

National **IN**security

**Bowing to U.S. "Security" Demands
Will Make Canadians Less Secure**

**Tony Clarke
with Murray Dobbin
and Ed Finn**



CCPA

CANADIAN CENTRE
for POLICY ALTERNATIVES

CENTRE CANADIEN
de POLITIQUES ALTERNATIVES

National **IN**security

Bowing to U.S. "Security" Demands
Will Make Canadians Less Secure



Tony Clarke
with Murray Dobbin
and Ed Finn



National **IN**security

Bowing to U.S. "security" demands
will make Canadians less secure

By Tony Clarke with Murray Dobbin and Ed Finn

January 2005

Copyright Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and the authors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher or the author.

TONY CLARKE is founder and director of the Polaris Institute, which tracks the growing power of transnational corporations. He also chairs the Corporations Committee of the International Forum on Globalization. He is the author of several influential books, including *Silent Coup* and (with Maude Barlow) *Blue Gold: The Battle Against Corporate Theft of the World's Water*.

MURRAY DOBBIN is a freelance journalist, political commentator, and the author of several best-selling books, including *The Myth of the Good Corporate Citizen* and *Paul Martin: CEO for Canada?*

ED FINN is editor of *The CCPA Monitor*, the monthly journal of the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Cover design by Studio 2 studio2@rogers.com

Book layout by Nadene Rehnby www.handsonpublications.com

CAW 567
OTTAWA

www.policyalternatives.ca



Suite 410, 75 Albert Street
Ottawa, ON K1P 5E7
Tel 613-563-1341 Fax 613-233-1458
ccpa@policyalternatives.ca

NOT MANY CANADIANS KNOW ABOUT NASPI. THEY'RE NOT supposed to. The initials stand for the North American Security and Prosperity Initiative. It's a new political agenda launched by the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE), formerly called the Business Council on National Issues (BCNI).

The CCCE is the country's strongest political lobby. It consists of the top executives of Canada's largest 150 corporations. They have quick and easy access to the levers of power in Ottawa – to cabinet ministers, to top bureaucrats, to the most influential journalists and academics.

These powerful business leaders are accustomed to getting what they want from our federal and provincial governments. And what they want now, more than anything else, is to bind Canada more tightly to the United States in order to ensure direct access to the world's largest market.

They've been pursuing this goal, of course, for the past 30 years. Their aggressive advocacy of "free trade" with the U.S. led to the first such agreement in 1988, and then to NAFTA in 1993. But, after September 11, 2001, Canada's big business leaders were shocked to find that NAFTA alone was not enough to ensure market access. The border was suddenly shut down, causing a loss of between one and two billion dollars' worth of trade in goods and services a day.

NASPI is the new deal that the CCCE wants Ottawa to work out with Washington. The plan itself was developed in dialogue with the Bush administration and the U.S. Business Round Table. In April, 2003, 18 months after 9/11, CCCE President Tom d'Aquino took 100 Canadian business leaders to Washington to meet with officials in Washington, including Tom Ridge, Secretary of Homeland Security; Spencer Abrahams, Secretary of Energy; and Richard Pearle, author of the Bush Doctrine on National Security. It was clear from these exchanges that there would be no new deal on trade issues from the U.S. unless Canada agreed to make major commitments on "security" issues.

"Security will trump trade," declared Paul Cellucci, U.S. ambassador to Canada, following the post-9/11 Bush Doctrine

POWERFUL BUSINESS LEADERS ARE ACCUSTOMED TO GETTING WHAT THEY WANT FROM OUR FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS. AND WHAT THEY WANT NOW, MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE, IS TO BIND CANADA MORE TIGHTLY TO THE UNITED STATES IN ORDER TO ENSURE DIRECT ACCESS TO THE WORLD'S LARGEST MARKET.

on National Security. Canada's former ambassador in Washington, Allan Gotlieb, echoed Cellucci's warnings: "The Canadian political agenda is economic security: for Americans it is homeland security. Therein lie the potential elements of a grand negotiation." And Wendy Dobson, from the big business think-tank the C.D. Howe Institute, went on to argue: "Canadian concerns about economic security need to be linked with U.S. domestic priorities... [and since] homeland security is the single overriding U.S. goal... what's needed is a strategic framework that links security and defence with economic goals."

For the Bush administration, "national security" means security for the U.S. empire. Canadian reluctance to fully satisfy U.S. security needs on any front will no longer be tolerated.

