

Tyrants and Traitors: The “Evolution by Stealth” of a North American Union

By [Andrew Gavin Marshall](#)

Global Research, August 07, 2007

7 August 2007

Region: [Canada, USA](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

As a young person in Canada, who wants to live in a free, democratic country, where I have embedded rights and freedoms, I feel that there is nothing more important right now than to find out and spread information regarding the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP), which was signed into agreement by the Liberal government in 2005, under then Prime Minister Paul Martin, with President Bush and then-Mexican President Vicente Fox. This agreement was signed shortly after the creation of the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America. This task force is a tri-national grouping of think tanks and interest groups, represented in the United States by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), in Mexico by the Mexican Council on Foreign Relations, and in Canada by the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE) – formerly known as the Business Council on National Issues (BCNI).

In January of 2003, the CCCE launched the North American Security and Prosperity Initiative, in which they propose 5 key elements:[1](#)

- 1) Reinventing borders
- 2) Maximizing regulatory efficiencies
- 3) Negotiation of a comprehensive resource security pact
- 4) Reinvigorating the North American defence alliance
- 5) Creating a new institutional framework

In November of 2003, the CCCE wrote up a short document “Paul Martin Urged to take the Lead in Forging a New Vision for North American Cooperation”.[2](#) In this, they literally say, “all of the CCCE’s 150 member CEOs are involved in this ambitious two-year initiative”. This document referred to statements and suggestions made by the President and CEO of the CCCE, Thomas D’Aquino, in saying:

“He urged that Mr. Martin champion the idea of a yearly summit of the leaders of Canada, Mexico and the United States in order to give common economic, social and security issues the priority they deserve in a continental, hemispheric and global context.”

This document was written up before Martin became the Prime Minister, as is also evident by what is listed at the bottom of this same document in naming who the Executive Committee, Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of the CCCE are, among them, “David L. Emerson”.

Clearly, it is evident that Paul Martin was taking the advice of the CCCE, as he appointed Emerson to be his Minister of Energy. After this two-year initiative by the CCCE ended, the “Independent Task Force on the Future of North America” was formed with the CFR in the United States.

A March 14, 2005 statement was released by this task force, titled “Trinational Call for a North American Economic and Security Community by 2010”.[3](#)

In this document, released by the task force whose Canadian Co-Chairmen are former Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance John P. Manley, as well as Thomas D’Aquino, the President and CEO of the CCCE. One of the American Co-Chairmen from the CFR is Robert Pastor, who also in 2001 wrote a book titled “Toward a North American Community” in which he called for new institutions and “North American policies”, drawing on the successes of the European Union (which was created on the basis of the European Economic Community, later known as the European Community). As well as this, Pastor recommended that our “North American policies” include the areas of “infrastructure and transportation, immigration and customs,” and “a unified currency”.[4](#)

In Canada, the top think tanks such as the Fraser Institute and the C.D. Howe Institute are also fully on board for this agenda and process, which they term “deep integration” with the United States and Mexico. The Fraser Institute drew upon this concept that Pastor raised in his book about a “single currency”, in which they published a document titled “The Case for the Amero: The Economics and Politics of a North American Monetary Union”.[5](#)

The “Amero” would be the equivalent to the European Union’s “Euro”, and the formation of this would hand over creation and control over the printing and creation of money to a North American “institution”, as opposed to Canadian’s having control over their own currency. Even the Governor of the Bank of Canada, David Dodge, on May 21, 2007, it was reported by the Globe and Mail, had suggested that, “North America could one day embrace a euro-style single currency”.[6](#) [7](#)

This is not the first time David Dodge has suggested this either, as on the website of the Bank of Canada, comments made by Dodge to the Couchiching Institute on Public Affairs in August of 2003, discussed “Economic Integration of North America”, in which he stated, “If there was a political decision in Canada to adopt policies of deeper North American integration, would it still make sense for us to keep our own currency? Or should we be thinking about adopting the U.S. dollar as our currency?”[8](#) He further stated, “suppose we were well on our way to achieving a true single market for goods and services, labour, and capital. Then it would be sensible to consider a common currency”.

Well now, we are well on our way into the process of deep integration a mere 4 years later, at which time, according to the Globe and Mail, he is again suggesting this single currency is possible.

The Independent Task Force on the Future of North America’s “Trinational Call for a North American Economic and Security Community by 2010” document made a list of recommendations, including:

* “Build a North American economic and security community by 2010”, of which was stated “the chairs propose a community defined by a common external tariff and an outer security perimeter”.

* “Create the institutions necessary for a North American community”, of which they stated, “The chairs propose annual summit meetings among the three countries and the creation of a North American Advisory Council to prepare for and implement the decisions made at the summits”.

* “Enhance North American competitiveness with a common external tariff”, after which they stated, “the chairs recommend that the three governments negotiate a common external tariff on a sector-by-sector basis at the lowest rate consistent with multilateral obligations”.

* “Develop a border pass for North Americans”, where they state, “The chairs propose a border pass, with biometric indicators, which would allow expedited passage through customs, immigration, and airport security throughout North America”. (*Also known as a continental ID Card*).

* “Adopt a unified Border Action Plan”, where they state, “First steps should include: harmonized visa and asylum regulations; joint inspection of container traffic entering North American ports; and synchronized screening and tracking of people, goods, and vessels, including integrated “watch” lists. Security cooperation should extend to counterterrorism and law enforcement, and could include the establishment of a trinational threat intelligence center and joint training for law enforcement officials”.

- This correlates with a story that was written by CBC, in which they revealed that, “A Vancouver man has won an out-of-court settlement from the RCMP after an incident in which he says he was illegally searched by an American police officer”, it continued, “Last spring, David Laing was driving on a highway near Hope, B.C., when he was pulled over by a man with a heavy Texas accent,” and that, “The American was a Texas state trooper working with a member of the Hope detachment of the RCMP”. Furthermore, “Seconds later, Laing says a different RCMP officer and Texas trooper stopped his car, decided he was driving under the influence of marijuana, and searched his vehicle and two-year-old son”. It was revealed that, “The Texas state troopers were in B.C. as part of an exchange program with the RCMP”.[9](#)

- Not only this incident, but another interesting one, in which “Public Safety Minister Stockwell Day acknowledged Thursday that U.S. agents conduct investigations in Canada”, and that, “Day was responding to a report regarding an internal FBI audit that shows U.S. agents are carrying out investigations without the approval of the Canadian government”, continuing, “It says the FBI has given agents in its Buffalo field office clearance to conduct “routine investigations” up to 50 miles into Canadian territory”. Furthermore, “Day said Canadian security forces work with Canada’s allies, including the U.S, and have agreements in terms of information sharing” and the article further revealed that, “The most recent audit by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s inspector general, done in 2004, documents the growth of FBI operations in Canada since 2001”, not to mention, “The inspector general’s report documents 135 unapproved FBI crossings and says there is no sign the crossings will stop,” and that “Canadian officials say they have made no protest to the U.S. government about FBI agents operating without permission on Canadian soil.”[10](#)

Back to the recommendations of the Independent Task Force, they continue by suggesting to:

* “Develop a North American energy and natural resource security strategy”, under which

they state, “Canada and Mexico are the two largest oil exporters to the United States; Canada alone supplies the United States with over 95% of its imported natural gas and 100% of its imported electricity. The three governments should expand and protect energy infrastructure, *fully exploit continental reserves*, conserve fossil fuels, and reduce emissions”. (emphasis added)

* “Deepen educational ties”, under which they state, “the chairs recommend expanding scholarship and exchange programs, developing Centers for North American Studies in all three countries, and cross-border training programs for school teachers”.

