



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 38, NO. 12

P.O. BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY 2005

## The Plan to Integrate the U.S., Mexico and Canada

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) has just let the cat out of the bag about what's really behind our trade agreements and security partnerships with the other North American countries. A 59-page CFR document spells out a five-year plan for the "establishment by 2010 of a North American economic and security community" with a common "outer security perimeter."

"Community" means integrating the United States with the corruption, socialism, poverty and population of Mexico and Canada. "Common perimeter" means wide-open U.S. borders between the U.S., Mexico and Canada. "Community" is sometimes called "space" but the CFR goal is clear: "a common economic space ... for all people in the region, a space in which trade, capital, and people flow freely." The CFR's "integrated" strategy calls for "a more open border for the movement of goods and people."

The CFR document lays "the groundwork for the freer flow of people within North America." The "common security perimeter" will require us to "harmonize visa and asylum regulations" with Mexico and Canada, "harmonize entry screening," and "fully share data about the exit and entry of foreign nationals."

This CFR document, called "Building a North American Community," asserts that George W. Bush, Mexican President Vicente Fox, and Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin "committed their governments" to this goal when they met at Bush's ranch and at Waco, Texas on March 23, 2005. The three adopted the "Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America" and assigned "working groups" to fill in the details.

It was at this same meeting, grandly called the North American summit, that President Bush pinned the epithet "vigilantes" on the volunteers guarding our border in Arizona.

A follow-up meeting was held in Ottawa on June 27, where the U.S. representative, Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff, told a news conference that "we want to facilitate the flow of traffic across our borders." The White House issued a statement that the Ottawa report "represents an important first step in achieving the goals of the Security and Prosperity Partnership."

### *Open Borders for Low-Wage Workers*

The CFR document calls for creating a "North American preference" so that employers can recruit low-paid workers from anywhere in North America. No longer will illegal aliens have to be smuggled across the border; employers can openly recruit foreigners willing to work for a fraction of U.S. wages. Just to make sure that bringing cheap labor from Mexico is an essential part of the plan, the CFR document calls for "a seamless North American market" and for "the extension of full labor mobility to Mexico."

The document's frequent references to "security" are just a cover for the real objectives. The document's "security cooperation" includes the registration of ballistics and explosives, while Canada specifically refused to cooperate with our Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

To no one's surprise, the CFR plan calls for massive U.S. foreign aid to the other countries. The burden on the U.S. taxpayers will include so-called "multilateral development" from the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, "long-term loans in pesos," and a North American Investment Fund to send U.S. private capital to Mexico.

The experience of the European Union and the World Trade Organization makes it clear that a common market requires a court system, so the CFR document calls for "a permanent tribunal for North American dispute resolution." Get ready for decisions from non-American judges who make up their rules ad hoc and probably hate the United States anyway.

The CFR document calls for allowing Mexican trucks "unlimited access" to the United States, including the hauling of local loads between U.S. cities. The CFR document calls for adopting a "tested once" principle for pharmaceuticals, by which a product tested in Mexico will automatically be considered to have met U.S. standards.

The CFR document demands that we implement "the Social Security Totalization Agreement negotiated between the United States and Mexico." That's code language for putting illegal aliens into the U.S. Social Security system, which is bound to bankrupt the system.

Here's another handout included in the plan. U.S. taxpayers are supposed to create a major fund to finance 60,000 Mexican students to study in U.S. colleges.

To ensure that the U.S. government carries out this plan so that it is "achievable" within five years, the CFR calls for supervision by a North American Advisory Council of "eminent persons from outside government . . . along the lines of the Bilderberg" conferences.

Ask your Senators and Representatives which side they are on: the CFR's integrated North American Community or U.S. sovereignty guarded by our own borders.

### ***The People Behind the CFR Plan***

The best known Americans who are members of the CFR Task Force that wrote the plan for a North American Community are former Massachusetts Governor William Weld and Bill Clinton's immigration chief Doris Meissner.

William Weld was the liberal Republican Governor of Massachusetts who appointed the controversial Margaret Marshall to the Massachusetts high court in 1996. While Governor, he made a big splash trying to get the Republican National Convention to remove the pro-life plank from the Party's platform; he was not successful. After his term as Governor, he sought appointment as Ambassador to Mexico, but Senator Jesse Helms stopped that.

Weld's appointee, Justice Margaret Marshall, became the author of the infamous *Goodridge* decision that ordered same-sex marriage licenses. In her decision, she praised the Canadian court that redefined the traditional meaning of marriage and approved same-sex marriage. "We concur with this remedy," she wrote.

One of the byproducts of integrating the three North American countries could be fulfillment of the threat made by the president of the International Lesbian and Gay Law Association: "Equal marriage is going to become Canada's leading export in the next couple of years." That's because marriages legally performed in another country are traditionally accepted in the United States, and Canada has no residency requirement.

Doris Meissner was President Bill Clinton's Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Administrator. In that capacity, she implemented Al Gore's devious plan in early 1996 to create a million new voters for Clinton by putting a million aliens on the fast track to citizenship even if they didn't qualify and even if they had criminal records. Gore kept the pressure on to make sure the aliens were naturalized by September 1, the last day to register for the presidential election.