For Canada's big business leaders, the NASPI agenda is largely designed to get Ottawa on-side with U.S. security interests. And they have willing political partners in Parliament – not just in Paul Martin's minority government and the civil service mandarinates, but also in the Conservative opposition party led by Stephen Harper. They have made it a priority to "improve relations" with the U.S. – which, for the Bush administration, means nothing short of bowing to its demands.

The business leaders, of course, don't describe their NASPI agenda in those terms. They call it "the Big Idea," or "the Grand Bargain," or some other such euphemism. But in reality what they seek is to replace Canadian sovereignty with Canadian subservience to U.S. "security" needs.

THE TERM "SECURITY" HAS BECOME A CONVENIENT LABEL FOR the whole range of American concerns in the wake of the 9/11 attacks. The Bush administration's response was a chest-thumping declaration of U.S. military and economic might as the world's sole remaining superpower. The U.S., we were warned, was prepared to act unilaterally, to launch preventive nuclear strikes against its perceived enemies, to impose trade embargoes, to root out and punish terrorists and terrorist sympathizers by any means felt necessary – including the curtailment of civil rights at home and abroad.

In the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, the Bush Doctrine of unilateralism and "preventive" attack was on display for all to see. As was the expansion and consolidation of the new American Empire. Other countries, including Canada, were expected to conform to this doctrine. As Bush reminded them, "you're either with us, or with the terrorists."

Historian Jack Granatstein, an ardent Canadian continentalist, in one of the C.D. Howe Institute's recent "border papers," wrote that "every Canadian knows instinctively that Canada cannot be truly independent of the United States... We are part of a vast and powerful, if informal, U.S. empire

now..." Reflecting these realities, the CCCE's d'Aquino told a conference on Canada-U.S. relations in December 2003 that he became convinced, after conversations with George Bush Sr. during a three day fishing trip, that Canadian business interests could not be taken seriously until Canada was prepared to meet U.S. security interests and demands.

Most Canadians, however, don't have the same business interests. They don't share the eagerness of their country's Quislings to abandon Canada's values, social programs and culture – indeed, its treasured independence – for the dubious privilege of having Canada turned into an American satellite. They don't want to become the Empire's serfs, its hewers of wood and drawers of water, its cannon fodder in future pre-emptive military campaigns.

MOST CANADIANS DON'T SHARE THE EAGERNESS OF THEIR COUNTRY'S QUISLINGS TO ABANDON CANADA'S VALUES, SOCIAL PROGRAMS AND CULTURE – INDEED, ITS TREASURED INDEPENDENCE – FOR THE DUBIOUS PRIVILEGE OF HAVING CANADA TURNED INTO AN AMERICAN SATELLITE.

To understand the scope and gravity of the NASPI threat, it helps to see the various elements of the Bush administration's foreign policy offensive under the all-purpose rubric of "security." To strike a CCCE-driven "new deal" with the U.S. – acceptable to the U.S. – will involve meeting the Bush government's security criteria on several fronts, including military security, "homeland" security, energy security, social security, water security, and global security. Let's look at each of them separately, and in so doing perceive how they are all interlinked and interdependent – and how acceding to any of them will further empower the American Empire at the price of sacrificing our Canadian way of life, including our sovereignty and democracy.

MILITARY SECURITY

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION RELUCTANTLY ACCEPTED THE CHRÉTIEN government's refusal to join the U.S. "coalition of the willing" and commit Canadian troops to the attack on Iraq. It will not forgive similar displays of "non-cooperation" in U.S. military or defense measures by the Martin-led government. It is demanding that Canada substantially increase its military spending and bolster its armed forces.

The litmus test of Canada's compliance with U.S. military policy will be our participation in the Bush administration's proposed North American ballistic missile defense (BMD) system. A decision not to join in the BMD program, warns Defence Minister Bill Graham, will have negative "consequences" for Canada-U.S. relations.

The Martin government has already taken the first step toward BMD participation. That happened last August when Canada acceded to Washington's request for revisions to the NORAD agreement that will allow missile launch warning information to be made directly available to the U.S. Northern Command, which is responsible for operating the continental missile defence system.

