

A CITIZENS' ALTERNATIVE TO DEEP INTEGRATION

REVISED EDITION, JANUARY 2005

THE CANADA WE WANT

BY MAUDE BARLOW



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
A - STRUCTURALLY ADJUSTED CANADA	5
B - DEEP INTEGRATION	8
C - BAD IDEAS	11
1. Supporting U.S. Foreign Policy	
2. Joining the U.S. National Missile Defence Program	
3. Canadian Homeland Security Measures	
4. A Continental Resource Sharing Pact	
5. A Common Market	
6. A Continental Water Market	
7. Foreign Ownership of Telecommunications and Media	
8. Pursuing a U.S. Global Trade Agenda	
9. Adopting U.S.-Style Health Care	
10. A Continental Agriculture Market	
D - WHAT DO CANADIANS SAY?.....	22
CONCLUSION	23
E - VISION STATEMENT	25
F - ABOUT THE AUTHOR	26

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the following individuals for their contributions to this paper: the Board and the Campaign and Communications Team of The Council of Canadians; Steven Staples and Tony Clarke of the Polaris Institute; Gerry Barr of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation; Fred Wilson of Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union; Elizabeth May and John Bennett of the Sierra Club; and Roch Tasse of the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group.

Written by Maude Barlow
Edited by Brent Patterson
Copy Edited by Janet Shorten
Cover design and layout by Kolegram

The Council of Canadians
170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 700
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5V5

Telephone: 1-800-387-7177
Fax: (613) 233-6776
E-mail: inquiries@canadians.org
Web site: www.canadians.org

INTRODUCTION

WHAT'S THE BIG IDEA?

As Canadians settle into a new minority government we should be concerned about a constellation of forces coming together to challenge Canadian sovereignty and values in an unprecedented way.

Not since 1984, when newly elected Prime Minister Brian Mulroney announced to an elite business audience in New York City that Canada was “open for business,” have we seen the groundwork being laid for such major structural changes in Canada's relations with the United States.

The same economic and political elite that advanced the Canada-U.S. free trade agenda 20 years ago is now pushing an even more dangerous agenda. The C.D. Howe Institute calls it a “Big Idea.” The Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE) calls it the “North American Security and Prosperity Initiative.”

The new deal envisaged by these powerful right-wing think tanks and lobby groups, and supported by various newspaper editorial boards and members of the Liberal and Conservative parties, including Mulroney, would see a greater integration of the Canadian Armed Forces into U.S. military strategies, new security measures in Canada akin to those implemented by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and an iron-clad guarantee of an increasing supply of Canadian energy resources to the United States.

The U.S. under George Bush

It is not a coincidence that this is happening now. The United States has been living under the rule of the most autocratic, right-wing government in its recent history. In the wake of 9/11 and the ascendancy of a new conservatism under George W. Bush and his corporate backers, the U.S. has acted in a unilateral manner, withdrawing from critical international commitments and institutions.

The refusal of the United States to support the Ottawa Landmines Treaty (signed by 133 countries), the Kyoto Protocol on climate change (ratified or acceded to by 120 countries) and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (signed by 82 countries), and the U.S. withdrawal from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, have placed the superpower outside the mainstream international community. George W. Bush, with his launching of the war against Iraq without United Nations backing, and his decision to militarize space in the face of worldwide opposition, has declared himself the global commander-in-chief.

The “Bush doctrine” has implications for the whole world; but for Canada, which shares the longest undefended border in the world with the U.S., it is a threat to our very nationhood. The Bush administration has made it clear that any independent foreign policy stance on the part of Canada is unwelcome and that the price of friendship is the further harmonization of Canada's foreign, security and energy policies with U.S. demands. It is to these fears and demands that Canadian proponents of deep integration are playing.

Canada under Paul Martin

Facing possible defeat and a renewed New Democratic Party, Paul Martin ran on traditional Liberal Party values in the June 2004 federal election, vowing to protect medicare and Canadian sovereignty. As a result, he is being very careful to keep his distance from George Bush for the moment and is promising not to involve Canada in anything that would lead to the “weaponization of space.”

However, there is cause for concern given the political predisposition of the new Prime Minister and the Cabinet he has chosen. Paul Martin, a millionaire businessman, comes out of corporate Canada and has a strong relationship with it. As finance minister, he oversaw the largest cuts to social and environmental protection in Canadian history.

His Cabinet is much more conservative than that of his predecessor. It includes Finance Minister Ralph Goodale, whose first public pronouncement was to defend \$4.4 billion in corporate tax cuts; Deputy Prime Minister Anne McLellan, who as the minister of natural resources was a favourite of the big energy companies for her further deregulation of the energy sector; Foreign Affairs Minister Pierre Pettigrew, who as the minister for international trade allied Canada to the U.S. in all its trade interests; and Defence Minister Bill Graham, who is a strong proponent of joining Bush's missile defence plan. "On continental defence matters, we should be accommodating the Americans and work with them as closely as we possibly can" he told the *Toronto Star* in September 2004.

Behind the scenes, House Leader Tony Valeri is coordinating a strategy in concert with Graham and Pettigrew to deal with opposition to the missile defence plan. There is great concern in Liberal Party circles about the growing and outspoken resistance to missile defence from backbench Liberal women MPs.

Even before the election, Paul Martin's first major policy initiatives focused on Canada-U.S. relations. He set up a powerful new Ministry of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness that oversees intelligence and border security and is linked to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. He appointed Rob Wright as the first Canadian "National Security Advisor," and situated him in the Prime Minister's Office for easy access. He appointed Scott Brison, a former Tory leadership candidate, as his parliamentary secretary with special responsibility for Canada-U.S. relations (Mr. Brison is a proponent of a "seamless border" between Canada and the United States). In addition, signalling the weight he

gives to the issue, Martin himself chairs a new Cabinet committee on Canada-U.S. relations. He has also announced a full-scale review of Canada's foreign and defence policies.

And, for the last two years, groups of Canadian and American military experts have been meeting to write new rules of engagement for defending North America in a post 9/11 world. Headquartered at the NORAD Air Base in the U.S. Rocky Mountains, the group will soon publish a report with recommendations and a contingency plan that, for the first, time, will establish coordinated Canada-U.S. responses to terrorist attacks, including the sensitive issue of the movement of troops back and forth across national borders.

Put together, these forces hold the potential for a dramatic change in Canada-U.S. relations and a challenge to what is left of Canadian sovereignty and values. It is imperative that a strong public debate emerges over these issues.

A.

STRUCTURALLY ADJUSTED CANADA

The Impact of the FTA and NAFTA

The harmonization of Canadian social, environmental and economic policy has been well under way for over a decade and forms the backdrop to this current debate. Its inception can be traced back to the signing of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement in 1988, and its successor, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994. These two trade deals bound our economic future almost exclusively to the United States and made Canada much more reliant on the U.S. for our economic health and much more vulnerable to its troubles in the wake of 9/11.

