

not only to the United States but throughout the world. Because we would be more competitive.

There are a great many Canadian producers who relish the challenge of greater access to a market of 250 million people. They are confident about their capacity to compete in a more certain North American environment. They have confidence in their capacity as managers and in the skills, know-how and diligence of their workers.

The government wants these firms to flourish. We know that this is a more promising avenue to growth and employment than bailouts -- or taking a plunge into our own brand of protectionism.

So much for the importance of the initiative. Let's look for a moment at our objectives.

In broad terms, I see them as follows:

First, to save jobs in the short term and to create jobs in the medium and long term.

Second, to create a stronger economy in all regions of Canada.

Third, to stimulate balanced growth and job creation throughout the nation.

Fourth, to allow all Canadians to share in the

benefits of this national effort.

Fifth, to strengthen the economic basis of our cultural sovereignty.

Sixth, to secure and enhance our access to the U.S. market by designing a better set of rules whereby our trade is conducted and disputes can be settled.

And seventh, to develop a more predictable environment for trade and investment.

Those are the objectives we would aim for in negotiations with the United States. To achieve them we would seek an agreement that would secure our market access, enhance that access and, finally, enshrine it.

Let me spell that out, too.

We would attempt to secure our market access by seeking relief from the protectionist effect of U.S. trade remedy laws -- so that Canada would no longer get side-swiped by measures aimed at others. We would also try to get a rigorous limitation on the degree and duration of measures which might affect Canada.

We would also aim for clear and reciprocal definitions of countervailable financial assistance programs