The hawks in both the minority Liberal government and the Conservative opposition, spurred on by the big business lobby, favour Canada's involvement in the Bush missile defence

plan. They take this stand knowing that the system is unworkable and that most scientists as well as objective military experts (including 49 retired U.S. generals and admirals who wrote a joint letter to President Bush) agree it could never work. They are pro-BMD even though they know (or should know) that it would trigger a new and perilous global arms race and lead eventually to the weaponization of space. Leaked Pentagon papers leave no doubt that the placement of weapons in space is seen by the U.S. military as essential to assure U.S. domination of the planet.

According to the CCCE, Ottawa would also have to massively increase its military spending to ensure what the business lobby calls “the inter-operability of Canadian and U.S. armed forces on land, sea, and in the air.” What the CCCE and

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION RELUCTANTLY ACCEPTED THE CHRÉTIEN GOVERNMENT’S REFUSAL TO JOIN THE U.S. “COALITION OF THE WILLING.” IT WILL NOT FORGIVE SIMILAR DISPLAYS OF “NON-COOPERATION” IN U.S. MILITARY OR DEFENSE MEASURES BY THE MARTIN-LED GOVERNMENT.

the Martin government are not telling Canadians is that Canada is already spending more than \$13.6 billion on its military and is the sixth highest military spender among the 26 nations that comprise NATO. Only the U.S., Britain, France, Germany and Italy are putting more actual cash into their “defence” budgets. Canada’s military spending is more than double that of countries such as Norway, Denmark, Greece and Belgium. (A good case could probably be made that billions of our defence dollars have been wasted or misspent, but not that the overall size of Canada’s defence budget is in any sense too small.)

HOMELAND SECURITY

FOLLOWING THE 9/11 ATTACKS, U.S. PURSUIT OF "MILITARY SECURITY" has been increasingly reinforced by the adoption of tough "homeland security" measures. And the Bush administration is now defining "homeland" as encompassing all of North America, not just the U.S. So it is pressuring both Canada and Mexico to join in the creation of a common security perimeter for the whole continent.

In response, the Martin government has already moved in this direction by establishing a powerful new Ministry for Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, which is closely modelled on the U.S. Homeland Security Agency in Washington. Canada has also:

- enacted its own anti-terrorism legislation (Bill C-36) [also patterned on the infamous U.S. Patriot Act], which grants law enforcement and national security agents a great deal more clout to investigate, apprehend, arrest, detain, and deport;
- set up a data bank to track foreign air travel by all Canadians (Bill C-23);
- implemented the "Smart Border Accord" (largely promoted and drafted by the CCCE), which coordinates U.S. and Canadian intelligence operations and

harmonizes our visa, immigration and refugee policies with those of the U.S.; and

- signed the Safe Third Country agreement whereby Canada and the U.S. recognize each other's rules on refugee claims to the point where refugees denied status in the U.S. cannot go on to claim refugee status in Canada.

Together, these "homeland security" measures threaten the civil liberties accorded Canadians by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. They also open the door for the criminalization of legitimate dissent and the resort to racial profiling. The current public inquiry into the ordeal of one Canadian citizen, Maher Arar, shows how vulnerable innocent people have become to

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION IS NOW DEFINING "HOMELAND" AS ENCOMPASSING ALL OF NORTH AMERICA, NOT JUST THE U.S. SO IT IS PRESSURING BOTH CANADA AND MEXICO TO JOIN IN THE CREATION OF A COMMON SECURITY PERIMETER FOR THE WHOLE CONTINENT.

mistreatment under this legislation. (Arar was detained on a stopover in New York by U.S. authorities – with RCMP complicity – and deported to Syria, where he was imprisoned and tortured for nearly a year.)

Using the U.S. "war on terror" as an excuse to curtail human and civil rights is not only fundamentally wrong, but is also a flawed and futile effort to make Canadians safe from terrorism.

ENERGY SECURITY

FOR THE UNITED STATES TO BUILD AND EXPAND ITS MILITARY AND economic power, a key prerequisite is access to a stable supply of oil, gas, and electricity. Canada, of course, has long been a major supplier of natural gas for the U.S., and recently became its No. 1 source of imported oil, surpassing even Saudi Arabia. Now, given the insecurity of supplies from the Middle East and Venezuela, U.S. Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham has announced that the U.S. will reduce its dependence on these sources in favour of the more dependable Canadian supplies.

In particular, the Americans have set their sights on the Athabaska tar-sands in northern Alberta, where proven reserves are second in size only to Saudi Arabia's and roughly equal to those of Kuwait. With reserves estimated at between 176 billion and 271 billion barrels – up to a high of 2.5 trillion barrels from the deepest tar-sands – Canada is seen by the Bush administration as a safe and reliable supplier of most of the oil its military machine will need in the years ahead. And it's just next door.