In the first decade of free trade, exports to the United States increased by 250 per cent, and the U.S. now receives 87 per cent of all Canada's exports. As Canada has become more dependent on U.S. markets, trade within Canada and with the rest of the world has declined. This dependence has made Canada more vulnerable to U.S. trade disputes such as the contentious softwood lumber issue. Disputes of this kind, contrary to promises made during the negotiations, have not abated under the free trade regime.

The increased reliance on trade with the U.S. for economic growth has also subjected all Canadian laws, practices and regulations, including government spending, to the test of whether they violate U.S. big business interests. This in turn has had a dramatic impact on Canada's ability to maintain social, cultural and environmental policies that are in the interests of its citizens.

Deregulation, Foreign Ownership and Trade Liberalization

Influenced by the imperative of continental economic integration implicit in these trade deals, successive federal governments have abandoned domestic regulations that maintained independent Canadian policy positions and adopted market priorities that have curtailed democratic decision making at home. These free trade deals have imposed "structural adjustment" on Canada of the kind the World Bank and International Monetary Fund have imposed on many Third World countries in exchange for "debt relief." Brian Mulroney (accurately, for once) described NAFTA as a "cold shower" and stated that free trade would change Canada forever.

Canadians have lost a great deal of control in almost every sector of the economy in the wake of these trade deals. Between 1985 and 2002, there were over 10,000 takeovers of Canadian firms, including almost 6,500 by American corporations. As a result, between 1988 and 2000, manufacturing productivity in Canada has dropped from 83 per cent of the U.S. level to 65 per cent.

Automobile manufacturing had thrived under the Auto Pact, a 36-year-old agreement that gave the big three auto makers the right to sell cars in Canada tariff-free in exchange for creating jobs here. In 2001, however, Canada was forced to abandon the Auto Pact by a World Trade Organization (WTO) ruling that declared it a trade violation. As a result, in just three years Canada has slipped from being the fourth largest producer of cars in the world to the seventh.

Yet, despite these losses, the federal Liberals, who ran against these free trade agreements more than a decade ago, have unabashedly adopted all the basic tenets of the "Washington Consensus," which imposes a market-based capitalism as the only model of development for the whole world. The Liberal government is now an enthusiastic booster of deregulation, privatization and trade liberalization. They are active players in both the WTO and its new services agreement the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), as well as the Free Trade Area

of the Americas (FTAA), which extends NAFTA to the rest of the hemisphere.

Tax and Spending Cuts

Liberal governments have lowered corporate taxes and taxes on the rich, closing the tax gap between Canada and the U.S. in these areas. And their cuts to spending have been so great that the gap between the U.S. and Canada on social and environmental spending went from 15.2 per cent in 1992 to 5.79 per cent in 2000.

These cuts, combined with almost two decades of downward pressure on wages and job restructuring in the private sector, have left many Canadians vulnerable. As the federal government abandoned the Canadian Assistance Plan, which once provided national standards for social assistance, most provincial governments cut social assistance and their minimum wage in the mid-1990s. As well, the federal government gutted the Unemployment Insurance (UI) program and replaced it with an Employment Insurance (EI) scheme that provides only half the benefits of its predecessor.

Just in the last five years, spending on the elderly through Old Age Security and the Canada (and Quebec) Pension Plan has dropped as a share of the gross domestic product from 5.2 per cent to 4.6 per cent.

A recent Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development study confirms that Canada is now spending just 18.9 per cent of its GDP on social programs, 15 per cent less than a decade ago. And in an end-of-decade analysis of Canada's economic performance during the 1990s, Standard & Poor's, the world's foremost provider of independent credit ratings, said that Canada now provides fewer programs to its elderly and unemployed than the United States. The agency went so far as describing Canada's treatment of its vulnerable as "ugly."

Growing Poverty and Inequality

The results of cuts of such magnitude are predictable. Canada has experienced a deepening rift between rich and poor and has created an entrenched underclass for the first time in generations.

Since 1989, the year Parliament unanimously voted to end child poverty by the end of the century, child poverty in Canada has actually risen to the shameful figure of 15.6 per cent (in 2001). Anyone living through this period in a Canadian city can attest to the increasing visibility of homeless people on the street. In fact, the number of people receiving emergency groceries from a food bank doubled between 1989 and 2000 to over 760,000 people.

In the November 2002 study "Rags and Riches," the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives found that the gap between rich and poor in Canada, in relative terms, rivals anything in the Third World. Millions of Canadians are living on the brink of financial disaster, while others have accumulated huge slices of the wealth pie. The study found that in 1999 the wealthiest ten per cent of family units in Canada held 53 per cent of the wealth. The wealthiest fifty per cent of family units controlled an almost unbelievable 94.4 per cent of the wealth, leaving only 5.6 per cent of the country's wealth to be shared among the bottom fifty per cent of the population.

Loss of Jobs and Income

Between 1989 and 2002, half as many full-time jobs were created in Canada as during the previous 13 years. Significantly, the quality of jobs has also been declining. Between 1997 and 2002, the real median hourly wages of "blue collar" workers fell by as much as 11 per cent in some categories. And with the privatization of workplaces and the de-unionization of the workforce, more and more Canadians have become "precarious workers" – part-time or self-employed, with no security, pensions or benefits. While it is true that some of the heavy job

losses experienced in the early years of free trade have been partially recouped in recent years, it cannot be argued that free trade has been good for working people.

Big business has done very well for itself through these trade agreements. In 1988, the Business Council on National Issues' 150 member corporations claimed collective assets of \$1 trillion. Today, the member groups of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (the new name of the BCNI) claim collective assets of \$2.1 trillion. The Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives found that between 1988 and 2002, 39 BCNI/CCCE member corporations increased their revenues by 105 per cent, while at the same time decreasing their workforces by almost 15 per cent. So much for their promises of "jobs, jobs, jobs."

B.

DEEP INTEGRATION

Buoyed by these profits, Canadian big business is now calling for the next level of deep integration with the United States. Promoters of this agenda say these NAFTA-inspired structural adjustments have not been enough and are calling for a common border, a continental security perimeter, and a common security and defence regime. Some, including Herbert Grubel of the Fraser Institute, are also calling for a common currency.

Border Security

Growing concerns over terrorism south of the border have already spurred major changes to our border policy.

The Canadian government has taken significant measures to harmonize many of our visa and immigration laws and has enacted anti-terrorist legislation that many believe violates our civil liberties. The International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group, a coalition of civil society organizations, calls Bill C-36 (an Act amending the Criminal Code, the Official Secrets Act, the Canada Evidence Act, the Proceeds of Crime Act, and other Acts) and other recent anti-terrorism legislation an "unprecedented expansion of state powers."