Just 9 days after the publication of this document, Bush, Martin and Fox signed the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP), and released a joint statement, in which they stated their efforts in the ‘agreement’ included to:

* “Implement common border security and bioprotection strategies”;

* “Enhance critical infrastructure protection, and implement a common approach to emergency response”;

* “Implement improvements in aviation and maritime security, combat transnational threats, and enhance intelligence partnerships”;

* “Implement a border facilitation strategy to build capacity and improve the legitimate flow of people and cargo at our shared borders”;

* “Improve productivity through regulatory cooperation”;

* “Promote sectoral collaboration in energy, transportation, financial services, technology, and other areas to facilitate business”;

* “Reduce the costs of trade through the efficient movement of goods and people”;

* “Enhance the stewardship of our environment, create a safer and more reliable food supply while facilitating agricultural trade, and protect our people from disease”.

Furthermore, they stated:

* “We will establish Ministerial-led working groups that will consult with stakeholders in our respective countries. These working groups will respond to the priorities of our people and our businesses, and will set specific, measurable, and achievable goals. They will identify concrete steps that our governments can take to meet these goals, and set implementation dates that will permit a rolling harvest of accomplishments”.[11](#)

It all kind of sounds like a copy-and-paste of what the Independent Task Force recommended.

Oddly enough, the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America released a document 2 months after the SPP summit, in May of 2005, titled, “Building a North American Community”.[12](#)

Canadian Task Force members include Thomas D’Aquino, President and CEO of the CCCE, Wendy Dobson, Professor at University of Toronto and former President of the C.D.

Howe Institute, who is also a director of several corporations, Allan Gotlieb, former Canadian Ambassador to the United States as well as being Chairman of the CCCE as well as being a board member of several Canadian and US corporations, Michael Hart, former official in Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, currently an official at Carleton University, Pierre Marc Johnson, former Premier of Quebec, current law professor at McGill University and also serves on Canadian and European corporate boards, John Manley, former Deputy Prime Minister of Canada and Minister of Finance.[13](#)

The report put forth a series of recommendations, such as:

* **“Establish a common security perimeter by 2010”**, under which they suggest, “The governments of Canada, Mexico, and the United States should articulate as their long-term goal a common security perimeter for North America”.

* **“Develop a North American Border Pass”**, again suggesting that, “The three countries should develop a secure North American Border Pass with biometric identifiers” and that “The program would be modeled on the U.S.-Canadian “NEXUS” and the U.S.-Mexican “SENTRI” programs, which provide “smart cards” to allow swifter passage to those who pose *no risk*” (emphasis added). Further, “The pass would be accepted at all border points within North America as a complement to, but not a replacement for, national identity documents or passports”.

* **“Develop a unified North American border action plan”**, and they state their recommendations being to:

- “Harmonize visa and asylum regulations, including convergence of the list of ‘visa waiver’ countries”;

- “Harmonize entry screening and *tracking procedures for people, goods, and vessels* (including integration of name-based and *biometric watch lists*)” (emphasis added);

- “Harmonize exit and export tracking procedures”;

- “Fully share data about the exit and entry of foreign nationals”; and

- “Jointly inspect container traffic entering North American ports”.

* **“Expand border infrastructure”**, stating, “The three governments should examine the options for additional border facilities and expedite their construction. In addition to allowing for continued growth in the volume of transborder traffic, such investments must incorporate the latest technology, and include facilities and procedures that move as much processing as possible away from the border”.

* **“Expand NORAD into a multiservice Defense Command”**, continuing, “As recommended in a report of the Canadian-U.S. Joint Planning Group, NORAD should evolve into a multiservice Defense Command that would expand the principle of Canadian-U.S. joint command to land and naval as well as air forces engaged in defending the approaches to North America”.

* **“Increase information and intelligence-sharing at the local and national levels in both law enforcement and military organizations”**, under which they state, “Law

enforcement cooperation should be expanded from its current levels through the exchange of liaison teams and better use of automated systems for tracking, storing, and disseminating timely intelligence”, and that “Training and exercises should be developed to increase the cooperation and interoperability among and between the law enforcement agencies and militaries”.

* **“Establish a North American investment fund for infrastructure and human capital”**, where they suggest, “The United States and Canada should establish a North American Investment Fund to encourage private capital flow into Mexico”.

* **“Enhance the capacity of the North American Development Bank”**, suggesting to “expand NADBank’s mandate to include other infrastructure sectors, particularly transportation”.

* **“Develop a North American energy strategy”**, which includes, “the expansion and protection of the North American energy infrastructure; development opportunities and regulatory barriers”.

* **“Fully develop Mexican energy resources”**, where they state, “Although the inclination of Mexico to retain full ownership of its strategic resources is understandable, expanded and more efficient development of these resources is needed to accelerate Mexico’s economic growth”.

* **“Conclude a North American resource accord”**, saying, “the three governments need to conclude an accord that recognizes the balance between security of supply and security of access and includes rules about resource pricing that will reduce the friction that has given rise to some of the most persistent and difficult bilateral irritants” (i.e. softwood lumber dispute).

* **“Adopt a common external tariff”**, again stating, “We recommend that the three governments harmonize external tariffs on a sector-by-sector basis, to the lowest prevailing rate consistent with multilateral obligations”.

* **“Review those sectors of NAFTA that were excluded or those aspects that have not been fully implemented”**, suggesting “to make the coverage of NAFTA more comprehensive”.

* **“Establish a permanent tribunal for North American dispute resolution”**, where they recommend, “As demonstrated by the efficiency of the World Trade Organization (WTO) appeal process, a permanent tribunal would likely encourage faster, more consistent, and more predictable resolution of disputes”. (For those that aren’t aware, the World Trade Organization tribunals are all done in SECRET).

* **“Ensure rapid implementation of the North American regulatory action plan”**, under which they state, “Businesses and other stakeholders must work closely with governments in all three countries to identify opportunities for early action in individual sectors and longer-term process issues whose resolution could have a major impact in improving North American competitiveness”.

* **“Open skies and open roads”**, where they suggest, “governments should consider the benefits of allowing North American transportation firms unlimited access to each others’ territory”.

* **“‘Tested once’ for biotechnology and pharmaceuticals”**, in which they explain, “regulatory cooperation in the areas of human and veterinary drugs, medical devices, pest control, and chemicals would raise the value of sales in these sectors by more than 10 percent, profits by 8 percent, and the rate of return on new products by an average of 4.8 percent,” and suggest to, “adopt a ‘tested once’ principle by which a product tested in one country would meet the standards set by another, or to establish a North America testing center with personnel from each country”.

* **“Integrating protection of food, health, and the environment”**, where they suggest there is a great “need to ensure that regulatory processes are as integrated as their relevant markets”.

* **“Expand temporary migrant worker programs”**, where they explain, “Canada and the United States should expand programs for temporary labor migration from Mexico. For instance, Canada’s successful model for managing seasonal migration in the agricultural sector should be expanded to other sectors where Canadian producers face a shortage of workers and Mexico may have a surplus of workers with appropriate skills”.

* **“Create a major scholarship fund for undergraduate and graduate students to study in the other North American countries and to learn the region’s three languages”**, and they explain, “Cross-border educational study within North America by Canadians, Americans, and Mexicans should expand to reflect the degree of our commercial exchanges”.

* **“Develop a network of centers for North American studies”**, and they start by stating, “The European Union provides substantial funding for EU centers in fifteen universities in the United States, as well as twelve Jean Monnet Chairs. The U.S. Department of Education provides similar grants to support language and international studies outside North America, but not within North America. That should change”, which is a clear indication that this is a move towards a North American Union, whether or not they call it that, and they further recommend, “that the three governments open a competition and provide grants to universities in each of the three countries to promote courses, education, and research on North America and assist elementary and secondary schools in teaching about North America”, and that “a student summit should be held periodically in each of the three countries”.

* **“Develop teacher exchange and training programs for elementary and secondary school teachers”**, where they suggest, “This would assist in removing language barriers and give some students a greater sense of a North American identity. Greater efforts should also be made to recruit Mexican language teachers to teach Spanish in the United States and Canada”.

* **“An annual North American Summit meeting”**, where they state, “There is no more succinct or forceful way to demonstrate to the people of all three countries the importance of the North American partnership than to have the Mexican and American presidents and the Canadian prime minister meet at least once a year.”