The new Mackenzie Valley pipeline project, scheduled for completion by 2009, is another big source of energy the U.S. is depending on. Designed to bring Arctic natural gas south to Fort MacMurray, it will not only help maintain Canada's export commitments to the U.S. through a massive

interconnected pipeline system that now exists between the two countries, but will also be used to directly fuel the huge oil extraction and refinement process from the Athabaska tar-sands.

A closer integration of Canada's electricity grid with its U.S. counterpart, together with a planned harmonization of energy security mechanisms between the two countries, will put Canada in a position to guarantee the U.S. uninterrupted supplies of oil, gas, and electricity. But little is said about what effect this will have on our own energy security, given the depletion of conventional supplies and the fact that we no longer have a made-in-Canada energy policy.

Nobody in the Canadian government seems concerned about the detrimental effects this role of chief energy supplier

GIVEN THE INSECURITY OF SUPPLIES FROM THE MIDDLE EAST AND VENEZUELA, U.S. ENERGY SECRETARY SPENCER ABRAHAM HAS ANNOUNCED THAT THE U.S. WILL REDUCE ITS DEPENDENCE ON THESE SOURCES IN FAVOUR OF THE MORE DEPENDABLE CANADIAN SUPPLIES.

to the U.S. will have on Canada's non-renewable energy resources, on meeting Canada's own future energy needs, on Canada's environment, or on Canada's Kyoto accord commitment to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions.

SOCIAL SECURITY

FOR THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION, "REFORMING" THE U.S. SOCIAL security system by privatizing it is a top priority in its second term. Indeed, this was a key domestic plank in Bush's re-election platform last fall. Both the control and resources of the country's social assistance programs – those that are still provided primarily by the government or government agencies – are to be turned over to large corporations, such as Cigna and HCA Columbia in health-care, EDS in education, and Lockheed-Martin in social welfare. And hundreds of billions of dollars in federal social security funds are to be earmarked for investment on Wall Street.

Almost certainly, U.S. private service-providers will be seeking to expand their market reach into Canada and are counting on the Bush administration to open the border to them. Their confidence may not be misplaced. U.S. pressure on Canada to "harmonize" its economic regulations with those in the U.S. may very well be accompanied by a push to have the two nations' social security systems harmonized as well.

Will the minority Martin government bow to such pressure? A disturbing indicator was the creation last year of a new cabinet portfolio charged with developing "public-private partnerships" or P3s, in which governments contract out some

if not all aspects of public facilities and services to for-profit private “partners.”

More pro-privatization pressure is also looming from the World Trade Organization, which is planning to open up cross-border trade in services in its current GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services) negotiations. If these new rules are adopted by WTO members, they will greatly facilitate the privatization and deregulation of publicly-delivered social security programs in Canada. The Martin government insists it will never allow foreign-based companies to have access to Canada’s health-care, education, or social assistance programs, but, if it signs the new GATS, it will become even more vulnerable to U.S. demands to open up these sectors to American corporations.

U.S. PRESSURE ON CANADA TO “HARMONIZE” ITS ECONOMIC REGULATIONS WITH THOSE IN THE U.S. MAY VERY WELL BE ACCOMPANIED BY A PUSH TO HAVE THE TWO NATIONS’ SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEMS HARMONIZED AS WELL.

Canada’s top business leaders, through their NASPI agenda, also favour the privatization of parts of Canada’s social programs – the potentially most profitable parts – and can be expected to add their powerful lobbying pressure for this “reform” to the pro-privatization demands coming from Washington.

WATER SECURITY

CERTAINLY, ONE OF THE MOST PROVOCATIVE ISSUES IN CANADA-U.S. relations these days is the prospect of bulk water transfers. The United States needs an adequate supply of water as much as it needs a reliable source of energy – and it is rapidly running out of the water it can derive from its domestic lakes, rivers, and aquifers (underground reservoirs). Indeed, several states and regions of the U.S. – Arizona, New Mexico and California, among them – are close to drying up.

One of the world's largest fresh water sources, the Ogallala aquifer, which is used to irrigate the farm belt of the American Midwest, is now being drained at a rate of 14 times its ability to replenish itself. Unless new sources of freshwater can be tapped, this region of the U.S. could be stricken by a severe and prolonged drought.