These new laws grant police expanded investigative and surveillance powers, allow for preventative detention, and undermine the principle of due process by guarding certain information of "national interest" from disclosure during judicial proceedings.

In addition, the Smart Border Declaration, signed by Canada and the United States in December 2001, is designed to give the U.S.

new rights of inspection at the Canadian border, including a merging of Canadian and U.S. immigration and customs databases. This will give U.S. border agents access to the immigration and tax records of Canadians, which includes information on work records, property owned and investments.

Linking Trade and Security

While big business applauds these initiatives, it is relentlessly seeking more continental integration. In the months following 9/11 it became clear that security issues would trump trade for the foreseeable future in the United States. Regardless of the cost, and even if cross-border business slowed to a crawl, the U.S. asserted that its border had to be secured from terrorist threat. This rang the alarm bells of Canadian big business, whose own policies have made it heavily dependent on exports to the U.S. and cross-border traffic.

As a result, the CCCE and other influential business lobby groups decided to deal with this new reality by linking economic prosperity and security, and setting out to convince the U.S. government that one day the Canada-U.S. border would represent no greater threat than the borders that exist between the states of the union.

In the long run, they believe, the only way to accomplish this is to merge the border, as well as all regulatory, environmental and inspection systems. The CCCE had high praise for the federal government's report of the External Advisory Committee on Smart Regulation (released in September 2004) that recommends, among other things, treating regulatory policy as a fundamental element of Canada's foreign policy, working toward a single review and appraisal system for all of North America and dismantling regulatory differences between Canada and the U.S.

Furthermore, big business is seeking the creation of a military security perimeter around North America that would see a North American military force and seamless North American immigration and refugee policies.

To achieve this, the big business and defence lobbies have begun to work closely together to ensure their mutual interests. Thomas d'Aquino, head of the CCCE, has organized an "action group" of 30 CEOs, including powerful leaders in the banking, energy and defence industries, to promote this plan.

The defence industry has a related agenda. As America tools up for the weaponization of space, there are billions of dollars in potential Pentagon contracts to be had. The Canadian defence industry wants to get in on this market. This helps to explain why Canada is spending so much of its military dollars on non-peacekeeping hardware such as attack submarines and fighter-bombers.

Due to the confluence of security and economics, the Canadian and American defence lobbies now wield great influence in the creation of Canada's economic and trade policies. This should worry Canadians because it is in the self-interest of the industry to promote an aggressive continental weapons buildup and to use the threat of terrorism to arm the borders.

The North American Security and Prosperity Initiative

The CCCE's "North American Security and Prosperity Initiative" cites "the extent to which our two countries share core values, history and institutional roots" and therefore must approach new global challenges as one North American community.

Their plan, released in January 2003, calls for action on five "fronts":

1. Reinventing Borders

The goal of this front is to "eliminate as many as possible of the barriers to the movement of people and goods" at the border and "emphasize protection of the approaches to North America." To accomplish this goal, the CCCE would develop shared approaches to commercial processing, infrastructure, and intelligence and policing, including a North American identity document and a shared institution to oversee

procedures. They say, "This would enable us to transform the internal border into an effective but shared checkpoint with an integrated economic space."

2. Maximizing Economic Efficiencies

The goal here is to replace domestic regulatory systems relating to standards, inspection and certification procedures with a "tested once" principle. The CCCE argues that, because our economies are now so integrated, our domestic laws are redundant. The CCCE would remove three areas of "significant sensitivity": the use of trade remedies within a "de facto integrated market," regulatory restrictions on access and ownership in major industries, and impediments to the mobility of skilled labour. These are some of the few tools of national sovereignty left to governments.

3. Ensuring Resource Security

This goal would involve the creation of a "resource security pact based on two core principles: open markets and compatibility of regulatory frameworks." To achieve this goal, the CCCE calls for a "major initiative aimed at removing the threat of trade disputes and in particular, resolving once and for all the controversial issues of resource pricing and subsidies." If the goal were achieved, Canada would have to give up all remaining regulatory mechanisms under which it claims sovereignty to its oil, natural gas, electricity, coal, uranium, primary metals, forest products, water and agriculture.

4. A North American Defence Alliance

The goal of this front is to "create a North American defence community of sovereign nations." This would allow Canada and the U.S. to jointly defend the continent from missile attacks, share naval protection and protect infrastructure from terrorist attack. The CCCE states that this new commitment would necessitate a reinvestment in Canada's military to ensure the "interoperability of Canadian and United States armed forces on land, at sea and in the air." No mention is made of Canada's traditional role of peacekeeping or that we are already the sixth highest military spender, dollar for dollar, among NATO's 19 members, but the CCCE insists that Canada must enhance its

“homeland security capabilities within North America” if it is to be a player in this new North American Defence Alliance.

5. *Developing 21st-Century Institutions*

The goal here is to create a new institutional partnership to operationalize the four preceding fronts. While the CCCE is vague on how this would be done and does not call for a full customs union at this time, it does leave open the possibility of one if the differences in Canadian and American treatment of third country trade “eventually illustrates the benefits.”

The C.D. Howe Institute paper views the Smart Border Declaration as a “good start”; believes in a “proactive security agenda,” including Bill C-36; sees greater military spending as “one price Canadians must pay for economic openness”; and argues the need for “pricing options” on natural resources, including water.

Big Idea

The C.D. Howe Institute in its “The Border Papers” series has proposed a number of so-called “big ideas” for deeper integration with the U.S. In her April 2002 “Framework for Action” paper, Wendy Dobson discusses three “big ideas”:

1. *A Customs Union*

This would establish a “common external tariff toward the rest of the world, allowing for the free circulation of goods and services within the common area.” This approach would include a common external trade policy for the two countries.

2. *A Common Market*

Like a customs union, a common market would be a single market within a common area where “not only is internal trade in goods and services freed up; even greater efficiency gains are achieved by allowing people, capital, and technology to circulate freely as well.” Dobson sees the benefits of “harmonizing existing standards, regulations, and policies to a common norm” with the U.S.

3. *A Strategic Bargain*

Their strategic bargain is defined as “a pragmatic mix of customs-union-like and common-market-like proposals plus Canadian initiatives in areas of strength that are of particular interest to Americans,” specifically border security, immigration, defence and energy policy.

C.

BAD IDEAS

High-level meetings on both sides of the border have taken place to advance this agenda without the knowledge of the majority of Canadians. It is imperative that Canadians become aware of the plans of the CCCE and others before irreparable steps are taken.

The Council of Canadians believes that the “big idea” of deep integration is a bad idea that will destroy what is left of Canadian sovereignty and Canadian institutions. We will work to oppose deep integration in 10 key areas.

