



POSITION PAPER

AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY AND THE NORTH AMERICAN UNION

The term 'Free Trade' is usually defined as the absence of tariffs, quotas, or other governmental barriers to international trade. There is no doubt that many recent free trade agreements have not been very good for the American worker. On the other hand, the agreements have been great for the large multinational corporations, particularly those that have moved their manufacturing plants from the United States to China, Mexico and other low-wage countries where they can hire people there for a few dollars a week. These corporations can now produce their products without worrying about the costs of meeting OSHA requirements, providing employee health care or pensions for its workers and then they can bring their products back into the USA to sell. These products oftentimes are not made to the same quality standards as when they were produced in America and as recent incidents involving Chinese imports have shown, these products can pose health hazards to Americans as well.

The supporters of many free trade agreements, particularly the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), have always promised increased exports, better jobs and better wages. Under many of these free trade agreements, however, just the opposite has occurred. Under NAFTA, for example, the U.S. trade deficit has soared and now averages \$55-65 Billion dollars per month; the U.S. has lost over a million manufacturing jobs and real wages in both the U.S. and Mexico have fallen significantly. In short, NAFTA has not been a friend to the citizenry of either the United States or Mexico.

The force behind much of the modern free trade movement has been two very private, though official sounding organizations, the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission. Members of these two organizations, which have included recent U.S. presidents, currently dominate key positions in America's government, military, multinational corporations, media outlets and educational foundations and institutions. Both organizations support the economic integration of the United States, with Canada and Mexico.

For example, in 2005, the Council on Foreign Relations published a report entitled "Building a North American Community." Some of the recommendations included the need for the US, Canada and Mexico to:

- *"Adopt a common external tariff."*
- *"Adopt a North American Approach to Regulation"*
- *"Establish a common security perimeter by 2010."*
- *"Establish a North American investment fund for infrastructure and human capital."*
- *"Establish a permanent tribunal for North American dispute resolution."*
- *"An annual North American Summit meeting" that would bring the heads-of-state together for the sake of public display of confidence.*
- *"Establish minister-led working groups that will be required to report back within 90 days, and to meet regularly."*
- Create a *"North American Advisory Council"*
- Create a *"North American Inter-Parliamentary Group."*¹⁶

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the United States, Canada and Mexico was negotiated by President George H.W. Bush. The US Trade representative at the time, Ms. Carla Hills, was the primary architect and negotiator of NAFTA. Both President Bush and Ms. Hills were members of the Trilateral Commission. Bill Clinton, the next President, who also became the champion of NAFTA, ultimately fast tracked its passage through congress. Clinton was also a member of the Trilateral Commission.

The Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission have both supported the joint screening of travelers from countries outside of North America at their first point of entry into North America and have recommended the elimination of most controls over the temporary movement of these travelers within North America. In other words, the United States should not control its own border, nor limit the travel of other North Americans into our country. Maybe this is why our government currently seems unwilling or unable to control our borders.

In 2005, a new mechanism was created to speed the further expansion of the NAFTA free trade agreement into a North American Union. It is called the Strategic and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP), which was an agreement between President George W. Bush, President Vicente Fox and Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin during their March 2005 summit meeting in Waco, Texas. The Security and Prosperity Partnership is designed to facilitate the establishment of a North America Union through the "economic integration" of the US, Mexico and Canada. The NAFTA superhighway proposal is another part of the plan and it is also designed to help erase the borders between the three countries. The goal is to create a single entity out of the United States, Canada and Mexico, with a new unelected bureaucracy and possibly with its own monetary system similar to the Euro. Unfortunately, the people of the United States have never had the opportunity to be heard as to whether or not they wanted "economic integration" with Mexico and Canada.

The most important feature of the SPP is that it does not require congressional ratification or the passage of any federal legislation by the congress of the United States. This design places the negotiation fully within the authority of the executive branch in the United States. How else would Mexican truckers be able to begin operating in the USA over the objections of Congress, American truckers and most of the American people?

The people and their elected representatives in congress no longer seem to have a voice when it comes to international trade. This is definitely a national sovereignty issue. International trade issues that affect 300+ million Americans should be made by the people's representatives in Congress, not by a handful of government bureaucrats and corporate elites who use their government connections to bypass congress and ignore our Constitution, which expressly grants Congress the sole authority to regulate international trade.

The goal of these international trade elite is to create an integrated North American Union, complete with a currency, a cross-national bureaucracy, and virtually borderless travel within the proposed Union. Like the European Union, a North American Union would represent another step toward the destruction of our national sovereignty. A free America, with limited, constitutional government, would just be a memory.

I support any legislation, similar to House Con. Res. 40 of the 110th Congress that expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should:

1. Not engage in the construction of a North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Superhighway System;
2. Not allow the Security and Prosperity Partnership to implement regulations that would create a North American Union with Mexico and Canada; and
3. Urges the President to oppose these acts or any other proposals that threaten U.S. sovereignty.

The language of Resolution 40, however, is not strong enough. Free trade agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), World Trade Organization (WTO), and Central American Free Trade Agreement CAFTA are a threat to our sovereignty and independence as a nation because these types of agreements transfer power from the U.S. government to unelected international bureaucrats.

Not all free trade agreements are bad, but I believe that the United States of America must withdraw from any international agreements that infringe upon the freedom, sovereignty and independence of the American people.

By:

JOHN W. WALLACE

Candidate for Congress

New York's 20th Congressional District

www.johnwallaceforcongress.com