* **“Strengthen government structures”**, and suggest, “strengthening links between governments, as the three leaders did at their March meeting in Texas, by establishing minister-led working groups that will be required to report back within ninety days, and to meet regularly”.

* **“A North American Advisory Council”**, here they suggest that the North American governments “should appoint an independent body of advisers. This body should be composed of eminent persons from outside government, appointed to staggered multiyear terms to ensure their independence”. This means people in the corporate world, however, their mandate would be to “provide a public voice for North America”. So, essentially, it would be corporate representatives speaking for ALL the people of North America. They continue, “A complementary approach would be to establish private bodies that would meet regularly or annually to buttress North American relationships, along the lines of the Bilderberg”.

* **“A North American Inter-Parliamentary Group”**, where they state, “The Task Force recommends that the bilateral meetings occur every other year and that the three North American partners form a trilateral interparliamentary group to meet in the alternating year. The North American Advisory Council could provide an agenda and support for these meetings”.

It is literally shocking how far along these proposals have come. Firstly, in June of 2005, the Security and Prosperity Ministers of all three countries submitted a Report to Leaders on progress, and the Canadian ministers include Minister of Industry and former Vice-Chair of the CCCE, David Emerson, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Anne McLellan, and Minister of Foreign Affairs Pierre Stewart Pettigrew. American Ministers included Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Homeland Security Director Michael Chertoff, as well as the Commerce Secretary Carlos Gutierrez.[14](#)

In 2002, the North American Forum on Integration (NAFI) was formed, which is described on its website as “a non-profit organization based in Montreal”, and “aims to address the issues raised by North American integration as well as identify new ideas and strategies to reinforce the North American region”. It continues, “Over the first two years of its existence, NAFI organized conferences which brought together government and academic figures as well as business people”, the first conference was held in Montreal in March 2003, the second one was held in April 2004 in Mexico, and states that “About 200 participants and conference speakers took part in the conference, among which the former Energy Minister, Mr. Felipe Calderon”, who is now the President of Mexico. It then states that, “In the following years, NAFI organized an annual North American mock parliament, called the Triumvirate”, and that “This innovative event allows a hundred Canadian, American and Mexican university students to better understand the North American dynamic as well as the challenges faced by NAFTA partners”. It continues, “A first edition took place in the Canadian Senate in May 2005, under the presidency of ex-Ambassador Mr. Raymond Chrétien”, who also happens to be the son of former Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. Further, “The second edition took place in the Mexican Senate in May 2006”.[15](#)

It declares it’s main three objectives to be:

* “Making the academic world, the public and decision-makers aware of the challenges posed by integration between the three NAFTA countries;

* Identifying the elements of the North American agenda which would allow the consolidation and reinforcement of the North American region;

* Favouring the creation of North American networks to set the basis for a trilateral dialogue.”

The Universities across North America that are involved in the mock North American parliaments are American University, Carleton University, McGill University, Roosevelt University, Simon Fraser University, Tecnológico de Monterrey, Universidad de Monterrey, Université Laval, Université de Montréal, Université du Québec à Montréal and University of Arizona.[16](#)

The Board of the North American Forum on Integration (NAFI) includes the Chairman M. Stephen Blank, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, who is the Director of the North American Center for Transborder Studies at Arizona State University, and Director Dr. Robert A. Pastor, Professor and Director of the Center for North American Studies at American University, author of the book, "Toward a North American Community", member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a Vice Chair of the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America which produced the document "Building a North American Community", which essentially set the agenda for the SPP agreement.[17](#)

In March of 2006, the leaders of the three countries again held a summit meeting for the Security and Prosperity Partnership, this time with Fox, Bush and newly elected Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper.[18](#)

At this summit meeting, the three leaders announced the formation of a North American Advisory Council, called the North American Competitiveness Council (NACC), which was discussed in the "Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America Report to Leaders August 2006".[19](#)

In this report, written by the three countries' respective SPP ministers within government, stated, "we are pleased to inform you that on June 15, Ministers officially launched the North American Competitiveness Council (NACC) that you announced in Cancun". They continue, "Our three governments recognize that private sector involvement is key to enhancing North America's competitive position in global markets and is the driving force behind innovation and growth. As such, the creation of the NACC provides a voice and a formal role for the private sector. The regular meetings between ministers, senior officials, and the NACC, complemented by ongoing consultations with other interested stakeholders, will help ensure that the SPP remains a cornerstone of North American cooperation". This means that corporate representatives meet regularly with our elected government officials. The Security and Prosperity Ministers who signed this report were the same American Ministers who signed the previous one, namely, Michael Chertoff and Condoleezza Rice, and on the Canadian side, with the newly elected Canadian Conservative government, the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Stockwell Day, Minister of Industry Maxine Mernier and Foreign Affairs Minister Peter MacKay. Meanwhile, former Industry Minister in the Liberal government, David Emerson, (from the Canadian Council of Chief Executives), was asked by Prime Minister Harper to cross the aisle and join the Conservative cabinet, where he now sits as Minister of International Trade, where his main first priority was resolving the softwood lumber issue, which the Task Force report clearly indicated was a sour spot for them. On resolving the softwood lumber issue, Emerson stated that those who opposed his proposition were "anti-American".[20](#) I'm also sure that it was simply a coincidence that while at the CCCE and before going into Ministerial Positions in the Canadian government, David Emerson was President and CEO of Canfor Corporation, Canada's largest manufacturer of softwood lumber.[21](#)

The North American Competitiveness Council (NACC) is run out of the US Chamber of Commerce.²² It is made up of corporate representatives of all three countries, and the Canadian representatives include the CEOs of Manulife Financial, Power Corporation of Canada, Ganong Bros. Limited, Suncor Energy, Canadian National Railway Company, Linamar Corporation, Bell Canada Enterprises, Canfor Corporation (the company David Emerson used to be CEO of before going into government), The Home Depot Company and the Bank of Nova Scotia. The American NACC members include top representatives from the Campbell Soup Company, Chevron Corporation, Ford Motor Company, FedEx Corporation, General Electric Company, General Motors Corporation, Kansas City Southern, Lockheed Martin Corporation, Merck & Co., Inc., Mittal Steel USA, New York Life Insurance Company, The Procter & Gamble Company, UPS, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and Whirlpool Corporation. These are some of the biggest corporations, not just in the United States, but in the world, literally advising our elected representatives on how to properly “integrate” our countries to form the North American “Community” (Union) by 2010.

In August of 2006, a list of priorities was made both in the areas of Security and Prosperity through the SPP agreement, which is fully available for viewing on the Canadian governments SPP website.²³ Under the Security Priorities, they have three columns, the first being “Initiative”, the second being “Key Milestones”, and the last being “Status”, where it lists whether or not the initiative is “On Track”, “Partially Completed”, “Completed”, “Ongoing”, or “Delayed”. I won’t go through the exhaustive list,²⁴ but rather go to one key point due to some recent developments in that sector in Canada. Under “Aviation Security”, it states, “Develop and implement a strategy to establish equivalent approaches to aviation security for North America”, the initiative it made was, “Develop, test, evaluate and implement a plan to establish comparable aviation passenger screening, and the screening of baggage and air cargo”. Under “Key Milestones”, it states, “For aviation security purposes, each country has developed, is developing or may develop its own passenger assessment (no-fly) program for use on flights within, to or from that country to ensure that persons who pose a threat to aviation are monitored or denied boarding, within 24 months (June 2007)”.