No wonder, then, that American eyes have been turned enviously upon Canada, which is seen as a land blessed by bountiful lakes, rivers and streams – and thus the nearest and best source for slaking the prodigious American thirst.

The recent plan to divert water from the Great Lakes proposed by the governors of the states bordering these lakes is only the first of such American schemes for tapping Canada's fresh water. Already, millions of bottles of water from various Canadian springs and streams are being shipped to U.S.

consumers by private bottling companies licensed by some provinces. This trans-shipment, however, falls far short of meeting future overall American water requirements. The Americans are not going to remain satisfied with just our bottled water. They will be looking for – demanding – much greater access to our lakes and rivers.

During the 1980s, two mega-projects for bulk water transfers were proposed. One, called the Grand Canal scheme, was designed to re-direct the flow of northern Quebec rivers to bring water downstream through an elaborate canal system into the Great Lakes where it would then be flushed into the American Midwest through canals and pipelines. The other, called NAWAPA (North American Power and Water Authority), was designed to redirect water from northern B.C. and Yukon

THE U.S. NEEDS AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF WATER AS MUCH AS IT NEEDS A RELIABLE SOURCE OF ENERGY – AND IT IS RAPIDLY RUNNING OUT OF THE WATER IT CAN DERIVE FROM ITS DOMESTIC LAKES, RIVERS, AND AQUIFERS.

rivers to flow into a huge crater within the Rocky Mountains, where it would then be transported by pipelines through the western U.S. states into the Mid-west. Neither of these mega-projects was developed at the time, due to lack of capital and sufficient demand. But the blueprints for both are still in-place. If the current “security” talks between the U.S. and Canadian governments were to be held three or four years from now, it’s safe to assume that the U.S. demand for bulk water exports from Canada would be front and centre, even to the point of making or breaking a deal satisfactory to the U.S. Until then, “water security” will not be as high on the priority list as energy – but, as the U.S. gets thirstier and thirstier, it is bound to become a major flash-point in Canada-U.S. relations.

GLOBAL SECURITY

WASHINGTON IS EXERTING PRESSURE ON CANADA – AS WELL AS other nations – to re-align its foreign affairs policy to conform to the imperatives of the U.S. “war on terrorism.” What the Bush administration wants is for its “allies” to accept and follow the unilateralist foreign policies of the U.S. rather than the multilateral policies of the United Nations as outlined in the UN’s Millennium Development Goals.

A prime example is Canada’s overseas development aid, most of which used to go to poor countries in the global South to help them alleviate their crippling scourges of poverty, hunger, and disease. Now, under U.S. pressure, much of this foreign aid – \$650 million so far – has been redirected to Afghanistan and Iraq which have been devastated by U.S.-led military attacks.

Canada has also bowed to U.S. demands to cancel Iraq’s \$750 million debt. At the Paris Club meeting in November 2004, the Martin government proposed to remit 80% of Iraq’s \$750 million debt to Canada. In effect, Canada managed to offer more debt relief to Iraq in one meeting than it has done for the poorest countries over the past four years. Meanwhile, Canadian aid commitments to sub-Saharan Africa have been substantially scaled back.

The U.S. is also pressuring Canada to allocate some of its overseas aid funds to train police and military forces in

developing nations so they can more effectively join in the Americans' war on terrorism.

If Canada continues to succumb to such U.S.-driven changes in its overseas assistance policy, this money will increasingly be used to mop-up after U.S. military operations instead of fulfilling its proper function of helping alleviate poverty and disease. Ironically, neglecting the plight of the world's poor will further erode U.S. security – and Canada's, too – since poverty and misery breed anger and desperation, which in turn provide the main breeding ground for terrorism.

WHOSE SECURITY?

THESE ARE THE KINDS OF "SECURITY" COMMITMENTS THAT CANADA is being called upon to make to enable the CEOs to achieve their main objective, which is trade security: a speedy, uninterrupted flow of trade in goods, services and capital across the Canada-U.S. border. This means more than just resolving the disputes over Canada's beef and lumber exports. The business leaders are concerned that, without genuinely free trade with the U.S., another 9/11-type attack could provoke an American clampdown on border crossings that would devastate Canada's economy.

To achieve the desired level of "trade security," however, means putting in place all of the other components of continental security. It is instructive to look at the CCCE's proposals for achieving the "trade security" they crave. They include the creation of "an economic integrated space" designed to facilitate cross-border flows of goods and services, as well as setting up several "joint bi-national commissions" to provide the necessary governance and oversight.