BAD IDEA #1 **Supporting U.S. Foreign Policy**

One clear objective of deep integration is to force Canada to abandon its historical commitment to multilateralism and align itself with an increasingly unilateralist United States. The U.S. has a long history as a rogue nation in the building of a multilateral world, refusing to support many international treaties and conventions, including the Kyoto Protocol on global climate change, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on nuclear weapons testing, the UN Agreement to Curb the International Flow of Illicit Small Arms, the International Criminal Court for war crimes, and the Ottawa Landmines Treaty. In addition, U.S. foreign aid is only .10 per cent of their GDP, the lowest level in the industrialized world.

Under George Bush, U.S. unilateralism has only deepened. Under the influence of Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, Vice-President Dick Cheney, and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, the U.S. has now adopted a “first strike” position (even with nuclear weapons), reserving the right to attack countries it sees as hostile to its interests and refusing to abide by UN Security Council decisions. It is clear that the Bush administration is dismissive of the United Nations and that it has, in fact, declared war on multilateralism.

We should remember that the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (written by Canadian John Humphrey), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights formed the basis for a global crusade for universal health care and education, and led to further declarations on the rights of women, children and indigenous peoples. Deep integration with the U.S. and its policy of unilateralism would be a terrible mistake for Canada.

Better Ideas

One of the Council's partner groups, the Canadian Council for International Cooperation, has a better idea – actually four of them:

1. Canada should commit to rebuilding multilateralism and work with all nations for the common good. Canada must advocate for the strengthening of the United Nations, particularly its Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and the creation of an Economic and Security Council to address urgent global issues of injustice and environmental degradation.
2. Canada should increase its foreign aid every year until it takes our current expenditures of .28 per cent of GDP to the UN goal of .7 per cent by 2015. This aid should not be tied to Canadian business interests, but rather meet the real needs of the developing countries. In addition, Canada should resume international leadership to cancel all outstanding foreign debts for the poorest countries and support a fair debt arbitration process for other highly indebted countries.
3. Canada should choose peace. Security may drive the current international agenda, but security is more than the absence of conflict or terrorists. Real security is the addressing of injustice, poverty, denial of human rights, and political exclusion.
4. Canada should create a broad vision and framework to enhance active global citizenship, drawing upon civil society groups in Canada and around the world.

BAD IDEA #2 **Joining the U.S. National Missile Defence Program**

This bad idea would see Canada sign on to George Bush's plan to build a national missile defence system.

In order to be a full participant in the "Son of Star Wars," Canada would have to agree to place a substantial part of the Canadian Armed Forces under the "Northern Command," a permanent, integrated, U.S.-led command structure for North America. In addition, since the use of Canadian territory would improve the early detection of missiles launched from the Middle East (though none exist at present), Canada could be required to build new radar and interceptor missile sites in the Arctic and on the East Coast. Speaking on condition of anonymity, a senior official with the U.S. State Department told the *Toronto Star* in September 2004 that, if Canada wants its cities protected from missile attack, it will have to contribute military personnel and even land to the U.S. project.

This would entail not only a massive increase in military spending in order for Canada to do its "part" (the U.S. is planning to spend US\$2 trillion over the next five years on its military), but would remove Canada's ability to choose peacekeeping priorities for any budget increases to the military. The Bush administration has made it clear that it expects its allies to help pay for the War on Terrorism, including missile defence. Although some Canadian officials are downplaying the cost estimates, a military official recently indicated that the Department of Defence has nearly a half-billion dollars ready to pay for Canada's participation in missile defence.

Although Canada's foreign policy remains opposed to placing weapons in space, American officials – including Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld – consider space-based weapons part of a future phase of the missile system. A new arms race could occur, given that China has already said that it cannot allow the U.S. to unilaterally arm space. If Canada were to back the national missile defence program, it would be turning its back on its own proud history of opposition to the weaponization of space.

Military and defence industry boosters of this bad idea point out that a joint North American defence would ensure Canada's support and involvement in pre-emptive wars initiated by the U.S. Promoting the commercial and security interests of the world's lone superpower by abandoning our own foreign and military policy would be a tragic mistake.

Better Ideas

1. Canada's Cold War-era defence policy must be updated so that the Armed Forces are given the support they need to play a more specialized role in peacekeeping and conflict resolution.
2. Canada's diplomacy should stress peace, disarmament and the promotion of human security, which are inextricably linked to the people's social, political and economic needs. Canada could play a pivotal role in searching for alternative military models that would help achieve global stability.
3. Canada should promote and contribute to a mobile UN rapid response force that could operate within dangerous, low-intensity conflict environments and in situations of civilian crisis.
4. Canada's military spending should be redirected from aggressive weapons and used to support the men and women in the Armed Forces and to rebuild Canada's international leadership in United Nations peacekeeping.

BAD IDEA #3 **Canadian Homeland Security Measures**

The plan behind this bad idea is to implement in Canada provisions similar to those put into place by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. In the U.S., homeland security measures have violated the civil liberties of many American citizens. In fact, in 2002 surveillance requests made by the U.S. federal government under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (an Act intended to hunt down foreign spies) outnumbered all requests under domestic law for the first time in U.S. history. If adopted here, measures such as the Homeland Security Project; the Total Information Awareness System; the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System; the profiling and registering of residents based on country of origin, religious background and/or gender; and many other related U.S. initiatives would undermine Canadian values and constitutional guarantees, as well as national and international human rights.

A disturbing example of all of this is the treatment of Canadian citizen Maher Arar by American authorities. Mr. Arar was subjected to the following illegal actions by U.S. authorities: denial of access to a lawyer, prohibition from using a telephone, denial of legal aid, non-notification of the Canadian consulate, and a secret hearing without representation.

Canada has already enacted Bill C-36, the anti-terrorism law, which diminishes the rights accorded Canadians under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and Bill C-23, which sets up a data bank containing private information on the foreign air travel of all Canadians. Canada has also signed the Smart Border accord with the U.S., which sets an agenda for the coordination of Canadian and U.S. intelligence services and the harmonization of visa, immigration and refugee policies. This accord also contains a provision to develop a "safe third country" agreement under which Canada would turn back refugee claimants at land borders, requiring them to seek asylum in the U.S. Proponents of this bad idea want to see these acts and accords, plus some new initiatives, rolled into a "National Security Policy" that mirrors U.S. homeland security measures. In

many ways, Canada has overreacted with its anti-terrorism legislation. Weakening legal safeguards and trampling on human rights will not make us safe from terrorism.

Better Ideas

1. Canada should ensure that any new measures taken to promote the security of Canadians adhere to the accepted principles of human rights and humanitarian values reflected in our Constitution and the Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms.
2. Canada should require that security measures not have a dual purpose, but be strictly limited to fighting known threats of terrorism. For instance, security measures must not be used to criminalize legitimate dissent or racial profiling. Further, they must be appropriate to the real nature of the threat to Canadians.
3. Canada must develop a parliamentary mechanism to oversee the implementation of security legislation. The International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group is calling for more accountability, supervision, and due process in the enactment of these laws.
4. Canada needs to undertake an accelerated review of the new security laws, particularly Bill C-36, through the government's proposed National Security Standing Committee of the House of Commons.

