Britain has had an enormous amount to offer: It was someone in Britain who developed electricity; a British scientist who developed the World Wide Web; who built the world’s first computer; who developed penicillin; and who led the programme that is now becoming the human genome. Our experience tells us that there has to be a national commitment that actively embraces ideas, technology, talent and capital from all around the world.

I think as we all compete in one global economy, it will be impossible for any nation alone to have the human and the physical resources to compete successfully. Our experience is that by attracting the ‘many’, we can beat the ‘any’.

Thank you for your time and attention.

<u>Questions and Answers</u>

<u>Question</u>

I missed whether the UK government provides tax incentives and other privileges to foreign investors or not. However, I see a few contradictions in Mr. Fraser’s presentation. Firstly, not only developing countries but nowadays many developed world countries come to Seoul to tell us please invest in our country. So, what happens to the underdeveloped countries that are capital seeking but slow in mobilising resources, if already developed countries like the UK draw all the productive capital out of the international capital market? I see a contradiction there.

Another point is that I hear from Koreans residing in London that it is very hard to survive there. In other words, they have been doing business here and there, but in London the discrimination is very subtle. How do you explain that?

Fraser:

Firstly, we do not give any tax incentives to foreign business for a very simple reason –

we do not have any foreign business. There is no foreign business in Britain. Anyone doing business in Britain is a British company. There is no discrimination in law or in practice based on ownership. You can start a business within a day and there is no need to get permission.

I think we are skirting around another issue here. In Korea, you do have a cultural problem embracing foreign ownership and it is partly a measure of your extraordinary success. Those of us who regularly visit this country are constantly reminded of what you have achieved in such a short period of time and you have done it by yourselves. You have done it through your own extraordinary talent and hard work. As you know the country had virtually nothing after the war and is now, at the end of the century, one of the world's top ten economies with half of the population on the Internet. This has been built on the basis of some very strong national names and national companies and there is a great sense of national champions.

Our experience was a little different because our economy was older, more mature and had always been interdependent with other economies and with trade worldwide. We were very keen to see with the decline of the British motor industry, the success of the motor industry in Britain, two very different phenomena. So, we found it a little easier to adopt the sense of Nissan being a great British success story. A company like Sony we embrace as Welsh, and the biggest investor in Welsh language education in the world is Sony. There is a difference in how we look at this culturally and I understand the hurdle you must get over. You have achieved this on your own, with your own brand names, your own way of doing things. However, in the global environment, which you want to be part of because you are a great exporting nation, everyone plays everywhere. The Internet knows no geography. I understand that it will take some change as you adapt from your strong sense of what is Korean and from all that you have achieved in the last 50 years, to being truly part of these global webs. And that transition is never easy.

The confusion point you raised is interesting. Are we looking at developed nations widening the gap between themselves and the developing world through this phenomenon? I hope not and I expect not. I spoke recently at a conference where some Chinese delegates were present and I was struck by how excited they are by the globalisation phenomenon, because they see this as a way of really participating in the world economy and competing to world standards rather than being dependent on other people setting those standards. I think genuinely that investment becomes a win-win proposition; it is not a zero sum game. There is no fixed finite amount of global capital available. Indeed, the world seems to be awash with liquidity these days. Actually, both sides benefit from investment in both directions and we certainly believe it is valuable to see our great companies doing business in Korea and around the world. It is far from a loss to the British economy, not only do we see a divided return from around the world of extraordinary figures with benefit to British shareholders in those corporations, but we also see the transfer of new technology and the access to new markets, which I think allows developing nations to play in this global environment rather than have the developed nations set the agenda.

I am sorry to hear that some companies are finding it hard to survive. London is a very competitive environment and the costs in London now are quite high, higher even than five years ago. The world is beating a path to hotspots, Silicon Valley is full, it is very expensive, it is impossible to find people and everyone wants to go there. No one is saying, “let’s move to Wisconsin,” where there are acres of available land. We are seeing a cluster phenomenon, where people are competing more in the big successful hotspots. However, my experience has been that one of the reasons people enjoy working in Britain is this embrace of a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural environment in which there is no discrimination.

<u>Question</u>
My question relates to the organisation dealing with FDI. As you may know we have KISC (Korean Investment Service Centre) as part of KOTRA. KISC is not part of the Korean government but Invest UK is part of the British government, as you explained before. Therefore, based on your experience, which will be the most efficient organisation in dealing with FDI, especially concerning the incentives and one-stop services?