Now this is a very important point to note, because it states that this is to be done by June 2007, now, in Canada, we recently heard about a news item in our media, as the CBC reported on **June 18, 2007** that “Transportation experts and privacy advocates warned of potential abuses as Canada’s no-fly list, which checks the names of domestic airline passengers against a list of people deemed to be threats, went into effect on Monday”.²⁵ The article continues, “Fewer than 1,000 names are believed to be on Transport Canada’s Specified Persons list, unlike its U.S. counterpart, which has grown to contain more than 44,000. The list will not be available to the public, which means those on it will only find out when they try to travel”. It also mentioned that, “Critics also point to the ordeal of Canadian Maher Arar, who was sent by U.S. officials to Syria, where he was detained and tortured for more than a year. Despite being exonerated by federal inquiry in Canada, Arar remains on a U.S. watch list”. The article even further reported that, “In May, the federal government announced that as another part of the Passenger Protect program, all travellers 12 and older on flights within Canada, from Canada and destined for Canada would have to show valid photo identification or two pieces of additional ID, one of which shows date of birth, name and gender, before they will be issued a boarding pass”. However, what the article makes no mention of is the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP), which is the “agreement” that this was implemented under. It states simply that Canada decided to do this, which further suggests that this SPP agreement is largely secretive and out of the

public view.

How it works is that the agendas and initiatives under the SPP, which literally cover every aspect of our society, from integration of trade laws, economies, defense, (and with that foreign policy), emergency response, education, transportation, immigration, health and environmental regulations, resources, energy, law enforcement, intelligence, ID cards and a single currency, all these initiatives are not listed as being under a “treaty”, because a treaty would have to go through the three countries’ respective Parliaments and Congressional bodies, and therefore be subjected to examination and debate, and thusly, become aware to the public. So, the people behind this call the SPP a “dialogue”, and in actuality work through merging the bureaucracies of our three countries, working through the different branches of government where they propose different initiatives to take, which the Executive branch (Prime Minister’s Office and Cabinet/ White House and Presidential Administration) pushes and approves, stating that they are “Canadian”, or “American” initiatives, but in reality are “harmonizing” all the changes to be integrated with all three North American countries, to more easily merge us into a North American Union, secretly and without the public being aware. The idea is that they want to move this process of integration so far along without public knowledge that by the time the public becomes aware, remember they state that we must be in this “North American Community” (Union), by 2010, at which time it will be far too late for the public to oppose it, as it will have already become a reality. The ‘No-fly’ list is just an example of this process.

Another short example is that on May 8, 2007, it was reported in the Montreal Gazette that, “Canada is set to raise its limits on pesticide residues on fruit and vegetables for hundreds of products. The move is part of an effort to harmonize Canadian pesticide rules with those of the United States, which allows higher residue levels for 40 per cent of the pesticides it regulates.” This article actually mentioned that it was about “harmonizing” our pesticide residue levels with that of the United States, and it continued, “Differences in residue limits, which apply both to domestic and imported food, pose a potential ‘trade irritant,’ said Richard Aucoin, chief registrar of the Pest Management Regulatory Agency, which sets Canada’s pesticide rules.” What this means, however, is that “U.S. pesticide residue limits are often higher because their warmer climate means they are plagued by more pests”, and therefore in Canada we are *lowering* our pesticide standards, raising a potential health risk. The article then goes on to actually explain the reasons behind this change, “Canadian regulators and their U.S. counterparts have been working to harmonize their pesticide regulations since 1996, as part of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Now the effort is being fast-tracked as an initiative under the Security and Prosperity Partnership, a wide-ranging plan to streamline regulatory and security protocols across North America”, and it continued, “The SPP’s 2006 report identified stricter residue limits as ‘barriers to trade’.”[26](#)

On September 12-14, 2006, representatives from all three countries met in secret at the Banff Springs Hotel to convene the North American Forum. This information was brought to light through Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests made in the United States by a government watchdog group, Judicial Watch. Included in the FOIA documents, is a list of all the attendees, as well as the agenda being discussed and pursued.[27](#)

The three Co-Chairs of the North American Forum were, from Mexico, Pedro Aspe, the former Finance Minister of Mexico and currently a director of the McGraw Hill Companies and The Carnegie Corporation, from Canada, Peter Lougheed, the former Premier of Alberta, currently a director on five Canadian corporations as well as being a member of the

Trilateral Commission and is Chancellor Emeritus of Queen's University in Kingston, and from the United States, George P. Shultz, the former US Secretary of State under the Reagan Administration, was in the Nixon Administration and was President of Bechtel Group (an engineering and construction firm that gets large contracts in the 'war on terror') and currently sits as Chairman of the International Advisory Council of JP Morgan Chase.

The Canadian participants in the North American Forum include Stockwell Day, the SPP Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Greg Melchin, the Minister of Energy in the government of Alberta, Perin Beatty, the President and CEO of Canadian manufacturers and Exporters, Peter M. Boehm, Assistant Deputy Minister, North America, Thomas D'Aquino, President and CEO of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, Vice-Chair of the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America as well as being one of the architects of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and is a member of the North American Competitiveness Council (NACC). Other Canadian members include John English, Executive Director at the Center for International Governance Innovation, Brian Felesky, a director of TransCanada Power, Suncor Energy, Fairquest Energy and is Vice-Chair of the Canada West Foundation, Richard George, the President and CEO of Suncor Energy, is a member of the NACC, as well as being a Chairman of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, James Gray, Chair of the Canada West Foundation, a board member of the Canadian National Railway Company, member of the advisory board of Lazard Canada, Fred Green, President and CEO of Canadian Pacific Railway, V. Peter Harder, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Harold Kvisle, CEO of TransCanada Corporation, as well as being on the boards of PrimeWest Energy Inc., and the Bank of Montreal, Gaetan Lavertu, the Canadian Ambassador to Mexico, John Manley, former Deputy Prime Minister and a Vice Chair of the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America and is on the boards of Nortel Networks, CIBC, and Canadian Pacific Railway, Colin Robertson, Minister & Head of the Advocacy Secretariat at the Canadian Embassy in Washington, and was a member of the team that negotiated the NAFTA agreement, Berel Rodal, Vice Chairman on the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict and is on the boards of and is an advisor to technology firms in Canada, the United States and Europe, Gordon Smith, Chairman of the International Development Research Committee and is a member of the Trilateral Commission.

American participants in the North American Forum include General Peter Pace, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the highest military position on the United States, Deborah Bolton, Political Advisor to the Commander the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), and the Commander of the United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM), Ronald T. Covais, President of the Americas at the Lockheed Martin Corporation, the largest weapons manufacturer and defense contractor in the world, Christopher Henry, the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Carla A. Hills, Chairman and CEO of Hills & Company, former US Trade Representative in the George H.W. Bush Administration, Vice Chair of the Council on Foreign Relations, which was the principal sponsor of the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America, a member of the Executive Committee of the Trilateral Commission, Co-Chair of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), a top US think tank, Caryn Hollis, the Principal Director of Western Hemisphere Affairs in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs in the Pentagon, Robert James, President of Asset Management, Inc., a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, Admiral Timothy J. Keating, the Commander of US Northern Command and NORAD, M. Peter McPherson, on the board of Dow Jones, and was Director of Economic Policy in Iraq, formerly worked in senior executive positions at Bank of

America, former Deputy Secretary of the US Treasury, where he was instrumental in the negotiations for the Canadian Free Trade Agreement, Doris Meissner, a Senior Fellow at the Migration Policy Institute and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, Mary Anastasia O'Grady, Editorial Board Member of the Wall Street Journal, a former employee of Merrill Lynch & Co., Robert Pastor, Director of the Center for North American Studies and Vice President of International Affairs and professor of International Relations at American University, also author of the book, "Toward a North American Community", and a Vice-Chair of the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America and is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, William J. Perry, a professor at Stanford University and former Secretary of Defense, the head of the Pentagon during much of the Clinton Administration, Thomas A. Shannon, Jr., the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemispheres who works for Condoleezza Rice, David G. Victor, a Professor of Law at Stanford Law School and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and Maj. General Mark A. Volcheff, Director of Plans, Policy & Strategy for NORAD.[28](#)

In the FOIA documents that can be freely downloaded from Judicial Watch's website, they openly discuss how they plan to use the issue of climate change to impose a carbon tax on the people of North America as another method of further integrating North America.[29](#) But perhaps the most revealing and disturbing aspect was when they were discussing "Border Infrastructure and Continental Prosperity", which was Chaired by John Manley, and which, in the documents it was written that, "While a vision is appealing working on the infrastructure might yield more benefit and bring more people on board ('**evolution by stealth**')".[30](#) [Emphasis added] This is the most concerning thing yet, as the phrase "evolution by stealth", refers to implementing this agenda under the radar, out of public view and in secret. This is the general thinking of those involved with implementing this "deep integration" process, leading to the formation of a North American Union.