BAD IDEA #4 **A Continental Resource Sharing Pact**

This bad idea would further harmonize the Canadian and U.S. energy market to the point where Canada would lose complete control over its oil, gas and electricity resources. The U.S. is aggressively seeking new supplies of cheap energy on this continent to reduce its dependence on “foreign” markets. American energy companies have already been on a takeover spree in Canada’s oil patch. In 2003, foreign shareholders controlled over 50 per cent of Canada’s oil and gas production, an increase from 31 per cent in 1999.

Canada has already deregulated its oil and gas industries under the FTA and NAFTA by signing a “proportional sharing” agreement with the U.S. that commits us to ever mounting exports. As a result, there has been a massive increase in energy exports to the U.S. In 1988, 25 per cent of our gas production was exported to the U.S. Now, we send over 60 per cent of our gas south. In fact, Canada has replaced Saudi Arabia as the number one supplier of oil and gas to the U.S., the biggest energy waster in the world. To feed the demand for gas, several huge new mega projects, including the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline, are in the works.

The Bush Energy Plan, released in 2001, rejects conservation in favour of securing new energy supplies and increasing production. Written with direct assistance of big energy companies, such as Enron, the U.S. plan includes big plans for Canadian energy. With the U.S. energy demands set to double in the next decade, Canada is already actively searching for new supplies, many of them in pristine wilderness areas. To maintain our oil commitment to the U.S., Canada is developing the ecologically devastating, water-guzzling and carbon-intensive Athabasca tar sands. Under this bad idea, as these supplies become available, they will essentially belong to U.S. interests.

The United States is also seeking an integrated electricity market under the General Agreement on Trade in Services. The goal is to harmonize and deregulate the North American electricity market on the California model, thereby ending

provincial control of electricity. Many people in eastern Canada will remember that the existing integration of the power grid between the two countries – and a systems failure in the U.S. – was a key cause of the blackout that affected millions of Canadians. And many others will remember that California’s fiasco of escalating energy prices, rolling blackouts, and bankrupt utilities was basically a result of deregulation. Even our own fiasco with deregulation in Alberta and Ontario was the direct result of Conservative governments wanting to tie into the continental energy grid in order to become electricity suppliers to the U.S. market.

Better Ideas

1. Canada should put a moratorium on environmentally damaging resource extraction projects while we develop a “made in Canada” energy policy that emphasizes Canadian energy security, conservation, and transition to cleaner alternatives.
2. Canada must restrict foreign ownership of our energy sector, reinstate the 25-year energy reserve for Canadians, repeal the “proportional sharing” provision of NAFTA, and ensure that the National Energy Board plays a real watchdog role in guarding our energy future.
3. Canada needs to implement strong environmental standards for both the production and the export of our energy and electricity.
4. Canada should put an end to the destruction of our wilderness areas by transnational corporations that have no interest in the environmental impact of their practices.

BAD IDEA #5 **A Common Market**

This bad idea was laid out in a 2003 memorandum written by officials from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and entitled *Securing Growth: Beyond the Border Accord*. This memo calls for a common North American approach to standards, testing, qualifications, regulations, labelling, procurement and environmental protection. Noting the support such ideas are getting from the C.D. Howe Institute and others, the government officials write that the harmonization of all our practices and regulations would “free up resources that could be devoted to our shared security interests.”

Under the categories of “Secure Flow of Goods” and “Secure Flow of People,” the officials recommend removing all remaining regulations on Canadian energy resources, adopting a “tested once” policy for pharmaceuticals and other consumer goods, doing away with the rules of origin requirements, facilitating special border crossing procedures for businesspeople, building a common regulatory environment for electronic commerce, and harmonizing the standards and training for transportation personnel such as truck drivers and pilots. If adopted, these measures would affect every aspect of Canadian life, including environmental standards, consumer protection, and health and safety inspection.

This memo also calls for common exemptions to the WTO, which is a very dangerous idea considering the desire of the U.S. to use the General Agreement on Trade in Services to pry open Canada’s public services, health care system and water services. The U.S. Trade Representative’s Office has declared, “The United States is of the view that commercial opportunities exist along the entire spectrum of health and social care facilities.”

Harmonization toward common higher standards is a laudable goal and one that most Canadians would not oppose. However, the Bush administration is rolling back decades of environmental, health and safety regulations. Laws that protect clean air and water, lower pesticide exposure, and protect habitat are under attack by his government.

Canada has already experienced weakened regulatory regimes in order to accommodate U.S. demands or honour international trade obligations. For instance, Canada was forced to abandon its attempt to sell all cigarettes in plain packaging because any such law would have violated the rights of manufacturers under NAFTA. Similarly, Canada was forced to reverse its ban on the import of MMT – a dangerous additive to gasoline – after it was threatened with a trade challenge from the American producer of the product.

It would be a terrible mistake for Canada to harmonize our laws that protect citizens and the environment with those of the United States.

Better Ideas

1. Canada should re-commit to environmental, health and safety regulations and standards.
2. A review should be undertaken to find out where Canada has already weakened its regulatory regimes to accommodate U.S. demands and international trade obligations.
3. Canada should have a compulsory-licensing program guaranteeing cheaper prescription drugs (rather than giving American drug companies 20-year patent rights).
4. Canada must retain its right to exempt any area, including water, culture and health, from trade agreements like the FTAA and those associated with the WTO.

BAD IDEA #6

A Continental Water Market

Many parts of the United States are running out of water. Arizona is depleted, New Mexico has a 10-year supply of water, and California has a 20-year supply left. Business interests on both sides of the border are gearing up to move water by super tanker, pipeline or diversion. Web sites promoting commercial water trading are booming and Canadian bottled water is becoming a favourite in the U.S.. So it is not surprising that a continental water market is a long-term goal of many on both sides of the border.

Already, water is included as a “good” in both NAFTA and the WTO and as an “investment” in NAFTA, and it is slated to be included as a “service” in the upcoming GATS and FTAA agreements.

In a recent draft agreement called the Great Lakes Annex 2001, U.S. governors have proposed new guidelines for diversions of the waters of the Great Lakes that many believe will open the floodgates to communities and industries far away from the Great Lakes Basin. As a result, the long-term sustainability of the Lakes is now in question. Further, the new rules may open the door to the commodification of the Great Lakes waters as new diversions can now be “sold” for promises of improvements to the Basin. Of great additional concern to Canadians, the authority for these new water diversions lies entirely with the U.S. governors.

When asked by a Canadian reporter at the Summit of the Americas in Quebec City how he viewed Canada’s water resources, President Bush replied that he saw them as part of America’s energy security.