I would like to mention one of our particular organisations in Korea, the Ombudsman’s Office that Dr. Kim is now leading. That is the creation of the Korean government to handle the existing investors, not for the new potential investors. In giving assistance to existing investors, we are going to expand investment in Korea. So, could you give us your opinion on the organisation in Korea of dealing with FDI?

Fraser:

It is not for me to decide what is the best structure for Korea and there are a variety of structures worldwide. I actually think you have to be part of government, because there are brilliant lawyers in Korea who can help with legal issues, there are brilliant investment bankers, venture capitalists, accountancy firms, etc., who all play their part in the private sector, but there are certain issues on which companies look to government. Very importantly, we have become a key instrument of the British policy agenda. A number of key policy issues in Britain are not directed by foreign investment, but are certainly informed by foreign investors, such as whether we are competitive on tax rates, stock options and skills, for example. So, the relationship we have with investors allows our ministers to be very quickly informed as to what the policy environment is in Britain, in competition with our neighbours. Investors are very quick to see the differences if we make tax changes, for example. If we are doing something wrong, inward investors are very quick to notice, and are very quick to tell us and inform the policy agenda. I think for that reason alone, informing the policy agenda, being part of government is key.

There are also some issues which only government can manage: the long-term skills agenda; physical infrastructure; the regulation of industries; and in our case, the enormity of dealing with Brussels. We are part of this European market and Korean and other investors look to us to help steer them through the latest anti-dumping regulations, the latest working time practices, etc. Those are issues that the government deals with. I am not saying that there is not a role for the private sector but government has to play a role, both nationally and regionally. I think our structure is right so that our team will work in Korea within our Embassy team, which in turn will have a relationship with our politicians, educationalists, cultural practices, etc. So I think government pulls it all together, but if you can maintain a private sector ethos as a business service organisation within government, that makes a difference. If government is responsive then this is likely to be place to do business, but I am not going to advise you on how to do it.

<u>Question</u>
The UK is known for its very vicious labour strikes in the past. How did the UK government deal with those strikes?

Fraser:

In the knowledge economy, the competition among nations will be rooted in the skills, the training, the talent, and the adaptability of the workforce. It is human talent that will be the difference between societies. Peter Drucker wrote, " In the future, there will be no poor societies, only ignorant societies." I think the centrality of education and skills and training to the national competitiveness agenda for everyone will be very critical.

In Britain, our situation got so bad that there was a kind of national agreement that we had to do something about it towards the end of the 70s. Certain key things happened: firstly, the regulatory framework was amended and Trade Union powers were formalised in law; secondly, we started to see new generation of management in Britain, management that did not talk about two sides of industry. In Britain we always had two sides of industry, but we never talk that way any more. We now have a genuine sense of partnership with the TUC (Trade Union Congress) and the CBI (Confederation of British Industry) working together on a range of issues. One of the reasons for that is the impact of inward investors, whose practices broke down some of the old hierarchy problems of British industry. I am very struck when I meet some of our Asian investors in Britain, because none of them have any employees, the use the word 'members' instead. It may sound very subtle, but it is a powerfully different point. For example, the 'members' at Honda have voted not to have a union. Honda in Japan has a union but it does not in the UK. The bulk of our electronics industry is non-union because the workforce has voted to have an individual contract with the employer rather than a union contract.

There is now a genuine sense of consensus in industry and that is a very powerful national advantage. Last year we had the lowest level of labour disputes since records began in 1893. Investors tell me that their relationship with the UK workforce is constructive and that the partnership is a reality. Single union agreements were also key, introduced by the early Japanese investors. Toshiba in 1977 in Plymouth introduced the first single union agreement, so that a factory would have one union not ten or twelve. Therefore, a history of demarcation disputes was broken down.

So, a range of things happened, but fundamental to it was a commitment to a new consensus and a new partnership in business.

Question

This question is regarding some of the Korean firms in the UK. Have you heard anything about any Korean company in the UK being unique in its management or labour relations in any way?

Fraser:

It is hard to say whether they are unique. The ones I have visited have built on the kind of partnership I have just described. What I think has been very interesting is the speed with which UK managers have been assimilated. If you go to Daewoo's video plant in Northern Ireland, it is essentially a Northern Irish operation. On the south coast of England in Worthing is Daewoo's R&D centre for their automotive business, where there are engineers from all over the world. The Samsung operations are very well integrated with UK managers alongside Korean managers. I do not think there is anything I would particularly single out, except that the speed with which the companies have become imbedded as British companies has been very positive.

Kim Wan Soon:

Thank you very much Mr. Fraser, I hope we can emulate Britain's experience in attracting FDI.