In February of 2007, the North American Competitiveness Council released their prepared document for the SPP Ministers titled, "Enhancing Competitiveness in Canada, Mexico, and the United States: Private-Sector Priorities for the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP)".[31](#)

In their list of recommendations, they suggest:

* "**Speed up development of national critical infrastructure protection strategies**", where they state, "All three North American governments should complete their national critical infrastructure protection strategies and vulnerability assessments within the next 12 months".

* "**Enhance emergency management and pandemic preparedness through expanded use of specific disaster planning and simulations**", under which they state, "Emergency preparedness simulations, with the involvement of the private sector, have proven to be very useful. They should be conducted on a regular basis across a range of threats and border points".

* "**Agree to implement before the end of 2007 planned land preclearance pilot projects**", where they suggest, "Moving customs processes further away and inland from the actual border crossings has the potential to reduce border congestion considerably".

* "**Improve the benefits of voluntary business participation in security programs**", and state, "More efficient and faster processing at the border and elimination of duplicative

applications will result in increased participation in these programs”.

* **“Further simplify the NAFTA rules-of-origin requirements”**, where they explain, “Two phases of simplification to the rules of origin under the NAFTA have been completed successfully, covering more than US\$30 billion in trilateral trade. A third phase of public consultations has just been completed, and the resulting package of proposals for further simplification should be implemented as soon as possible”.

* **“Simplify the NAFTA certification process and requirements”**, and they say, “The long- term goal should be to eliminate the NAFTA certificate on shipments”.

* **“Withdraw or suspend the U.S. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) interim rule of August 26, 2006”**, and suggest in it’s stead, “The governments of the United States and Canada, in consultation with the private sector, should launch bilateral discussions to identify legitimate risks related to plant pests and animal diseases and to determine the most appropriate means of mitigating these risks while minimizing disruption to legitimate trade”.

* **“Sign a new North American Regulatory Cooperation Framework and ensure consistent application of standards and regulatory requirements within each country”**, and recommend, “a North American Regulatory Cooperation and Standards Committee should be formed to survey the variety of standards and regulatory differences by industry that impede trade”.

* **“Develop a public-private North American initiative to tackle counterfeiting and piracy”**, and they explain, “While the governments are already actively engaging the business community, the NACC encourages taking this to a new level. Engaging private sector stakeholders directly with their international counterparts, as well as with the three governments, would ensure a comprehensive cross-border solution”.

* **“Focus on trilateral collaboration to expand the supply of highly skilled people in the energy sector throughout North America”**, where they say, “Governments and businesses should organize an annual North American energy skills conference. This public-private conference should include energy companies, construction companies, energy ministry officials, local development planning authorities, training and education officials, immigration authorities, and others with an interest in expanding the pool of highly skilled workers (degreed professionals and vocational labor) in the energy sector”.

Benito Mussolini, the fascist dictator of Italy once said, **“Fascism should more properly be called corporatism because it is the merger of state and corporate power”**. ‘Public-private’ partnerships are the perfect example of a corporatist state, because it is the sharing of the duties and functions of government with large multinational corporations.

As an example of how secretive this process is and *is meant* to be, the Ottawa Citizen reported on May 11, 2007, about how “Amid heated charges of a coverup, Tory MPs yesterday abruptly shut down parliamentary hearings on a controversial plan to further integrate Canada and the U.S”, and further stated, “The firestorm erupted within minutes of testimony by University of Alberta professor Gordon Laxer that Canadians will be left ‘to freeze in the dark’ if the government forges ahead with plans to integrate energy supplies across North America. He was testifying on behalf of the Alberta-based Parkland Institute

about concerns about the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP), a 2005 accord by the U.S., Canada and Mexico to streamline economic and security rules across the continent". Furthermore, the article continued examining the remarks made by the University of Alberta professor, saying "The deal, which calls North American 'energy security' a priority, will commit Canada to ensuring American energy supplies even though Canada itself — unlike most industrialized nations — has no national plan or reserves to protect its own supplies, he argued." However, the real controversy arose when, "Tory MP Leon Benoit, chair of the Commons Standing Committee on International Trade, which was holding the SPP hearings, ordered Mr. Laxer to halt his testimony, saying it was not relevant", however, "Opposition MPs called for, and won, a vote to overrule Mr. Benoit's ruling. Mr. Benoit then threw down his pen, declaring, 'This meeting is adjourned,' and stormed out, followed by three of the panel's four Conservative members. The remaining members voted to continue, with the Liberal vice-chair presiding." The article then points out that, "Mr. Benoit's actions are virtually unprecedented, observers say; at press time, procedure experts still hadn't figured out whether he had the right to adjourn the meeting unilaterally. Mr. Benoit did not respond to calls for comment". The article finishes by saying, "'It's shocking the extent to which the Conservative party will go to cover up information about the SPP,' says NDP MP Peter Julian, who also sits on the committee."[32](#)

This was a positive development to see that a mainstream Canadian party has *finally* started to address the issue of the SPP, however, the NDP does **not** call for abolishing the SPP or the agenda of "deep integration" into a North American Union, and in fact, do not even mention to prospect of a North American Union, but rather call for "Canada to ensure that the SPP is put through real public consultations, democratic debate, and parliamentary oversight". [<http://www.ndp.ca/page/5550>]. It's not to say that I don't agree with this, it's just that it is not beneficiary to call for "discussing and debating" the SPP agreement when it is already being fast-tracked into implementation and formation for a North American Union by 2010, so it's more expedient to **immediately suspend and abolish** this agreement in order to preserve Canadian sovereignty and our independence as a nation. This is not an agreement worth altering or debating, because ultimately, should we even be debating whether or not we hand over all of our country to a North American Union of unelected individuals in an undemocratic continental super-state? To me, anyway, its not even up for debate, either you want Canada to remain independent and free and sovereign, or you want us to subvert everything about our country into a North American Union government made up of unaccountable people whose allegiance is not to any nation, constitution, or people, but rather to a group of international corporate elites who are the driving force behind it. The only Canadian political party which is truly calling this what it is, is the Canadian Action Party (CAP), led by Connie Fogal, which describes this integration as "The agenda of the corporate/financial/military elite of North America is to unify the territories currently occupied by Canada, USA, and Mexico into one entity with a new border around the perimeter of North America under their aegis and control", and therefore, "The Canadian Action Party calls for the immediate withdrawal of all government participation in the North American Union, including withdrawal of participation in the military Bilateral Planning Committee; the dissolution of the North American Competitiveness Council (Canadian membership announced by Stephen Harper in June, 2006); an end to the annual meetings of the three leaders of Canada, USA and Mexico on this NAU impetus; the abrogation of NAFTA; and the cessation of the NAFTA model expansion into all areas of Canadian affairs; defence, international trade, finance, immigration, justice, et cetera."[33](#)

So far, there have been 19 US State Legislatures that have been trying to pass Anti-

North American Union resolutions, blocking its development and the continuation of the Security and Prosperity Partnership, and in fact, a few of them have even managed to pass legislation blocking the North American Union, which is an excellent sign that opposition to the North American Union is growing very quickly.³⁴ And amazingly enough, the United States Congress voted 362 to 63 in favour of approving an amendment to H.R. 3074 (Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008), which prohibits “the use of funds to participate in a working group pursuant to the Security and Prosperity Partnership”, meaning that funding for the SPP working groups is being cut off.³⁵ However, the unfortunate thing is that if you even ask members of the Canadian Parliament about the SPP and the North American Union, they will either say they don’t know anything about it or that it’s a conspiracy theory. So we’ve got some work to do yet, and we have to do it quickly.