Although the Liberals promised in their 1993 Red Book to ban the commercial export of Canadian water, they have not done so, leaving many to believe that they are keeping their options open on this matter. And while Liberal governments have promised to exempt culture and social programs from the services agreement of the WTO, they have consistently refused to promise a similar exemption for water. In fact, just the threat of lawsuits and trade sanc-

tions has already caused the Canadian government to think twice about protecting our water. In 1999, the federal government initiated a “voluntary accord” on water that most provinces have ignored. The government made the accord voluntary rather than mandatory, to be “consistent with our international trade obligations.”

It is a bad idea to put water on the open market as a tradable commodity and sell it to the highest bidder. For Canadians, deep integration would mean that we lose sovereign control of our water supplies, just as we have lost control of our oil and gas.

Better Ideas

A better idea would be to assert our sovereign rights over our water.

1. Water must be immediately removed from NAFTA and the WTO and exempted from the General Agreement on Trade in Services.
2. Canada must ban the commercial trade and export of bulk water and assert its responsibility to protect Canada’s international waters. It must ensure that any agreement regarding the Great Lakes safeguards these waters, protects Canada’s share of control and responsibility over the Lakes, and closes the door to large-scale long-distance water diversions from the Great Lake Basin.
3. Canada must reverse its position (taken in April 2002 at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights) opposing the human right to water.
4. Canada should have a comprehensive national water policy, and the 20-year-old Federal Water Policy should be updated accordingly. This Act should include strict regulation of the bottled water industry based on principles of sustainability, and measures to control industrial and agricultural pollution.

BAD IDEA #7
Foreign Ownership of Telecommunications and Media

The federal government is aggressively promoting trade liberalization in telecommunications and cable. This agenda will have broad implications for all other forms of media in Canada.

Currently, rules effectively restrict foreign ownership to 46.7 per cent of a broadcasting or telecommunications company. But powerful forces, including the telecommunications industry on both sides of the border, cable companies and the Industry Committee of the House of Commons, are pressing to remove these restrictions and open the sector up entirely to market forces.

This bad idea would signal the end of Canadian control over its media because telecommunications companies in Canada are owners of cable, television networks and newspapers. For instance, BCE owns Bell, The Globe and Mail, CTV, and specialty television services, while Rogers Cable owns AT&T and many specialty channels. Removing foreign ownership restrictions would place all media in Canada in direct danger of being bought out by big American conglomerates such as AOL Time Warner which have no interest in telling Canadian stories. This issue of foreign ownership is on the GATS table and, distressingly, one of Paul Martin's first acts as prime minister was to shift the telecom portfolio from industry to international trade, thus clearly signalling his intent to use it as bargaining chip at the trade table.

In 1999, the market for Canadian TV drama was effectively killed by a change in CRTC regulations that redefined drama as "priority programming" and lumped it in with entertainment shows and regional programs which cost substantially less to make. This regulation change also allowed television networks to abandon local newscasts. In 2003, the federal government budget slashed support for films and television programs. These changes have devastated the Canadian production industry and they demonstrate that support for Canadian culture has not been high in the federal government (although former Heritage Minister Sheila Copps took a strong stand in favour of maintaining the foreign ownership restrictions).

Not long ago, communications were considered to have such strategic importance in distributing news and information and in shaping citizens' attitudes that governments worked hard to maintain a degree of public ownership and control over radio, television and other mass media. In fact, the CBC was established with a mandate to preserve and protect the nation's cultural identity and diversity, both within the country and in relation to the U.S. It is a bad idea to put our culture on the open North American market, allowing it to be devoured by the U.S. entertainment industry. Unless Canadians take a firm stand, control over our media is going to be lost.

Better Ideas

1. The rules restricting foreign ownership of a broadcasting or telecommunications company should stay in place.
2. Canada should have a telecommunications strategy and policy to bring affordable and accessible broadband services to all Canadians.
3. The changes made to CRTC regulations in 1999 affecting Canadian drama and local newscasts should be reversed. Long-term and stable funding should be provided to the CBC and to producers who will bring Canadian stories to our screens.
4. Arts and culture promoting the diverse views of Canadians and ensuring a Canadian voice need to be protected from the vagaries of trade deals.

BAD IDEA #8
Pursuing a U.S. Global Trade Agenda

This bad idea would see Canada continue to serve the interests of the United States and its big business lobby in the pursuit of unregulated global trade.

Through the WTO and the FTAA, the Bush administration is seeking a major liberalization of services, agriculture, and intellectual property rights, as well as the right for its corporations to make guaranteed profits in all countries without the obligation to return an economic benefit to communities. New provisions on competition policy, investment, market access and government procurement would remove the ability of governments to create or maintain laws and regulations to protect the health, safety and well-being of their citizens. These agreements would further lock the world into a failed economic model of market capitalism, forcing governments to turn their natural resources over to transnational corporations, replace sustainable farming with agribusiness, and privatize social services.

During the WTO's Doha Round meeting that took place only months after 9/11, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick made it clear to member countries that his government would judge whether a country was supportive of the U.S. in its war on terrorism by whether it supported the U.S. in trade negotiations. Canada's then Minister of International Trade Pierre Pettigrew and Canada's Ambassador to the WTO Sergio Marchi both played pivotal roles as "Friends of the Chair" in Doha and Cancun, where the last WTO meeting took place, pressing Third World countries to give up the remaining levers of control over their economies and social policies. In Doha, for example, Pettigrew reportedly insulted the trade minister of India, and ended up shouting at delegates from Pakistan and India over issues of market access for their textiles, accusing them of "blocking things."

The two most recent major trade meetings – the September 2003 meeting of the WTO in Cancun and the November 2003 meeting of the FTAA in Miami – ended in failure for the U.S.

and its allies, including Canada. Developing countries said no to an agenda that they rightly saw as controlled by the private sector interests of the industrialized North.

Better Ideas

Just as Canada needs an independent foreign policy, it needs a trade policy that is based on the needs of all Canadians, not just its business leaders, and that exhibits Canadian values at home and abroad. It is time for the Canadian government to reflect on the effect free trade has had on Canada and to understand why the South is rejecting the trade imperatives of the WTO and FTAA.

1. Canada should place a moratorium on all trade negotiations while the government undertakes a review of trade policy and past agreements.
2. Past mistakes should be corrected. Water should be removed from the trade deals and the Chapter 11 rights of corporations to sue governments should be cancelled.
3. All future trade agreements should be guided by values such as the protection of human rights and environmental stewardship.
4. Trade agreements should respect every nation's right to develop and protect its own institutions.

BAD IDEA #9 **Adopting U.S.-Style Health Care**

There are many influential groups and opinion makers in Canada that view Canada's public health care system as an anachronism in an era of open markets and globalization. The CCCE, the C.D. Howe Institute and the Fraser Institute are on record calling for a for-profit replacement to medicare. The CCCE has stated that health care should be "run like a business" with "performance bonuses," "corporate discipline" and "private-sector innovation." If Canada abandons its public system, we will end up with an American style of health care due to the harmonization that is taking place on the continent.

