

What is the problem is while we have a level playing field, we have two level playing fields, one in Canada, one in the U.S. The trouble is, we do not have the rules on how we're going to conduct the trade or the game, and we do not have an impartial referee to implement those rules. We have unilateral rules for trade transgressions set up arbitrarily and independently, both in the U.S. and Canada, on how we're going to deal with each other. It is impossible, then, for one or the other to feel comfortable or for there to be any stability when you do not have a common set of rules and a common set of enforcement.

Right now, trade is vulnerable from our point of view to the arbitrary use of the Countervale System, in which any industry or any group can initiate an action against a trading competitor, and under their own sets of rules, by their own sets of referees in their country, determine whether they need assistance from their government by the way of penalty or quota or some other method of restricting their competition. And that works the very same way by unilateral action that could be taken in Canada. What we seek to achieve in the free trade talks, then, is a single plane, a common set of rules governing the trade, and a referee system, an umpire system that will equally and fairly be able to recommend action where unfair trade practice may occur, because it will always occur from time to time between companies, between industries, between countries, and if we believe in free trade we don't want to see that type of action in our own country or in our trading partner.