These plans stop short of forming a Customs Union with the U.S., as the C.D. Howe Institute urges – one that would lock the two countries into a common trade policy with other nations. The CCCE feels that neither the White House nor the U.S. Congress would agree to curtailing U.S. political sovereignty in this way. Still, the Martin government continues

to explore with Washington a less formal arrangement that would accomplish the same thing. The developments being considered range from providing more Canadian-friendly border-crossing procedures to sharing common policies on matters such as food inspection and safety, and e-commerce, as well as trade with other countries.

If administrative measures like these were to be adopted in Washington and Ottawa, the principal elements of a Customs Union could be activated without the U.S. formally having to cede political sovereignty.

CREATING INSECURITY

THIS SIX-PACK POLITICAL AGENDA – MILITARY SECURITY, HOMELAND security, energy security, water security, social security, and global security – sets out the main terms for any “new deal” for trade security between Canada and the U.S. that will be acceptable to the Bush administration. All six components are interrelated and interdependent. Taken together, and carried to the implementation stage, they threaten to undermine what remains of Canadian sovereignty and democracy.

Security is not a matter of physical safety alone. Terrorism is not the only – or even the most dire – threat to people’s lives. Our security is threatened every day by a whole range of economic, social, political, environmental, and psychological issues.

Far too many Canadians are poor, hungry, and homeless. What kind of “security” will they – or any Canadian – be left with if the resources needed for decent jobs, health-care, housing and education are squandered instead for the build-up of military armaments?

What kind of “security” will we have if our remaining energy reserves are depleted to fuel the U.S. military machine?

What kind of “security” will we have if a militarized economy massively increases carbon emissions and accelerates global warming?

What kind of “security” will we have if our civil liberties and human rights are suspended? If our right to protest and dissent is criminalized? If our immigration and refugee laws are restricted to keep out “undesirables”?

What kind of “security” will we have if more and more Canadian jobs continue to be outsourced to low-wage countries?

What kind of “security” will we have if our public social programs and services are turned over to profit-driven private firms?

What kind of “security” will we have if our lakes, rivers and streams are re-engineered by corporations for bulk water exports to the U.S.?

The answer to all these questions is that the security of Canadians, in all its vital forms, will be weakened, not enhanced, if our federal government accedes to the kind of “security” agenda being pursued by the Bush administration and promoted by Canada’s business, academic, and media élites.

The Bush Doctrine is the principal driving force behind this continental “security” offensive. It flows from the resurgence of an American Empire and an increasingly military-based economy in which many large corporations stand to make enormous profits. Take, for example, Lockheed-Martin, which has a big stake in at least three of the “security” initiatives outlined above. This big U.S. corporation is not only a major armaments manufacturer; it also has branches that specialize in “homeland security” technology and the administration of social welfare programs in several U.S. states.

Whether the re-militarization of the American economy, as planned by the Bush administration, will overcome its present troubles (i.e., a ballooning deficit, a weaker dollar, and dying manufacturing industries) remains to be seen. In any event, this is the main assumption underlying the Bush “security” demands on Canada, so the pressure will intensify on the Martin government to comply. Only by saying “yes” to the

Americans, we're told, can strained relations with the U.S. be improved.

It is possible that – spurred on by the CCCE and the Conservative opposition as well as by Washington – the Martin government will move quickly to satisfy the U.S. on all of its security demands. More likely, however, given the public distrust and dislike of Bush and his government in Canada, Martin will decide to proceed more cautiously. He will probably address the various “security” matters more gradually, step by step, hoping not to unleash NDP and Bloc resistance or a revolt in his own caucus before having to fight another election.

In any case, it is becoming evident, in this minority government situation, that the balance of decision-making on the whole continental security agenda could well be tipped

SECURITY IS NOT A MATTER OF PHYSICAL SAFETY ALONE. TERRORISM IS NOT THE ONLY – OR EVEN THE MOST DIRE – THREAT TO PEOPLE'S LIVES. OUR SECURITY IS THREATENED EVERY DAY BY A WHOLE RANGE OF ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, POLITICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUES.

one way or the other by public opinion. To the extent that Canadians become aware of the scope and ramifications of the various “security” proposals – and of the detrimental effects they will have on this country if adopted – to that extent will the probability of blocking them be bolstered. Unlike a newly-elected majority government which could ram through the whole Bush “security” program despite strong public opposition, a minority government always on the brink of another election has to be much more sensitive to public sentiment.

