

Yet while much has changed, other factors have remained constant.

Despite the immense growth in trade between our two countries since 1911 and the profound changes in our relationship, there are those today who oppose an attempt to improve our relationship. The echo of "no truck or trade with the Yankees" is still heard, and the same arguments are being made. Opponents are asking us to believe that freer trade between our two countries is against our best interests.

They oppose us for a variety of reasons -- some because of fear of change, some because of fear of the unknown, and some because of narrow self-interest.

Just as opposition to freer trade still exists, so too do trade barriers. Despite the significant reduction in tariff barriers over the past half century, non-tariff measures have replaced them -- non-tariff measures which often protect the interests of the few at the expense of the many.

An example of what Canadians view as trade harassment by an interest group is the series of actions that led to last week's imposition of a provisional duty of 15 per cent on Canadian softwood lumber exports to offset alleged Canadian subsidies.

Canada does not dispute the right of the United States, or any country, to exercise its rights under international law to protect its industries from injury caused by unfair trade practices. We do dispute the labeling of different policy approaches as unfair merely because they are different from your own approach. And we do dispute efforts to use existing rules to advance narrow interests over broader national interests.

Unfortunately, that is what has happened in this lumber case. Three years ago, Canadian producers faced allegations of unfair subsidies; and three years ago, the Commerce Department cleared Canada completely of wrongdoing. That wasn't good enough for the American complainants, so a political lobby known as the "Coalition for Fair Lumber Imports" was formed. They lobbied Congress for changes in the rules. When they failed in the Congress, they launched a repeat of their 1983 case. The U.S. producers timed their case so a preliminary determination would be required prior to the mid-term election.

They created a political environment that could only enhance their own narrow interest to the detriment of other interests. This time, although the facts were the same, the result of the case was entirely different. The earlier recommendation was reversed with analysis that we in Canada find badly flawed.

I say badly flawed because industries in a whole sector, which is made up of pulp, paper, newsprint, particle board, plywood, and softwood lumber producers, were lumped together to form one