In the United States, health care is now a booming for-profit business. Drug and insurance companies, hospitals, outpatient clinics, doctors' practices and pharmacies have merged to form giant private health companies with combined annual profits of over US\$1 trillion. As a result, insurance costs have soared, close to 50 million Americans have no health insurance, cost cutting in for-profit hospitals kills Americans every year, and half of last year's 600,000 bankruptcies in the U.S. were families unable to pay their medical bills. In the end, Americans pay twice as much per person as Canadians pay for health care.

Yet several provinces are openly promoting for-profit hospitals, doctors' practices and clinics, while Ottawa stands by and does nothing. The issue of for-profit services was totally ignored by the First Ministers when they came to a new health accord at their historic meeting in September 2004, even though Paul Martin had campaigned against for-profit health care during the election campaign. Private spending on health care in Canada increased by 96 per cent in the last decade. There are now 250 large for-profit health corporations, over 600 private home care agencies and 140 private health insurance companies in Canada, many of them U.S.-based transnationals.

Consequently, our country is in danger of losing its health care exemption in NAFTA, which is only good as long as health care is delivered on a not-for-profit basis. Canada has already

offered up health insurance at the GATS, a dangerous move given that the global private health care industry is now estimated to be a US\$5 trillion per year moneymaking machine.

Canadians must defend our public health care system or we are going to lose it.

Better Ideas

Canadians believe that health care is a right of citizenship and not a commodity to be bought and sold on the open market.

1. Canada should re-commit to the five principles of public health care – medical and hospital care must be universal, portable, comprehensive, publicly funded (accessible) and publicly administered.
2. The Minister of Health should comply with federal regulations requiring him to monitor and report to Parliament on provincial compliance with the five principles and two conditions of medicare.
3. If it is found that the Canada Health Act does not prohibit for profit services, Canada should add a third condition to allow it to withhold federal funds to provinces that are promoting for-profit health care services. (As it stands there are two conditions under which the federal government can withhold funding to the provinces: if they allow extra billing or if they allow user fees.)
4. Canada should reduce the 20-year patent rights enjoyed by pharmaceutical corporations which have had the effect of driving up the cost of drugs. Canada must also re-implement the system of compulsory licensing of pharmaceuticals which lowers prices by introducing competitive generic drugs.

BAD IDEA #10 **A Continental Agriculture Market**

Already, Canada has adopted a corporate model of food production that hurts family farmers. It is a model that fits into a global system where only the big – big farms, big corporations, big countries – can survive.

Under the trade agreements it has endorsed, the Canadian government has slashed subsidies and farm income support while the U.S. has increased agricultural subsidies. As a result, thousands of family farms have been replaced by agribusiness corporations and their factory farms. Income for the remaining independent family farmers has crashed. The U.S. is now challenging Canada's food supply management and orderly marketing board systems, such as the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canadian Dairy Commission, which have ensured the survival of domestically controlled grain and dairy industries. Meanwhile, giant American corporations such as Cargill and ConAgra are moving into Canada and taking over large portions of our agricultural markets, and corporations like Monsanto are making huge profits in Canada with their genetically engineered crops.

Free trade has almost totally integrated livestock production between Canada and the U.S. Access to the American market was supposed to guarantee good incomes for livestock producers. But with the BSE crisis and border closure, our dependence on the U.S. market has been devastating for family farmers. In addition, large factory farms are now selling hogs below the cost of production to supply the American food processing industry with cheap meat. Family farmers cannot compete in this system and are being driven out of business.

Further integration would mean fewer people in the countryside; the replacement of independent family farmers with corporate agribusiness managers and underpaid farm workers; the loss of rural cultural and traditional knowledge; and the production of uniform, corporate-controlled, genetically engineered foods.

The integration of Canadian food production is harmful to Canada because it takes away our control over our food and agricultural policy. Our dependence on the U.S. market for revenues in meat, for instance, has meant that we lost the right to set higher environmental and safety standards. American beef producers fought hard against the higher standards that Great Britain adopted after its own mad cow crisis. If Canada had been able to set independent standards, mad cow in Canada might have been avoided.

Better Ideas

1. Canada needs a sustainable agriculture policy based on sound environmental and humane practices, a fair return to family farmers, more localized production, and the right to orderly marketing agencies.
2. Canada's food safety rules should be driven by the values of Canadians, not the demands of American corporations. Canada should reject food irradiation (about to be adopted in the U.S.), which subjects food to huge doses of radiation so that it can be shipped farther and stored longer.
3. Canada should say no to genetically engineered wheat, which could be approved in the U.S.
4. Canada should implement a moratorium on any further releases of genetically engineered foods, and should resist pressure from American corporations to allow imports of milk from cows injected with bovine growth hormone.

D.

WHAT DO CANADIANS SAY?

In March and April 2004, the Council of Canadians commissioned the polling firm of Ipsos-Reid to survey more than 1,000 Canadians on their views on issues critical to this debate. The results showed clearly that Canadians believe in public health care, Canadian sovereignty, clean water, fair trade, and safe food.

PUBLIC HEALTH

84 per cent agree that Canada's public services should be delivered by public sector workers accountable to elected representatives and the public, not by corporations accountable to shareholders.

64 per cent agree that Canada's health care system should exclude corporations that operate for profit, and instead rely solely on public and not-for-profit health care providers.

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

91 per cent agree that Canada should maintain the ability to set its own independent environmental health and safety standards and regulations, even if this might reduce cross-border trade opportunities with the United States.

77 per cent agree that Canada's limited military spending should be used to enhance our abilities in peacekeeping and conflict resolution rather than trying to maintain multi-purpose forces intended for heavy combat alongside U.S. military forces.

69 per cent disagree that Canada should actively support the Bush administration's missile defence system even if it may require dedicating military spending to the program or allowing U.S. missile launchers in Canada.

CLEAN WATER

97 per cent agree that Canada should adopt a comprehensive national water policy that recognizes clean drinking water as a basic human right.

75 per cent agree that Canada should rebuild its public infrastructure, such as hospitals, schools, highways and water systems, through direct public involvement and not through public-private joint ventures with corporations.

FAIR TRADE

62 per cent agree that the Canadian government should not sign a new international trade agreement with the World Trade Organization that makes Canada's public services, such as health care and education, open to competition from foreign corporations.

60 per cent agree that the Canadian government should not sign new trade deals that allow corporations to directly sue the Government of Canada if our public policies impair their ability to make profits.

SAFE FOOD

89 per cent agree that the agriculture policies of the federal and provincial governments should support family farms with environmentally friendly livestock production systems rather than large corporate farms.

83 per cent agree that the Canadian government should put a moratorium on any further releases of genetically modified crops until more health and environmental safety issues have been addressed.