Meissner removed alleged "bureaucratic roadblocks" to speedy naturalization by delegating broad authority to her field managers in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, New York and Miami. The aliens who became newly naturalized citi-

zens able to vote included more than 75,000 who had arrest records when they applied, an additional 115,000 citizens whose fingerprints were unclassifiable for various technical reasons and were never rechecked, and another 61,000 who were given citizenship without submitting any fingerprints at all.

INS officials were directed to relax the testing for English, to complete every interview within 20 minutes, and to ensure that all applicants passed the Civics test by continuing to ask questions until they got a sufficient number right, sometimes asking 25 questions to get four or five correct answers. The Democrats who worked on this Gore-Meissner project referred to it in memos as "a citizenship/Clinton voter mill," and it paid off big time: Bill Clinton was reelected President in 1996.

The smoking-gun documentation for this citizenship-election fraud was discovered by David P. Schippers in his role as chief investigative counsel for the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment of Bill Clinton, and was reported in Schippers' book *Sellout*.

### ***Is Lugar on Board with CFR's Plan?***

Another member of the CFR Task Force, American University Professor Robert A. Pastor, presented the CFR plan to "forge a North American Community" at a friendly hearing of Senator Richard Lugar's Foreign Relations Committee on June 9. His theme was that "instead of stopping North Americans on the borders, we ought to provide them with a secure, biometric Border Pass that would ease transit across the border like an E-Z pass permits our cars to speed through toll booths."

Pastor provided documentation to prove that President Bush is a staunch supporter of North American integration. Pastor referred to the Guanajuato Proposal, jointly endorsed by Bush and Mexican President Vicente Fox in February 2001, which read: "After consultation with our Canadian partners, we will strive to consolidate a North American economic community whose benefits reach the lesser-developed areas of the region and extend to the most vulnerable social groups in our countries."

Pastor testified loud and clear that the three-nation integration plan "should be institutionalized in a new North American Advisory Council" that will prepare the agenda for the three governments, monitor the implementation of the plan, advise the three heads of state, and serve as "a public voice and symbol of North America." Obviously, Pastor thinks the democratically elected North American governments need ongoing guidance and instructions from "distinguished individuals" (probably CFR members).

Of course, Pastor's testimony endorsed all the plans laid out in the CFR document, and he added a few other items.

He called for “an integrated continental plan for transportation and infrastructure that includes new North American highways and high-speed rail corridors.” He also called for a National Identification Card, although it’s not clear whether the United States or the new North American Community would issue it.

Pastor claimed that studies (which he didn’t identify) show “a convergence of values, on personal and family issues as well as on public policy.” On the contrary, Americans do not want to converge with Canada on either personal and family issues (such as the definition of marriage) or on public policy (such as SDI).

To expedite American embrace of the CFR plan, Pastor calls for educational centers to help us accept “an integrated North America” and to develop “a new consciousness” so that we will think of ourselves “as North Americans.” He stopped short of suggesting that we change the words of our favorite song to God Bless North America.

Pastor criticized the U.S., Mexican and Canadian government for remaining “zealous defenders of an outdated conception of sovereignty.” **Before it’s too late, we should rise up and encourage all our public officials to be very zealous defenders of American sovereignty.**

### *CAFTA Is Part of the Plan*

The CFR plan called “Building a North American Community” did not mention the Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), but it is obvious that it is part of the scheme. This was made clear by the Senate Republican Policy Committee policy paper released in June 2005. It argued that Congress should pass CAFTA because its purpose is “integrating more closely with 34 hemispheric neighbors — thus furthering the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA)” which the 2001 Quebec Declaration declared would bring about “hemispheric integration.”

President George W. Bush signed the Declaration of Quebec City on April 22, 2001, which was a “commitment to hemispheric integration” larded with favorite United Nations doubletalk such as “interdependent,” “greater economic integration,” and “sustainable development.”

The Senate Republican policy paper argued that CAFTA “will promote democratic governance.” But there is nothing democratic about CAFTA’s many pages of grants of vague authority to foreign tribunals on which foreign judges can force us to change our domestic laws to be “no more burdensome than necessary” on foreign trade.

By stating that CAFTA means the implementation of a “rules-based framework” for trade, investment and technology, the Senate Republican policy paper admitted that free trade requires world, or at least hemispheric, government. You can’t have a common economy without a common government.

CAFTA advocates argue that it is merely an agreement

to promote free trade. But CAFTA is not about free trade; it’s about round-trip trade. That means multinational corporations sending their raw materials to poor countries where they can hire very cheap labor and avoid U.S. employment, safety and environmental regulations, and then bringing the finished goods back into the United States duty-free to undersell U.S. companies that pay decent wages and comply with our laws.

The promise that CAFTA will give us 44 million new customers for U.S. goods is pie in the sky — like the false promise that letting Communist China into the WTO would give us a billion-person market for American agriculture. Or the false promise that NAFTA would increase our trade surplus with Mexico to \$10 billion when, in fact, it nosedived to a \$62 billion deficit.

CAFTA would even prohibit U.S. states from giving preference to American workers when granting taxpayer-funded contracts.