The Bi-National Planning Group, which was formed in 2002, was established as a “Canada-US Joint Planning Group”, and states that the planning group “will improve our ability to respond to a range of incidents in an efficient and timely way”, and to do this, it stated:

- “By preparing contingency plans to respond to terrorist attacks, natural disasters and other emergencies in Canada or the United States;

- By improving the coordination of military support to civilian authorities, when requested;

- And by better coordinating Canada-US maritime surveillance, intelligence sharing and threat assessments”.

It further stated that, “So in order to build linkages with civilian agencies and other levels of government, officials from the Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Preparedness and Foreign Affairs will also be working alongside military personnel”.³⁶

In conjunction with the Bi-National Planning Group, also in 2002, the Northern Command (NORTHCOM), was created, which, “was given responsibility for the continental United States, Canada, Mexico, portions of the Caribbean and the contiguous waters in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans up to 500 miles off the North American coastline”, and that Defense Secretary Rumsfeld boasted about “the introduction of NorthCom - with all of North America as its geographic command”. Even NORTHCOM’s own website states that, “USNORTHCOM’s AOR [area of operations] includes air, land and sea approaches and encompasses the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Mexico and the surrounding water out to approximately 500 nautical miles”.³⁷

Now, these agreements, put in place *before* the implementation or even signing of the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America, already made for the ability of the United States military to be deployed on Canadian or Mexican soil in the event of or even threat of an emergency of any kind. However, since the SPP, of which one of its primary agendas is the total integration of the military structure of North America, we have come a long way. Today, in the threat of or event of any emergency, be it a natural disaster or terrorist attack, here in Canada, we will see the US military being deployed on our soil with the full support of the Canadian government, or should I say “North American government”?

Now, in North America, it goes without saying that the United States is the most dominant country in the region, and therefore being merged into a North American Union will diverge most of the control over this process and the end result of the Union as being predominantly controlled by the US elite. Even the main backers on the Canadian side of this are already themselves deeply integrated with the US establishment, as a large amount of the corporations in the Canadian Council of Chief Executives are merely subsidiary companies of much larger American corporations, as well as European.

[<http://www.ceocouncil.ca/en/about/members.php#t>] And obviously, the US military is much more advanced than that of the Canadian Forces and military structure, so we must examine some very important legislation and orders coming out of the US government, because they can, in fact, have a very large effect upon all people in North America, as they predominantly relate to the reactions of the US government in the event of an emergency, and, just as we examined, in the event of an emergency, we will likely be under the control of the US military structure.

First of all, on October 17, 2006, George Bush signed the Military Commissions Act (H.R. 6166), which officially has the ability to designate any foreign citizen an “enemy combatant”, which strips them of the right to Habeas Corpus, which is the writ through which a person can seek relief from unlawful detention of themselves, which is vitally important to protect individual freedoms and liberty against arbitrary state action, such as imprisonment without trial or charges. Not only does this affect all non-US citizens, but, according to Bruce Ackerman, a Professor of Law and Political Science at Yale, who wrote an article for the Los Angeles Times, titled “The White House Warden—A Commentary by Bruce Ackerman”, in which he stated that the legislation, “authorizes the president to seize American citizens as enemy combatants, even if they have never left the United States. And once thrown into military prison, they cannot expect a trial by their peers or any other of the normal protections of the Bill of Rights”, and that, “ordinary Americans would be required to defend themselves before a military tribunal without the constitutional guarantees provided in criminal trials”.[38](#)

Marty Lederman, a Professor of Law at Georgetown University[39](#), wrote an article about the Military Commissions Act in which he stated, “the really breathtaking subsection is subsection (ii), which would provide that UEC [Unlawful Enemy Combatant] is defined to include any person “who, before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Military Commissions Act of 2006, has been determined to be an unlawful enemy combatant by a Combatant Status Review Tribunal or another competent tribunal established under the authority of the President or the Secretary of Defense”, and he continued, “Read literally, this means that if the Pentagon says you’re an unlawful enemy combatant — using whatever criteria they wish — then as far as Congress, and U.S. law, is concerned, you are one, whether or not you have had any connection to ‘hostilities’ at all”, and that, “This definition is not limited to Al Qaeda and the Taliban. It’s not limited to aliens — it covers U.S. citizens as well. It’s not limited to persons captured or detained overseas. And it is not even limited to the armed conflict against Al Qaeda and the Taliban, authorized by Congress on September 18, 2001. Indeed, on the face of it, it’s not even limited to a time of war or armed conflict; it could apply in peacetime”.[40](#)

On the same day Bush signed the Military Commissions Act, October 17, 2006, he also signed another piece of legislation, titled the “John Warner Defense Authorization Act, 2007”, and according to US Senator Patrick Leahy, the Conference Report on the Defense Authorization Act “includes language that subverts solid, longstanding posse comitatus

statutes that limit the military's involvement in law enforcement, thereby making it easier for the President to declare martial law", and that, "it adopts some incredible changes to the Insurrection Act, which would give the President more authority to declare martial law. Let me repeat: The National Guard Empowerment Act, which is designed to make it more likely for the National Guard to remain in State control, is dropped from this conference report in favor of provisions making it easier to usurp the Governors control and making it more likely that the President will take control of the Guard and the active military operating in the States". He continues, "The changes to the Insurrection Act will allow the President to use the military, including the National Guard, to carry out law enforcement activities without the consent of a governor. When the Insurrection Act is invoked posse comitatus does not apply. Using the military for law enforcement goes against one of the founding tenets of our democracy".[41](#)

On May 9, 2007, a Presidential National Security Directive was issued, the National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive NSPD 51/HSPD 20. This directive explains what the procedures will be for "Continuity of Government" in the event of a catastrophic emergency. The Directive defines "Catastrophic Emergency" as, "any incident, regardless of location, that results in extraordinary levels of mass casualties, damage, or disruption severely affecting the U.S. population, infrastructure, environment, economy, or government functions", and it defines "Continuity of Government" as "a coordinated effort within the Federal Government's executive branch to ensure that National Essential Functions continue to be performed during a Catastrophic Emergency". In Section (6) of the Directive, it states, "**The President shall lead the activities of the Federal Government for ensuring constitutional government.** In order to advise and assist the President in that function, the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism (APHS/CT) is hereby designated as the National Continuity Coordinator. The National Continuity Coordinator, in coordination with the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs (APNSA), without exercising directive authority, shall coordinate the development and implementation of continuity policy for executive departments and agencies." [Emphasis added]. The bold part is so important because it states how in the event of a "catastrophic emergency" the President takes over **all the functions** of government, making the legislative and judicial branches of government irrelevant. Essentially, the President will become a dictator in the event of an emergency. Furthermore, the Directive goes on to say, in section (7), "The Secretary of Homeland Security shall serve as the President's lead agent for coordinating overall continuity operations and activities of executive departments and agencies".[42](#)

Why this is so relevant is because if you notice the fact that in the event of an emergency it is the Executive branch, headed by the President of the United States who will be running the entire country, and another key individual, as revealed by section (7), above, is the Director of Homeland Security, who currently is Michael Chertoff, a Security and Prosperity Minister working very closely with his Canadian counterpart, Stockwell Day, the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, which was a department created in 2003, incidentally, the same year that the Homeland Security Department was created. And it is the Executive branch of government, which signed and has been advancing the goals and agenda of the SPP into forming the North American Union. So, in the event of a "catastrophic emergency", the people that are the main individuals responsible for implementing the SPP agreement will be giving extraordinary and unprecedented power, in fact, the power of a dictatorship.