CONCLUSION

DEEP INTEGRATION WITH THE UNITED STATES IS THE WRONG FUTURE FOR OUR COUNTRY.

Canadians care for our American neighbours and want to be good trading partners with them. We are conscious that the fear of terrorism has created a great alarm in the American people and we want to be supportive of them at this time in their history. We also agree that it is important to work with the United States to ensure a safe border crossing for all travellers. And we recognize the need to enact appropriate security precautions to ensure the safety of Canadians at home and abroad.

All of this can be done, however, without surrendering crucial aspects of our sovereignty, just as it would have been possible to create a trade agreement between our two countries that would have increased trading opportunities for businesses on both sides of the border, without giving away so many fundamental rights. We know that many citizens on both sides of the border recognize that we can have co-operation and trade without abandoning sovereignty and principles of social justice, compassion and fairness.

To adopt a policy of deep integration would mean turning our backs on Canadian history, on

our own narrative. In order to survive as a country on the northern half of the continent, our ancestors created a narrative of “sharing for survival,” which is fundamentally different from the American narrative of “survival of the fittest.” Generations of Canadians have been linked together across this huge land with “ribbons of interdependence” such as our national social programs, medicare, our marketing boards, our policies of multiculturalism and bilingualism, and the CBC.

Similarly, although Canadians are utterly opposed to terrorism, many have a broader definition of “security” than anything that could be provided by armed forces or border patrols. The purpose of national social programs, for instance, was to provide opportunity for all and to create a “just society” for every citizen of Canada. It is not possible to defeat terrorism and violence until we address the growing crisis of global injustice, and there is no way to address this if we do not question the dominant ideology of corporate globalization.

Global social justice is not on the deep integration agenda. Rather, deep integration is an agenda for more power to corporations, particularly large defence and energy corporations that are needed to enforce a military definition of security. Adopting deep integration would mean abandoning what we have left of the vision of a just society.

The Canada we want is a good neighbour to the United States, but also a good neighbour to the rest of the world. The Canada we want will play a crucial role, at home and abroad in the coming years, in seeking justice for all. In the end, justice is the only reliable security for all of us.

Actions

As our poll results so clearly show, the vast majority of Canadians are opposed to deeper integration with the U.S. if it means abandoning Canadian sovereignty, lowering our standards and social services, or losing control of our natural resources. It is imperative that we speak up now, while our government is making decisions on these crucial questions.

1. Demand full public participation in Prime Minister Paul Martin's review of Canada-U.S. policy.

Although Paul Martin has announced that he is going to have a full review of Canada-U.S. relations, he has not indicated that this review will be open to the public. It seems that it will be an internal review, headed up by the hawks in his Cabinet. It is crucial that this debate not be limited to a small elite but opened up to all sectors of Canadian society for input. What better way for Canadians to exercise their democratic rights than to demand public hearings, town hall meetings, or even a royal commission?

2. Turn up the political heat on our politicians on these issues.

- Call or write to the Prime Minister.
- Call or write your Member of Parliament.
- Send letters to the editor of your newspaper.
- Contact the Council of Canadians and join one of our chapters.
- Distribute this guide to your friends and neighbours.

3. Get involved in the Council of Canadian's Citizens' Inquiry on Canada-U.S. Relations.

The Citizens' Inquiry aims to raise public awareness and investigate the impact of deep integration in crucial areas such as health care, energy, and defence and security. Between October 28, 2004 and February 8, 2005, the Citizens' Inquiry will visit 10 Canadian cities and hear expert testimony and facilitate public discussion on these issues.

A final report will be produced on the Inquiry's findings and distributed to many more Canadians. In addition, a "Deep Integration Workbook" has been developed and is available to individuals and groups that wish to hold their own hearings or event in their community. Beyond promoting awareness and generating discussion, the Council's aim is to build the strongest possible local and national resistance to the agenda of deep integration.

The most recent information on the tour and other materials related to it, can be found on the Council's web site, www.canadians.org.

E.

VISION STATEMENT

The Council of Canadians is an independent, non-partisan, public interest organization committed to fair trade, safe food, clean water, public health and democratic participation in a world increasingly dominated by transnational corporations. We work to safeguard social programs, promote economic justice, preserve the environment and fight for the sovereign rights of people, both here in Canada and around the world. We have three major goals:

1. To help Canadians define ourselves and our understanding of sovereignty and democracy in relation to the rest of the world in an era of increased U.S.-Canada tensions and increased pressure for deeper continental integration.

The Council of Canadians has long had a vision for Canada in an interdependent world as a non-aligned 21st-century nation embracing cultural diversity, fair trade, social justice, the protection of the commons, and collective security based upon international co-operation and sharing. We believe that the majority of Canadians share this vision but that our political elites do not. We need to return to this vision in light of recent developments and seek a renewal of Canadian democracy in order to rejuvenate Canadian policies in the public interest. This vision includes promoting alternatives to corporate-driven globalization as Canada's main foreign policy, and giving clearer articulation to our commitment to fair trade, public health, safe food and clean water as fundamental rights of all Canadians.

2. To work with Canadians and people around the world to reclaim the global and local commons which are the shared heritage of humanity and of the earth.

There exist common heritage resources that constitute a collective birthright of the whole species to be shared equitably among all. These include the ecological commons – land, air, forests, water and fisheries; the cultural commons – the shared knowledge and art that are the collective creations of our species; and the modern social commons – including health care, education and social security. All of these commons are under threat as corporations seek to privatize and commodify them. Our vision and commitment must be to reclaim these commons from private interests. We recognize that this entails a moral obligation on the part of all peoples to ecological stewardship. We also recognize that it is impossible – and wrong – to fight for our commons birthright in Canada without securing such rights for all the peoples of the world.

3. To create a compelling civil society movement in search of social justice, both here in Canada and internationally, whose core mandate is the creation of participatory, living democracy for all the peoples of the world.

For the past two decades, our governments have transferred much of their responsibility to global corporations and adopted policies that have obliged their citizens to serve the interests of the global economy. It is time for our governments to create policies to reverse this trend. The economy should exist to serve communities and people, not the other way around. Democracy flourishes when people organize to protect their communities and rights and hold their elected officials accountable. It is through the dynamic processes initiated by civil society that the social climate for real political change will occur. The principle of this living democracy requires us to create systems that give the vote to those who will bear the costs when key decisions are made, and to limit the rights of absentee corporate landlords to govern the lives of the world's citizens.

F.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Maude Barlow is the National Chairperson of The Council of Canadians, Canada's largest public advocacy organization with over 100,000 members. She is a director with the International Forum on Globalization, a San Francisco-based research and educational institution opposed to economic globalization, and co-founder of the Blue Planet Project, an international civil society movement to stop the commodification of water. She is the author or co-author of 14 best-selling books. Her latest is *Profit Is Not the Cure: A Citizen's Guide to Saving Medicare*.