

building new structures that, over time, can extend the reach of a rules-based international order.

The NAFTA can provide a nucleus for a more open, global trading endeavour, but only if it reflects our collective desire, not to protect narrow domestic or regional interests, but to enable these interests to benefit from a more comprehensive free trade agreement — a GATT-plus if you will. Canada supported the NAFTA on the explicit understanding that the existing three partners would work together to clarify the continuing and vexing question of what constitutes a subsidy and of how dumping should be dealt with in a free trade area — issues which, if left unresolved, will deny all three countries the benefits of an integrated North American market.

Beyond that, however, Canada supported the NAFTA on the understanding that it would continue to evolve into a non-discriminatory, comprehensive free trade regime fundamentally open to all countries prepared to abide by its rules and disciplines. For this reason, we remain committed to facilitating the broadening, as well as the deepening, of the Agreement. We shall continue to assert that prospective NAFTA partners need not be limited to Latin America or even to the hemisphere.

Although there is every good reason to recognize Chile and perhaps other Western Hemisphere countries as likely candidates for inclusion, there is also every good reason to recognize that the accession clause of the NAFTA does not speak of "Western Hemisphere countries" but simply of "countries or groups of countries." For their part, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and Korea have, in various ways, all expressed an interest.

Canada is firmly committed to pursuing a more open, global trade strategy building on the commitments we have made regionally and multilaterally and the NAFTA is not the only vehicle available to us to expand our trade horizons. It is certainly, however, a preferred vehicle to bilateralism. The bilateral approach to expanding free trade can all too easily lead to a confusing overlap of rights and obligations, including multiple rules of origin, that will increase business costs and discourage smaller firms from becoming active traders. Surely none of us has an interest in creating a maze of overlapping agreements when a single "undertaking" is possible — especially with countries such as Chile which are obviously capable of accepting NAFTA disciplines.

Canada is also committed to an open, dynamic NAFTA because of the clear signal it would send to the global community. It would reaffirm for other countries which refuse to address our market access and market reform objectives that, in addition to our commitment to an effective World Trade Organization [WTO], North America has a longer term strategy and a clear policy direction. It would demonstrate that we at least are committed to a more open,