Not only that, but Peter DeFazio, a member of the US House Homeland Security Committee, as reported in the Oregonian newspaper, was hounded by phone calls to his office as Oregon citizens “worried there was a conspiracy buried in the classified portion of a White House plan for operating the government after a terrorist attack”. The article continued, “As a member of the U.S. House on the Homeland Security Committee, DeFazio, D-Ore., is permitted to enter a secure “bubbleroom” in the Capitol and examine classified material. So he asked the White House to see the secret documents. On Wednesday, DeFazio got his answer: DENIED,” and it further stated, “Bush administration spokesman Trey Bohn declined to say why DeFazio was denied access: ‘We do not comment through the press on the process that this access entails. It is important to keep in mind that much of the information related to the continuity of government is highly sensitive’.” The article ended with a quote from DeFazio, stating, “Maybe the people who think there’s a conspiracy out there are right”.[43](#) Another clear indication that Congress, the Legislative branch, has no authority when it comes to an emergency.

On July 17, 2007, George Bush issued an Executive Order titled, “Blocking Property of Certain Persons Who Threaten Stabilization Efforts in Iraq”, in which it is stated that, “all property and interests in property of the following persons (. . .) are blocked and may not be transferred, paid, exported, withdrawn, or otherwise dealt in: any person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense,

(1) to have committed, **or to pose a significant risk of committing**, an act or acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of:

(A) threatening the peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq; or

(B) **undermining efforts to promote economic reconstruction and political reform** in Iraq or to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people”.[44](#)

[Emphasis added]

Essentially, what this means, as pointed out by University of Ottawa Professor of Economics, Michel Chossudovsky, “The Executive Order criminalizes the antiwar movement”.[45](#)

Robert Pastor, one of the main architects of the North American Union/SPP, who is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, on the board of the North American Forum on Integration (mock North American Parliament), and was a Vice Chair of the Independent Task Force on the Future of North America, which wrote up the “Building a North American Community” document, and who also wrote the book, “Toward a North American Community”, has stated in an interview with a Spanish-language magazine, Poder y Negocios, that, “The 9/11 crisis made Canada and the United States redefine the protection of their borders”, and he continued, “What I’m saying is that a crisis is an event which can force democratic governments to make difficult decisions like those that will be required to create a North American Community”, and then he stated, “It’s not that I want another 9/11 crisis, but having a crisis would force decisions that otherwise might not get made”.[46](#)

This is why it is fundamental to understand the relationship between the North American Union and a “Catastrophic Emergency”. As well as this, there are deeply concerning developments, such as the fact that on January 24, 2006, the Department of Homeland

Security, headed by SPP Minister Michael Chertoff who would also help run the government in the event of an emergency, gave out a contract worth \$385 million dollars to a subsidiary of the Halliburton Corporation, KBR, (Kellogg, Brown and Root), an engineering and construction firm, and has, according to the press release on Halliburton's website, "been awarded an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract to support the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) facilities in the event of an emergency", and further states, "the competitively awarded contract will be executed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District. KBR held the previous ICE contract from 2000 through 2005". It continues, "The contract, which is effective immediately, provides for establishing **temporary detention and processing capabilities** to augment existing ICE Detention and Removal Operations (DRO) Program facilities in the event of an emergency influx of immigrants into the U.S., **or to support the rapid development of new programs.**" [Emphasis added]. And it also states, "The contract may also provide migrant detention support to other U.S. Government organizations in the event of an immigration emergency, as well as the development of a plan to react to a national emergency, such as a natural disaster. In the event of a natural disaster, the contractor could be tasked with providing housing for ICE personnel performing law enforcement functions in support of relief efforts".[47](#)

As renowned author and UC Berkley Professor Peter Dale Scott pointed out in an article he wrote titled, "Homeland Security Contracts for Vast New Detention Camps", he stated, "For those who follow covert government operations abroad and at home, the contract evoked ominous memories of Oliver North's controversial Rex-84 "readiness exercise" in 1984. This called for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to round up and detain 400,000 imaginary "refugees," in the context of "uncontrolled population movements" over the Mexican border into the United States. North's activities raised civil liberties concerns in both Congress and the Justice Department. The concerns persist." Scott continues, quoting another official, "'Almost certainly this is preparation for a roundup after the next 9/11 for Mid-Easterners, Muslims and possibly dissenters,' says Daniel Ellsberg, a former military analyst who in 1971 released the Pentagon Papers, the U.S. military's account of its activities in Vietnam. 'They've already done this on a smaller scale, with the 'special registration' detentions of immigrant men from Muslim countries, and with Guantanamo'."[48](#)

Later this month, on August 20 - 21, 2007, the leaders of our three countries are again meeting to convene the third annual SPP Leaders Summit, where they will be accompanied by the North American Competitiveness Council (NACC), in Montebello, Quebec. The Council of Canadians, a grassroots organization in Canada, which opposes the SPP was scheduled to hold a public forum discussing the dangers of the SPP, however, "The Municipality of Papineauville, which is about six kilometres from Montebello, has informed the Council of Canadians that the RCMP, the Sûreté du Québec (SQ) and the U.S. Army will not allow the municipality to rent the Centre Communautaire de Papineauville for a public forum on Sunday August 19, on the eve of the so-called Security and Prosperity Partnership Leaders Summit," and the Council of Canadians' press release further stated, "It is deplorable that we are being prevented from bringing together a panel of writers, academics and parliamentarians to share their concerns about the Security and Prosperity Partnership with Canadians", and that, "Meanwhile, six kilometres away, corporate leaders from the United States, Mexico and Canada will have unimpeded access to our political leaders". On top of this, "As well as being shut out of Papineauville, the Council of Canadians has been told that the RCMP and the SQ will be enforcing a 25-kilometre security perimeter around the

Chateau Montebello, where Stephen Harper will meet with George W. Bush and Felipe Calderón on August 20 and 21. According to officials in Montebello, there will be checkpoints at Thurso and Hawkesbury, and vehicles carrying more than five people will be turned back.”[49](#)

Here, we have a clear example of the dangers of the SPP, as already we are so far along that the US military has jurisdiction to tell Canadians where we can and cannot go in our own country. Not only that, but our so-called Democratic leaders are hiding from citizens behind a 25km (18mile) security perimeter where they are advised by giant corporations. Yes, that is freedom, that is democracy, that is transparency and above all, reassuring. It is now painfully clear that our so-called “representatives” do not work in the interests of the people they are supposed to represent, but rather work for the interests of giant corporations who seek to have total control. I hope everyone joins in a national and perhaps continental day of action on August 20, 2007, to peacefully protest the treasonous agenda being pursued by the North American political, military and corporate elite, who seek “Security” for themselves from free, democratic and constitutional societies, and “Prosperity” for their select clique of giant corporations over the prosperity of people, life and liberty.

In their main goal being to “integrate” North America, and all people within it, they will feel the backlash of some unintended consequences, such as, ironically enough, uniting all North Americans together . . . in opposition to them and their elitist agenda.

Mahatma Gandhi, the man who led India to independence from the tyrannical British Empire, once said:

“When I despair, I remember that all through history the ways of truth and love have always won. There have been tyrants, and murderers, and for a time they can seem invincible, but in the end they always fall. Think of it . . . always”.

Notes

1 Canadian Council of Chief Executives. “North American Security and Prosperity”.

<http://www.ceocouncil.ca/en/north/north.php>

2 Canadian Council of Chief Executives. “Paul Martin Urged to Take the Lead in Forging a New Vision for North American Cooperation”.

North American Security and Prosperity: November 5, 2003

http://www.ceocouncil.ca/en/view/?document_id=38

3 Canadian Council of Chief Executives. “Trinational Call for a North American Economic and Security Community by 2010”.

North American Security and Prosperity: March 14, 2005.

http://www.ceocouncil.ca/en/view/?document_id=395

4 Pastor, Robert. "Toward a North American Community: Lessons from the Old World for the New".

Peterson Institute: August 2001.

http://www.amazon.ca/Toward-North-American-Community-Lessons/dp/0881323284/ref=sr_1_1/701-6243606-4376334?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1186359143&sr=8-1

5 Grubel, Herbert. "The Case for the Amero: The Economics and Politics of a North American Monetary Union".

Fraser Institute: September 1999.

