

OF THE MAIN TRADING COUNTRIES THEREIN IS, ESSENTIALLY, MULTILATERAL RATHER THAN BILATERAL. TO PUT THE POINT ANOTHER WAY, EVEN IF ONE WERE IN A FREE-TRADE ENVIRONMENT WITH ONE OR MORE TRADING PARTNERS, THERE WOULD STILL BE TRADING PROBLEMS TO BE DEALT WITH WITH OTHERS AND, INDEED, WORLD TRADE. I THINK THE RECENT MTN IS REVEALING IN THIS RESPECT. IT IS CLEAR THAT THE AGREEMENT ON TRADE IN CIVIL AIRCRAFT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN A STARTER (FAR LESS A WINNER) UNLESS ALL THE KEY PLAYERS WERE AT THE TABLE AND READY TO PLAY. SIMILARLY, USA CONCURRENCE IN ELIMINATING ASP VALUATION FOR BENZENOID CHEMICALS, "FINAL LIST" VALUATION FOR A WIDE RANGE OF OTHER PRODUCTS AND THE WINE GALLON METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR DISTILLED SPIRITS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN NEGOTIABLE EXCEPT IN A MULTILATERAL CONTEXT. AND IT HAD BEEN MADE ABUNDANTLY CLEAR BY THE USA, WELL IN ADVANCE OF THE MTN, THAT AN INJURY TEST IN THE U.S. COUNTERVAILING DUTY STATUTE WAS ONLY CONCEIVABLE IN THE CONTEXT OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMITMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE RULES ON SUBSIDIES FROM ALL MAIN TRADING PARTNERS. AND, OF COURSE, THE USA WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN PREPARED TO OPEN UP ITS GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT OF CIVIL GOODS ON THE BASIS OF RECIPROCITY FROM CANADA ALONE.

BEFORE CLOSING AND WITHOUT, I HOPE, TRESPASSING ON THE GROUND TO BE COVERED BY MR. GHERSON, MAY I SAY A WORD ABOUT USA IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW MTN AGREEMENTS AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS PROCESS FOR CANADA. WHILE I YIELD TO NO ONE IN THE VIEW THAT ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS NECESSARY IN OUR TRADE AND