WHOSE VALUES? WHOSE CANADA?

WILL CANADIANS ACCEPT OR REJECT THIS CONTINENTAL SECURITY agenda and its implications for their political future? The country's fate hinges on how they face this challenge.

The best hope for resistance lies in the communal values held by the majority of Canadians. When asked by pollsters about what should be the priorities of government, their responses consistently emphasize values such as equality, social justice, the environment, participatory democracy, and collective rights, along with full employment and universal social programs.

True "security," most Canadians would argue, is achieved when people's basic needs and rights are met through decent jobs, a clean environment, universal health-care and education, cultural diversity, and peaceful co-existence.

Yet the same polls show that, with few exceptions, those who hold economic and political power in this country adhere to a different set of values and priorities. Their values tend to put profits before people, efficiency before equality, dividends for shareholders before jobs for everyone, small government before strong communities, and the survival of the fittest before social justice. If these values and priorities can best be achieved through deeper integration and guaranteed trade with the world's largest economic and military power, and if

this relationship can only be accomplished by serving U.S. empire security interests and demands, then it is a price our political and economic élites believe is worth paying. It matters little to them if deeply-held Canadian values and priorities are sacrificed in the process.

A wide gulf has thus opened up between the values and interests of the majority of Canadians and those of the dominant minority élite, and this divergence has set the stage for an historic battle over Canada's sovereignty and distinctive culture. If, as it seems, the members of dominant minority are determined to push ahead with their agenda for Canada's closer business and security ties to the United States, then they have in effect declared war on the many millions of their fellow


TRUE "SECURITY," MOST CANADIANS WOULD ARGUE, IS ACHIEVED WHEN PEOPLE'S BASIC NEEDS AND RIGHTS ARE MET THROUGH DECENT JOBS, A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT, UNIVERSAL HEALTH-CARE AND EDUCATION, CULTURAL DIVERSITY, AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE.

citizens who simply don't want this country to become an economic and military satellite of the American empire.

In a democracy, in a truly democratic process, the wishes of the majority would prevail. But the corporate and political élites have wealth and power at their command, as well as the country's major propaganda outlets. They believe they have the means to thwart the political will of the rest of us.

In the final analysis, what is at stake is nothing less than our distinctive culture, sovereignty and democracy as a nation state on the northern half of this continent. Unless Canadians in large numbers understand the scale and gravity of the challenge they now face, and are prepared to make the extraordinary commitment and determination required to measure up to it, then Canada's future as a free, independent, democratic society may be short-lived.

If, however, the majority of Canadians commit to defending their basic values and historic traditions, then the victory will

go not only to most of the people in this country, but also to the many more hundreds of millions on this planet who are struggling to build a better world that is not dominated by American imperialism. 



**The U.S. wants Canada's resources
to fuel its economy and military.**

**What do Canadians get in return?
We get to become an American colony.**

U.S. pressure is mounting on Canada to satisfy the Bush administration's many "security" demands: demands for military security, homeland security, social security, energy security, water security, and global security.

These demands are all interconnected, all parts of an overall American agenda aimed at achieving U.S. security at Canada's expense.

In this short but explosively informative booklet, Canadians will learn how the many forms of American security are being aggressively pursued in Canada. *National Insecurity* relates how a small but powerful group of Canada's business leaders--aided by some of our pro-American political, academic, and media élites--are actively pushing for our cooperation in meeting all U.S. "security" demands. They call it "deep integration," and argue that it's the only way to "improve" U.S.-Canada relations. What they don't tell us is that such an abject surrender of Canada's resources and sovereignty will effectively turn our country into a compliant U.S. satellite.

Most Canadians are concerned about their jobs, about health and education, about peace, the environment, our water and energy reserves. We *don't* want to sacrifice them--or our way of life--to appease the Bush administration. But the would-be Quislings among us hope to push through the U.S. "security" agenda by keeping most Canadians in the dark. If we don't know what our élites are planning, their sell-out of Canada may be a done deal before we know it's happening.

Read *National Insecurity*. It's the wake-up call our élites don't want Canadians to hear, but it's one we must hear--and act upon--in the months and years ahead. Nothing short of our country's freedom is at stake.

ISBN 0-88627-421-4



CCPA

CANADIAN CENTRE
for POLICY ALTERNATIVES
CENTRE CANADIEN
de POLITIQUES ALTERNATIVES