<http://www.fraserinstitute.ca/shared/readmore.asp?sNav=pb&id=152>

6 McKenna, Barrie. "Dodge says single currency 'possible'".

The Globe and Mail: May 21, 2007.

http://www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/Page/document/v5/content/subscribe?user_URL=http://ctv2.theglobeandmail.com%2Fservlet%2Fstory%2FRTGAM.20070521.wrxdodge%2Fbusiness%2FBusiness%2FbusinessBN%2Fctv-business&ord=8017644&force_login=true

7 Ibid. http://www.jonesreport.com/articles/210507_single_currency_possible.html

8 Dodge, David. "Economic Integration in North America".

The Bank of Canada, Publications and Research: August 7, 2003.

<http://www.bankofcanada.ca/en/speeches/2003/sp03-11.html>

9 CBC News. "Cop wins RCMP settlement after highway search".

January 28, 2005:

<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2005/01/28/texas-bc050128.html>

10 CBC News. "U.S. investigations on Canadian soil done within the law: Day".

Thursday, October 5, 2006:

<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2006/10/05/fbi-border.html?ref=rss>

11 White House. "Joint Statement by President Bush, President Fox, and Prime Minister Martin". Office of the Press Secretary: March 23, 2005.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/03/20050323-2.html>

12 John Manley, Pedro Aspe, William Weld. "Building a North American Community".

The Council on Foreign Relations: May 2005.

<http://www.cfr.org/publication/8102/>

13 Ibid. Pages 52-59.

14 SPP. "Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America: Report to Leaders".

June 2005: http://spp.gov/report_to_leaders/index.asp?dName=report_to_leaders

15 North American Forum on Integration. "Triumvirate: the only North American Parliament": <http://www.fina-nafi.org/eng/fina/presentation.asp?count=eng>

16 NAFI. "Triumvirate 2006". <http://www.fina-nafi.org/eng/triumvirat06/default.asp?langue=eng&menu=triumvirat06>

17 NAFI. "Our Board of Directors".

<http://www.fina-nafi.org/eng/fina/conseil.asp?langue=eng&menu=fina>

18 SPP.gov. "2006 Leaders Summit".

http://spp.gov/2006_leaders_summit.asp

19 Government of Canada: SPP. "Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America Report to Leaders August 2006".

http://www.spp-ppsp.gc.ca/progress/report_08_06-en.aspx

20 CTV.ca News Staff. "Opposition anti-U.S. on softwood, Emerson says".

August 31, 2006:
http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/20060831/softwood_liberals_060831?s_name=&no_ads=

21 Foreign Affairs and International Trade. "Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries".

<http://w01.international.gc.ca/minpub/Minister.aspx?isRedirect=True&ID=140&Language=E>

22 US Chamber of Commerce. "North American Competitiveness Council (NACC)".

February 2007: <http://www.uschamber.com/issues/index/international/nacc.htm>

23 Government of Canada: SPP. "SPP Reports".

<http://www.spp-ppsp.gc.ca/progress/reports-en.aspx>

24 Government of Canada: SPP. "Security Priorities".

http://www.spp-ppsp.gc.ca/progress/security_08_06-en.aspx

25 CBC News. "Critics alarmed by Canada's no-fly list".

June 18, 2007: <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2007/06/18/no-fly-list.html?ref=rss>

26 Patterson, Kelly. "Canada raising limits on pesticide residues".

The Montreal Gazette: May 8, 2007.

<http://www.canada.com/montrealgazette/news/story.html?id=2fa3e7f8-9c83-4ea9-ad60-c13b548fe688&k=6929>

27 Judicial Watch. "Judicial Watch Releases Pentagon Records from 'North American Forum' Meetings": January 29, 2007: <http://www.judicialwatch.org/6123.shtml>

28 Ibid. "Bolton Agenda and Notes". Pages 13-29.

29 Ibid. Page 5.

30 Ibid. Page 9.

31 CCCE. "Enhancing Competitiveness in Canada, Mexico, and the United States - Initial Recommendations of the North American Competitiveness Council (NACC)".

Publications: Presentations and Reports: February 23, 2007.

http://www.ceocouncil.ca/en/more_type/?type_id=5

32 Patterson, Kelly. "Tory chair storms out of SPP hearing".

Ottawa Citizen: May 11, 2007:
<http://www.canada.com/ottawacitizen/news/story.html?id=c6291848-5f41-4b72-831a-2e889cd6bb9e>

33 Canadian Action Party. "Globalization - Reject the North American Union (N.A.U.)".

Policies - Sovereignty:

http://www.canadianactionparty.ca/cgi/page.cgi?aid=432&_id=128&zine=show

34 JBS. "Update on the Status of the Anti-NAU Resolutions in 19 State Legislatures".

<http://www.jbs.org/node/3430>

35 JBS. "In an Historic Vote, Congress Moves to Limit SPP Funding".

<http://www.jbs.org/node/4839>

36 Canadian National Defence. "Minister of National Defence Speaking Notes".

December 9, 2002: http://www.cnos.forces.gc.ca/BPG/mndSpkngNotes_e.asp

37 Lagassé, Philippe. "NORAD, NorthCom, and the Binational Planning Group:

The Evolution of Canada-US Defence Relations - Part 1".

CASR: July 2003: <http://www.sfu.ca/casr/ft-lagasse1.htm>

38 Ackerman, Bruce. "The White House Warden—A Commentary by Bruce Ackerman".

Los Angeles Times: September 28, 2006: <http://www.law.yale.edu/news/3531.htm>

39 Georgetown Law. "Martin S. Lederman".

http://www.law.georgetown.edu/curriculum/tab_faculty.cfm?Status=Faculty&FacultyID=2134

40 Lederman, Marty. "Imagine Giving Donald Rumsfeld Unbounded Discretion to Detain You Indefinitely": September 27, 2006.

<http://balkin.blogspot.com/2006/09/imagine-giving-donald-rumsfeld.html>

41 Leahy, Patrick. "Remarks Of Sen. Patrick Leahy: National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2007": September 29, 2006.

<http://leahy.senate.gov/press/200609/092906b.html>

42 The White House. "National Security and Homeland Security Presidential Directive".

Office of the Press Secretary: May 9, 2007.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/05/20070509-12.html>

43 Kosseff, Jeff. "DeFazio asks, but he's denied access".

The Oregonian: July 20, 2007.

<http://www.oregonlive.com/news/oregonian/index.ssf?/base/news/118489654058910.xml&coll=7>

44 The White House. "Executive Order: Blocking Property of Certain Persons Who Threaten Stabilization Efforts in Iraq": July 17, 2007.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/07/20070717-3.html>

45 Chossudovsky, Michel. "Bush Executive Order: Criminalizing the Antiwar Movement".

Global Research: July 20, 2007.

<http://globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=6377>

46 Corsi, Jerome. "North American Union leader says merger just crisis away".

World Net Daily: December 15, 2006.

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=53378

47 Halliburton. "KBR AWARDED U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CONTINGENCY SUPPORT PROJECT FOR EMERGENCY SUPPORT SERVICES".

2006 Press Releases: January 24, 2006.

http://www.halliburton.com/default/main/halliburton/eng/news/source_files/news.jsp?newsurl=/default/main/halliburton/eng/news/source_files/press_release/2006/kbrnws_012406.html

48 Scott, Peter Dale. "Homeland Security Contracts for Vast New Detention Camps".

Pacific News Service: February 8, 2006.

http://news.pacificnews.org/news/view_article.html?article_id=eed74d9d44c30493706fe03f4c9b3a77

49 Council of Canadians. "RCMP, U.S. Army block public forum on the Security and Prosperity Partnership": Media Release: July 11, 2007.

<http://www.canadians.org/media/DI/2007/11-July-07.html>

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Andrew Gavin
Marshall](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca