

# Not counting Canadians

The Security and Prosperity Partnership and public opinion





The Council of Canadians  
70-170 Laurier Avenue West  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5V5  
1-800-387-7177  
Canadians.org • IntegrateThis.ca

April 2008

## Overview

---

On April 21, 2008, Prime Minister Stephen Harper went to New Orleans to attend the fourth annual North American Leaders' Summit to discuss progress to the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) with his American and Mexican counterparts. It has been four years since this process began, and no one beyond an elite group of corporate CEOs has been asked how they feel about the SPP—until now.

From April 7–10, 2008, the Council of Canadians commissioned Environics Research Group to conduct a survey of Canadians to find out how they feel about the major SPP policy directions and initiatives, including North American regulatory convergence, energy integration with the United States, bulk water exports, and the adoption of U.S.-style security measures in Canada. We also asked whether such a wide-reaching trilateral agreement should be brought to Parliament for a debate and vote.

The results<sup>1</sup> were significant:

**87%** of Canadians agree that Canada should maintain the ability to set its own independent environmental, health and safety standards, even if this might reduce cross-border trade opportunities with the United States. **And yet the Harper government is committed to an SPP policy of regulatory harmonization in the areas of consumer product safety, food and drugs, and the environment.**

**89%** of Canadians agree that Canada should establish an energy policy that provides reliable supplies of oil, gas and electricity at stable prices and protects the environment, even if this means placing restrictions on exports and foreign ownership of Canadian supplies. **And yet the Harper government is committed to a “market-based” policy of energy integration with the U.S. through the SPP’s North American Energy Working Group.**

**88%** of Canadians agree that Canada should adopt a comprehensive national water policy that recognizes clean drinking water as a basic human right and also bans the bulk export of fresh water. **And yet bulk water exports to the U.S. are on the table in SPP discussions.**

**48%** of Canadians do not feel that Canada should harmonize its security policies with the United States, even if this affects our trading relationship. It was the only question on which Canadians were divided. **And yet the 2008 Federal budget committed millions of extra dollars to SPP security initiatives anyway.**

**86%** of Canadians agree that the Security and Prosperity Partnership agreement **should be debated and submitted to a vote in Parliament.** Yet four years later, the debate is nowhere to be seen.

Canadian preferences for policies that run counter to the key SPP priorities listed above show conclusively that Prime Minister Harper does not have a democratic mandate for pursuing this agenda in secretive trilateral talks like the North American leaders summit in New Orleans. The government must cease all further SPP talks and debate the agreement fully and openly before submitting it to Parliament for a vote.

---

87%

## Canadians want independent environmental and public health standards

87% of Canadians agree that Canada should maintain the ability to set its own independent environmental, health and safety standards, even if this might reduce cross-border trade opportunities with the United States.

**So why is the Harper government committed**, through the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP), **to a policy of regulatory harmonization with the United States** where a cavalier approach to governing the behaviour of corporations prevails? “Is the sovereignty of Canada going to fall apart if we standardize the jellybean?” asked Harper dismissively at the SPP summit in Montebello, Quebec last August. But there is little mention of public health or the environment in subsequent regulatory discussions with the United States, and talk of “best practices” has already meant Canada adopting weaker U.S. practices.

- Harper’s new consumer product safety legislation is far weaker than media reports claim and belies a soft spot for corporate priorities. The new rules – a tri-national initiative from the 2007 SPP summit – were drafted in cooperation with U.S. regulators. Actually, the Bush administration announced very similar product safety legislation to Harper’s in November 2007.<sup>2</sup> At the heart of both systems is a reliance on industry reporting and monitoring, rather than independent government testing, and an emphasis on cleaning up the mess (to the environment or human lives) caused by bad products after the fact. They call this “risk management,” an about-face from the “precautionary principle” of better safe than sorry.<sup>3</sup>
- Also in Montebello, Harper signed a more concrete agreement on the **regulation of toxics and other hazardous chemicals** that also applies the “risk management” approach. Government regulators will only focus test the riskiest chemicals based on corporate data. The European Union has just announced a much stricter approach to regulating chemicals based on the precautionary principle – if a corporation can’t prove a product is safe, it can’t sell that product. Cooperating with Europe on this issue would result in higher standards, but Harper seems devoted to the “Montebello Agreement,” as the chemicals industry now fondly calls it.<sup>4</sup>
- A University of Toronto study this winter found that Canadians are not getting enough Vitamin D. In fact, we should be taking double the amount currently recommended by Health Canada, especially during colder months. Despite calls from the Canadian Cancer Society and other groups to raise the recommended level from 400 to 1,000 international units, Health Canada is committed to a policy of harmonizing food and drug standards with the United States, which uses the lower level. A Food and Agriculture SPP working group is sorting out the details.<sup>5</sup>

Regulatory harmonization has also already meant higher pesticide levels in our food and has the potential to lower safety standards for children’s car seats, among other manufacturing standards.<sup>6</sup> Based on our poll results, Canadians would clearly prefer independent standards that meet or exceed the best in the world rather than SPP harmonization.

89%

## Canadians want an energy policy that protects supplies and the environment

89% of Canadians agree that Canada should establish an energy policy that provides reliable supplies of oil, gas and electricity at stable prices and protects the environment, even if this means placing restrictions on exports and foreign ownership of Canadian supplies.

So why has the Harper government committed Canada, through the Security and Prosperity Partnership's (SPP) energy working group<sup>7</sup>, to a **fivefold expansion of the environmentally disastrous Alberta tar sands**? Why are we focused on North American energy security when it means **Atlantic Canada imports more oil and gas each year**? And why has Harper adopted "a market-based approach," to energy resources that privileges exports over a stable, domestic supply? These SPP policies don't make Canada an "energy superpower," as Prime Minister Harper likes to call us. Instead, these policies make us an energy satellite for the United States.

- Canada exports 60 per cent of the natural gas we produce each year to the United States, not including the vast quantities that are burned up to power Alberta tar sands production.<sup>8</sup> The National Energy Board now predicts that Canada will be a net importer of natural gas by 2028.<sup>9</sup>
- In February 2008, according to a Statistics Canada report, Canada hit the one billion barrel mark in oil production. That's about 40 per cent more oil than we consume, yet oil imports actually increased last year, to 851,000 barrels per day, mostly from Algeria, Saudi Arabia and Iraq.<sup>10</sup>
- Just prior to the third SPP summit in Quebec last August, the Harper government signed a treaty-level Agreement for Cooperation in Energy Science and Technology. The agreement makes it easier for energy workers and technicians to cross the border, and to explore and develop new resources. Ecologically sound energy and environmental policies are an afterthought.<sup>11</sup>
- In February, Environmental Defence reported that the tar sands were the largest and most environmentally destructive industrial project on earth. Water is being polluted by toxic seepage from tailing ponds that are killing birds; fish downstream are found floating with deformities; acid rain is falling as far away as Saskatchewan.<sup>12</sup> There is also evidence of heightened cancer rates in First Nations communities bordering the tar sands.<sup>13</sup>
- The National Energy Board is nothing but a rubber stamp for new pipelines. Kinder Morgan wants to build a pipeline from Alberta to Texas that would carry 300,000 barrels of crude per day. Enbridge's "Clipper" pipeline will move 400,000 barrels a day to the Chicago region by 2011. TransCanada's "Keystone" pipeline will move 600,000 barrels to Illinois and Oklahoma.<sup>14</sup>

Canadians recognize that a "market-based" energy policy really means no policy at all. In fact, according to our poll, support for an energy policy that protects the environment and even places restrictions on exports and foreign ownership was highest in Stephen Harper's home province of Alberta, with 92 per cent of those surveyed agreeing we need a more hands-on energy policy. Energy integration through the SPP is making that impossible.

88%

## Canadians think water is a human right and want to ban bulk water exports

88% of Canadians agree that Canada should adopt a comprehensive national water policy that recognizes clean drinking water as a basic human right and also bans the bulk export of fresh water.

**So why is Prime Minister Stephen Harper discussing bulk water exports with the U.S.** as part of the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP)? And why did the Conservative government recently block a United Nations bid to recognize water as a basic human right?<sup>15</sup> Through SPP discussions on bulk water exports to the U.S., and through diversionary tactics at the international level, the Harper government is making a mockery of Canadians' desire for a strong national policy that treats water as an essential human right, not a commodity to be bought and sold.

- In March 2006, at the second SPP summit in Cancun, Mexico, Harper, Bush and Calderon commissioned the North American Future 2025 Project – a U.S. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) initiative to help guide trilateral discussions on integration. A closed-door meeting in Calgary targeted “water consumption, water transfers and **artificial diversions of bulk water**” with the aim of achieving “joint optimum utilization of the available water.”<sup>16</sup>
- **“It’s no secret that the U.S. is going to need water. ... It’s no secret that Canada is going to have an overabundance of water,”** said CSIS project leader Armand Peschard-Sverdrup in an interview with the Ottawa Citizen in April 2007.<sup>17</sup> **“At the end of the day, there may have to be arrangements.”**
- Canada does not have an unlimited supply of fresh water. While it contains many lakes and rivers, it holds just **seven per cent of the world’s available freshwater supplies** – water that can be used without damaging the ecosystem or decreasing overall water stock.<sup>18</sup> This is **the same amount of useable water as is available in the United States.**
- Canada is already exporting water to the U.S. through the Alberta tar sands project, which requires between three and five barrels to produce one barrel of oil. Most of that oil heads due south, and the SPP calls for a fivefold increase in production.<sup>19</sup> A recent legal study warns that Canada could face a NAFTA challenge if it attempted to stem the flow of water to the tar sands.<sup>20</sup>
- Water was included as a “good,” a “service,” and an “investment” in NAFTA.<sup>21</sup> So like energy, once Canada begins exporting fresh water to the U.S. for commercial purposes, it will be enormously costly, if not impossible, to stop. In June 2007, the opposition passed a resolution in Parliament that urges the Harper government “to quickly begin talks with its American and Mexican counterparts **to exclude water from the scope of NAFTA.**”<sup>22</sup> There is no indication the Prime Minister has taken the resolution seriously.

According to our poll, **84 per cent of respondents who were Conservative Party voters support the above statement** on the need for a Canadian water policy that bans exports and treats water as a basic human right.



47%


## Canadians are not sold on the U.S.-led “war on terror”

Fewer than half of Canadians (**47%**) agree, and almost a third (**27%**) strongly disagree, that for the sake of improving cross-border flows of trade, Canada should harmonize its security policies with the United States, even if it requires us to share increasing amounts of personal information with U.S. authorities.

**That’s hardly a mandate** for the Harper government to deepen the Liberal’s Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) commitment to **security integration with the United States**—with the belief that common North American security measures will open the border for trade. The billions of dollars Canada has spent on border security,<sup>23</sup> “no-fly” lists, joint Canada-U.S. policing initiatives, and other SPP initiatives, didn’t stop the Bush administration from recently imposing new tariffs on Canadian agricultural imports.<sup>24</sup> Many of these policies did, however, essentially criminalize a substantial number of Canadians who do not qualify as “low risk” under SPP criteria, simply because of where they were born or the colour of their skin.

- The Harper government is developing, with the provinces, so-called **enhanced driver’s licences** (EDLs) that will contain personal and biometric data in Radio Frequency Identification Chips (RFID) that can be read by Canadian and U.S. authorities at the border and airports. Canada’s federal privacy commissioner thinks the project is dangerous and unnecessary. Personal information, including nationality, will be stored in Canadian and U.S. databases, creating a de facto North American ID card once all the provinces have signed up. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security says the EDL project will expand over time, which could mean RFID readers popping up anywhere, ready to check a person’s ID. **There was no debate on this measure, although the Conservative government allocated \$6 million towards EDLs in the 2008 budget.**<sup>25</sup>
- In March 2008, a joint RCMP-Homeland Security SPP pilot project, which put U.S. security agents on Canadian maritime patrols and vice versa, was made permanent. The **Shiprider project** gives some U.S. Coast Guard officers law enforcement privileges in Canadian waters. This kind of cross-border cooperation is also set to expand, according to the RCMP, which is “partnering with a number of other agencies, including provincial police, the Canadian Forces, U.S. state police and immigration and border patrol agencies to also develop the capability to pursue criminals on the ground and in the air.” Again, Canadians did not get a chance to debate this initiative.<sup>26</sup>
- On February 14, 2008, Canada Command and U.S. Northern Command signed a bilateral Civil Assistance Plan that “allows the military from one nation to support the armed forces of the other nation... during floods, forest fires, hurricanes, earthquakes and effects of a terrorist attack.”<sup>27</sup> The Harper government says it is considering whether to release the full text of the military-to-military pact—a priority of the Binational Planning Group and a necessary technical component of the North American Plan for Avian and Pandemic Influenza, signed by SPP leaders in Quebec last August.<sup>28</sup>

There is clearly no democratic mandate for increased security and military integration with the United States.



86%

## Canadians want a say in the Security and Prosperity Partnership

86% of Canadians agree that the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) agreement should be debated and submitted to a vote in Parliament.

So why does the Harper government continue to block access to SPP details and discussions to all but a hand-picked group of corporate executives who have been granted VIP access to annual trilateral summits like the April 2008 meeting in New Orleans? Our Prime Minister and his NAFTA counterparts have displayed nothing short of contempt for democracy and the parliamentary process. They and the 10 Canadian CEOs on the North American Competitiveness Council (NACC) – a 30-member permanent corporate advisory body to the SPP – have been acting on trilateral policies in secret and without a democratic mandate from the various peoples of North America.

- **Canadians are shut out of the process:** According to an article in *Le Devoir* on March 22, 2008, a co-ordination committee, which was promised by the leaders of all three NAFTA countries after the Montebello SPP summit in August last year as a means of informing the public on regulatory policy harmonization, has not been created.<sup>29</sup>
- **Corporations are drafting new laws:** SPP documents acquired through access to information requests show that there is pressure on Canada's various departments to put the corporate NACC recommendations into practice. "The message below from the SPP Secretariat concerns the final recommendations of the NACC and once again we are being asked to respond under very tight deadlines," says one email, in which a Canada Border Services Agency employee is asked to comment on six corporate requests affecting border issues.
- **Exclusive VIP access to annual summits:** The NACC is also the only group to receive regular debriefing sessions from government officials working on the SPP. On March 19, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Council of the Americas held an "off-the-record debriefing" on the February 27, 2008 meeting of SPP ministers and NACC member CEOs in Los Cabos, Mexico. U.S. Secretary of Commerce Carlos Gutierrez addressed the meeting, which was "limited to companies, sectoral associations, local chambers of commerce, and stakeholders."<sup>30</sup>
- **Civil society is ignored:** U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice told journalists on April 8, 2008 that this exclusive corporate sector involvement implies that civil society is being consulted on the SPP. "[The SPP] also has permitted the leaders to engage the public – the private sector and civil society through the North American Competitiveness Council," she said. "And they look forward to, again, engaging that council, because, obviously, trade and prosperity and a good life for the people of North America is not just the work of governments alone."<sup>31</sup>

Without a true and open public debate, there is no mandate for the sweeping regulatory and policy changes proposed in the SPP. Canadians clearly feel they and their elected representatives should have more input into Canada's place within North America. That's what democracy is for, isn't it?



## Surveying Canadian attitudes towards trade issues and the SPP

EnviroNics Research Group was commissioned by the Council of Canadians to conduct a national poll on attitudes towards trade and the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America. Between April 7 and 10, 2008, a total of 1,007 respondents were interviewed, resulting in a margin of error of +/-3.09 per cent 19 times out of 20.

The following statements were issued, after which respondents were asked if they strongly agreed, somewhat agreed, somewhat disagreed, or strongly disagreed. Finally, respondents were asked to answer yes or no as to whether the Security and Prosperity Partnership should be debated and submitted to a vote in the House of Commons.

**Statement 1: Canada should maintain the ability to set its own independent environmental, health and safety standards, even if this might reduce cross-border trade opportunities with the United States.**

Strongly agree – 53%  
Somewhat agree – 34%  
TOTAL AGREE – 87%  
Somewhat disagree – 6%  
Strongly disagree – 3%  
TOTAL DISAGREE – 9%

**Statement 2: Canada should establish an energy policy that provides reliable supplies of oil, gas and electricity at stable prices and protects the environment, even if this means placing restrictions on exports and foreign ownership of Canadian supplies.**

Strongly agree – 55%  
Somewhat agree – 34%  
TOTAL AGREE – 89%  
Somewhat disagree – 5%  
Strongly disagree – 3%  
TOTAL DISAGREE – 8%

**Statement 3: Canada should adopt a comprehensive national water policy that recognizes clean drinking water as a basic human right and also bans the bulk export of fresh water.**

Strongly agree – 63%  
Somewhat agree – 25%  
TOTAL AGREE – 88%  
Somewhat disagree – 5%  
Strongly disagree – 4%  
TOTAL DISAGREE – 9%



.....

**Statement 4: For the sake of improving cross-border flows of trade, Canada should harmonize its security policies with the United States, even if it requires us to share increasing amounts of personal information with U.S. authorities.**

Strongly agree – 16%

Somewhat agree – 31%

TOTAL AGREE – 47%

Somewhat disagree – 21%

Strongly disagree – 27%

TOTAL DISAGREE – 48%

**Final Question: In 2005, Canada, the U.S. and Mexico agreed to harmonize policies in a wide range of areas under a post-NAFTA agreement called the Security and Prosperity Partnership, or SPP. The policies that would be harmonized under the SPP could affect such things as consumer health and safety, environmental regulations, water management, energy exports and border security. Do you agree or disagree that this Security and Prosperity Partnership should be debated and submitted to a vote in the House of Commons?**

Agree – 86%

Disagree – 9%

# 5

## The Council of Canadians' five demands for the SPP

# INTEGRATE THIS!

Our demands in regard to deep integration with the United States are simple and stem from a strong belief in participatory democracy.

There is no good reason why Canadians should be kept in the dark about issues as important as the economic and social future of our country. Corporations certainly shouldn't be drafting government policy behind closed doors. Most of our elected officials do not understand the extent of deep integration and have not had a chance to vote on the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America. Big corporations are currently setting the parameters and timeline for Canada-U.S. integration without our approval. This cannot continue, which is why we demand the following of the Canadian government:

1. Cease all talks leading toward deeper integration between Canada and the United States, including annual Security and Prosperity Partnership summits.
2. Disband the North American Competitiveness Council. Corporations such as Manulife Financial, Suncor, Procter & Gamble and Lockheed Martin should not be writing economic, environmental and security policy on behalf of the Canadian and American governments.
3. Bring the Security and Prosperity Partnership to the House of Commons for a full debate and vote. The Harper government has promised that, "significant international treaties will be submitted for votes in Parliament."
4. Disclose the complete listing of Security and Prosperity Partnership working groups, their contact persons and participating membership, and, if they continue, make public their meeting dates, minutes, and provide opportunities for public input.
5. Consult with Canadians in a meaningful and participatory way on Canada-U.S. relations. The majority of Canadians support independent policies that protect our health and the environment, and safeguard our energy and civil liberties, over an agreement that puts corporate profits first.



## You can help stop the SPP! A citizen's guide to fighting the Security and Prosperity Partnership

There are many ways to get involved in the fight against deep integration and the Security and Prosperity Partnership. We encourage citizens to become informed about the issues, and to find creative ways to ensure that the Canadian government gets the message that further integration with the United States is not acceptable.

Here are some ideas to get you started.

- 1. Visit [IntegrateThis.ca](http://IntegrateThis.ca)!** Read through tons of information on the Security and Prosperity Partnership, deep integration, and other threats to democracy in Canada. You can also sign up to receive regular updates on the SPP, as well as information on upcoming actions and events related to our deep integration campaign.
- 2. Get in touch with your Member of Parliament and the Prime Minister.** Write a letter or make a phone call to let them know your views on deep integration. Most MPs still do not know much about the SPP, or how many government policies actually stem from the trilateral agreement.
- 3. Write a letter to the editor.** This is a good way to share information and get your views out to a larger audience. One of the concerns with the SPP is that many mainstream media sources do not critically analyze how our government is forging closer ties with the United States, and when they do write about the topic, they most often quote government and big business representatives.
- 4. Hold a meeting.** The Council of Canadians can help you find speakers and provide materials for a general discussion about the SPP and deep integration. Many communities across Canada are having these meetings as a way to help Canadians become better informed about the issues.
- 5. Join the Council of Canadians!** We are Canada's largest citizens' watchdog organization with more than 70 local chapters across the country. We work to protect Canadian independence by promoting progressive policies on fair trade, clean water, energy security, public health care, and other issues of social and economic concern to Canadians. The Council does not accept money from corporations or governments. We are sustained by the volunteer energy and financial assistance of our members. Join the Council now!



*For more information about the Council of Canadians and our campaigns please visit our website at [Canadians.org](http://Canadians.org) or call us at 1-800-387-7177.*

.....

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Results of the Environics survey of 1,007 respondents interviewed during the period: April 7th – 10th, 2008 with a margin of error of +/-3.09 per cent 19 times out of 20.
  - <sup>2</sup> See the CBC article, “Bush calls for higher product safety standards, stronger penalties,” November 6, 2007 (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/story/2007/11/06/product-panel.html>).
  - <sup>3</sup> For a preliminary analysis of Harper’s new food, drug and consumer product legislation, see the Council of Canadians article, “Government set to announce really dumb ‘smart’ regulations for food and consumer safety,” by Stuart Trew, February 19, 2008 (<http://www.canadians.org/integratethis/safety/2008/Feb-19.html>). For a more detailed description of the Canadian government’s “risk management” approach see the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA) report, “Putting Canadians at Risk: How the federal government’s deregulation agenda threatens health and environmental standards,” by Marc Lee and Bruce Campbell, September 2006 ([http://www.policyalternatives.ca/documents/National\\_Office\\_Pubs/2006/Putting\\_Canadians\\_at\\_Risk.pdf](http://www.policyalternatives.ca/documents/National_Office_Pubs/2006/Putting_Canadians_at_Risk.pdf)).
  - <sup>4</sup> For more information on the SPP chemicals regulation agreement, see the CCPA report, “More Than Jellybeans: The SPP Regulatory Framework Agreement and its Impact on Chemicals Regulation,” by Bruce Campbell, September 24, 2007 (<http://www.policyalternatives.ca/Reports/2007/09/MoreThanJellybeans/index.cfm?pa=A2286B2A>).
  - <sup>5</sup> For more information on Vitamin D and regulatory harmonization, see the Council of Canadians Action Alert, “Vitamin D, Not SPP,” March 28, 2008 (<http://www.canadians.org/action/2008/28-Mar-08.html>). See also the *Globe and Mail* articles, “Are you getting enough vitamin D?: The sunshine vitamin: Researchers sound alarm over shortage among non-whites,” December 19, 2007, and, “Cancer society calls for major vitamin D trial,” October 25, 2007, both by Martin Mittelstaedt.
  - <sup>6</sup> See the Council of Canadians article, “SPP: Unsafe at any speed,” by Brent Patterson, November 27, 2007 (<http://www.canadians.org/integratethis/safety/2007/Nov-27.html>).
  - <sup>7</sup> For official information on the North American Energy Working Group, see the U.S. Department of Energy’s Office of Policy and Internal Affairs website: <http://www.pi.energy.gov/naewg.html>.
  - <sup>8</sup> “Typically, Canada exports between 50 and 60 per cent of its gas production. In December 2007, natural gas exports to the U.S. were 370 Bcf, 18 per cent higher than in December 2006.” From “Canadian Natural Gas – Monthly Market Update,” February 2008 ([http://www2.nrcan.gc.ca/es/erb/CMFiles/2008\\_2\\_English206KGX-17032008-8247.pdf](http://www2.nrcan.gc.ca/es/erb/CMFiles/2008_2_English206KGX-17032008-8247.pdf)).
  - <sup>9</sup> See the *Globe and Mail* article, “High costs trim forecast for oil sands production,” by Norval Scott, November 16, 2007 (<http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/govrel/news.cfm?story=69207>).
  - <sup>10</sup> “Crude oil and natural gas: Supply and disposition,” in Statistics Canada’s *The Daily*, February 27, 2008 (<http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/080227/d080227c.htm>).
  - <sup>11</sup> See the Canadian Labour Congress research paper, “North American Competitiveness Council and the SPP: Les agents provocateurs at the Montebello Leaders’ Summit,” by Teresa Healy, November 21, 2007 ([http://canadianlabour.ca/index.php/thealy\\_en/1282](http://canadianlabour.ca/index.php/thealy_en/1282)).
  - <sup>12</sup> See the Environmental Defence report, “Canada’s Toxic Tar Sands: The Most Destructive Project on Earth,” February 2008 (<http://www.environmentaldefence.ca/reports/tarsands.htm>).
  - <sup>13</sup> The CBC has reported several times on the issue of illness and cancer rates near the Alberta tar sands. See, “High illness rate near oilsands worrisome, says Alberta health official,” March 10, 2006 (<http://www.cbc.ca/story/canada/national/2006/03/10/oilsands-chipewyan060310.html>).
  - <sup>14</sup> For a list of pipelines, including natural gas projects, see the Council of Canadians article, “The race to deliver tar sands oil is intensifying,” by Brent Patterson, December 13, 2007 (<http://www.canadians.org/integratethis/energy/2007/Dec-13-2.html>).
- .....

.....

<sup>15</sup> See the Toronto Star article, “Canada foils UN water plan,” by Linda Diebel, April 2, 2008 (<http://www.thestar.com/News/Canada/article/409003>).

<sup>16</sup> The North American Future 2025 Project, a briefing paper by Armand B. Peschard-Sverdrup of the Center for Strategic and International Studies ([http://www.canadians.org/water/documents/NA\\_Future\\_2025.pdf](http://www.canadians.org/water/documents/NA_Future_2025.pdf)). Also see the Council of Canadians’ backgrounder on the project ([http://www.canadians.org/water/documents/NA\\_Future\\_2025\\_backgroundunder.pdf](http://www.canadians.org/water/documents/NA_Future_2025_backgroundunder.pdf)).

<sup>17</sup> See the *Ottawa Citizen* article, “Selling water on the agenda at 3-way talks; Canada, U.S., Mexico to discuss future trade in precious resource,” by Kelly Patterson, April 13, 2007.

<sup>18</sup> Environment Canada statistics ([http://www.ec.gc.ca/envirozine/english/issues/42/feature2\\_e.cfm](http://www.ec.gc.ca/envirozine/english/issues/42/feature2_e.cfm)).

<sup>19</sup> See the CBC article, “U.S. urges ‘fivefold expansion’ in Alberta oilsands production,” January 18, 2007 (<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2007/01/17/oil-sands.html>).

<sup>20</sup> Joseph Cumming & Robert Froehlich, “NAFTA Chapter XI and Canada’s Environmental Sovereignty: Investment Flows, Article 1110 and Alberta’s Water Act (FLA),” in the University of Toronto Faculty of Law Review, March 22, 2007.

<sup>21</sup> For a legal opinion on the inadequate protection of water from bulk exports under NAFTA and the WTO rules, see Stephen Shrybman, “Water Export Controls and Canadian International Trade Obligations,” August 17, 1999 ([http://www.canadians.org/water/documents/Water\\_Export\\_Controls\\_Aug\\_99.pdf](http://www.canadians.org/water/documents/Water_Export_Controls_Aug_99.pdf)). See also Murray Dobbin’s October 2002 report, “Zip Locking North America,” which explains: “Chapter 3 of NAFTA establishes obligations regarding the trade in goods. Using the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) definition of a ‘good’ which clearly lists ‘waters, including natural or artificial waters or aerated waters,’ NAFTA adds in an explanatory note that ‘ordinary natural water of all kinds (other than sea water) is included.’” (<http://www.canadians.org/DI/documents/ZipLockingNA.pdf>).

<sup>22</sup> For a snapshot of water issues across Canada, including the positions of the various federal parties, see: <http://www.canadians.org/WorldWaterDay/issues.html>.

<sup>23</sup> See the CBC article, “The 9/11 effect: Has \$24 billion made Canada safer?” by Bill Gillespie, March 21, 2008 ([http://www.cbc.ca/news/viewpoint/vp\\_gillespie/2008/03/the\\_real\\_cost\\_of\\_911\\_has\\_24\\_bi.html](http://www.cbc.ca/news/viewpoint/vp_gillespie/2008/03/the_real_cost_of_911_has_24_bi.html)).

<sup>24</sup> See the *Globe and Mail* article, “Minister decries food fees,” by Barrie McKenna, October 31, 2007.

<sup>25</sup> See the Privacy Commissioner’s concerns about enhanced driver’s licences, from February 5, 2008, here: [http://www.privcom.gc.ca/media/nr-c/2008/res\\_080205\\_e.asp](http://www.privcom.gc.ca/media/nr-c/2008/res_080205_e.asp).

<sup>26</sup> For a more full description of the Shiprider project, which collects the available official and media reports, see the Council of Canadians article, “Joint RCMP-Homeland Security “Shiprider” pilot project to be made permanent,” by Stuart Trew, March 20, 2008 (<http://www.canadians.org/integratethis/insecurity/2008/Mar-20.html>).

<sup>27</sup> See the press release, “U.S. Northern Command, Canada Command establish new bilateral Civil Assistance Plan,” February 14, 2008 (<http://www.northcom.mil/News/2008/021408.html>).

<sup>28</sup> North American Plan for Avian and Pandemic Influenza, August 2007 (<http://www.state.gov/g/avianflu/91242.htm>).

<sup>29</sup> See the *Le Devoir* article, “Adieu aux promesses de Montebello,” by H el ene Buzzetti, March 22, 2008 (<http://www.ledevoir.com/2008/03/22/181787.html>).

<sup>30</sup> See the Council of the Americas calendar entry, “Debriefing with U.S. Secretary of Commerce Carlos Gutierrez,” Wednesday, March 19, 2008 (<http://coa.counciloftheamericas.org/calevent.php?id=289>).

<sup>31</sup> “Remarks With Mexican Foreign Secretary Patricia Espinosa and Canadian Foreign Minister Maxime Bernier After Their Meeting,” April 8, 2008 (<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2008/04/103316.htm>).

.....



Founded in 1985, The Council of Canadians is Canada's largest citizens' organization, with members and chapters across the country. We work to protect Canadian independence by promoting progressive policies on fair trade, clean water, energy security, public health care, and other issues of social and economic concern to Canadians.



*For more information please visit our website at [Canadians.org](http://Canadians.org) or call 1-800-387-7177.*