Knowing that Americans are upset about Central America’s chief export to the U.S., which is the incredibly vicious MS-13 Salvadoran gangs, the Senate Republican policy paper assured us that CAFTA will diminish “the incentives for illegal immigration to the United States.” That’s another fairy tale like the unfulfilled promise that NAFTA would reduce illegal aliens and illegal drugs entering our country from Mexico.

It’s no wonder CAFTA’s supporters pressured Congress to pass this agreement by a simple majority vote, thereby bypassing our Constitution’s requirement that treaties can be valid only if passed by two-thirds of our Senators. CAFTA could never get a two-thirds majority.

### *Will We Learn from EU Mistakes?*

Since democracy is the worldwide goal of the Bush Administration, we must face the stunning fact that the integration of different nationalities under a common European Union (EU) constitution was rejected this year by decisive democratic votes. President Bush can thank conservative leaders for saving him from the embarrassment of endorsing the EU constitution shortly before it was so soundly defeated in France and the Netherlands.

The EU constitution was defeated because Western Europeans don’t want to be politically or economically or socially integrated with the culture, economy, lifestyle, or history of Eastern Europe and Muslim countries. Western Europeans recognized in the proposed EU constitution a loss of national identity and freedom to a foreign bureaucracy, plus a redistribution of wealth from richer countries to poorer countries.

Americans don’t want to be “integrated” with the corruption, socialism, poverty, population, and communism of our hemispheric neighbors any more than the French want to be integrated with the Turks and Bulgarians.

The EU political elite ridiculed the French and the Dutch for not realizing that globalism is on the march and we should all get on the train before it leaves the station. The French and Dutch woke up to the fact that the engineers of the EU train are bureaucrats in Brussels and judges in Luxembourg who invent regulations and judge-made laws without so much as a tip of their hats to democracy.

Americans have already had enough impertinent interference with our lives and economy from the international tribunals Congress has already locked us into, such as the WTO (World Trade Organization) and NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement). Americans don't want decisions from another anti-American tribunal any more than the French and Dutch wanted their lives micro-managed by Belgian bureaucrats.

The pro-EU political bosses blamed the "non" vote by the French on worry about losing their jobs to the cheap labor of Eastern Europe and Turkey. But the worry was grounded in reality, and Americans are likewise correct to worry about how CAFTA will put U.S. jobs in competition with low-wage Central America where the average factory worker is paid about one dollar an hour. CAFTA is designed to serve the economic interests of the globalists and the multinational corporations, but it makes no sense historically, constitutionally, or democratically.

### ***Independence Depends on Sovereignty***

Sovereignty means the ability of a government to act without being subject to the legal control of another country or international organization, restrained only by moral principles. The United States Constitution is based on the premise that we are a sovereign nation and we don't obey any power unless authorized in the Constitution.

The enemies of sovereignty are working toward world government, but they know that is a highly unpopular concept. So they woo us with softer semantics, always undefined, such as global governance, human rights, sustainable development, and international justice.

The world government advocates think they can achieve their goal by incremental steps. Europe progressed from the European Common Market to the European Union, and complete integration was to be sealed with the European Union Constitution. In the Western Hemisphere, the steps are NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), CAFTA (Central America Free Trade Agreement), numerous North American summits such as the ones in Quebec in 2001 and at Bush's ranch in 2005, and finally FTAA (Free Trade Area of the Americas).

Bill Clinton was an eager advocate of replacing U.S. sovereignty with global governance. He told the United Nations that he wanted to put America into a "web" of treaties to set the ground rules for "the emerging international system."

Among the treaties that Clinton tried to get the United States to ratify were the International Criminal Court treaty, which would lock us into a global judicial order; the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which would set up a global committee to monitor the way parents raise their children; the Kyoto Protocol to the Convention on Climate Change, which would set up a global tribunal to control our energy use; the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which would create a global commission of feminist "experts" to regulate gender issues in our laws, customs, education and wages; and the Convention on the Law of the Sea, which would create an International Seabed Authority to control and distribute the mineral riches under the seas. Each one of these Clinton-supported treaties would have grabbed a big slice of our sovereignty, but fortunately they were never ratified.

We thank President Bush for opposing most of these treaties, but unfortunately he is on record as supporting the Law of the Sea Treaty. It may be the most dangerous of all.

Clinton's chief foreign policy adviser was notorious for his *Time* magazine article (July 20, 1992) entitled "The Birth of the Global Nation." Talbott opined that "national sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all," and he predicted that "Nationhood as we know it will be obsolete, all states will recognize a single, global authority."

Clinton's Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, in demanding that Yugoslavia surrender its sovereignty, said: "Great nations who understand the importance of sovereignty at various times cede various portions of it in order to achieve some better good for their country."

A new book called *The Case for Sovereignty* by Cornell Professor Jeremy A. Rabkin convincingly explains why the maintenance of American sovereignty, rather than yielding authority to various international institutions, is essential not only for our own security but is beneficial to the peace of the world. He shows that sovereignty is compatible with international *trade* but not with international *regulation* of trade.

Our Declaration of Independence, in essence, is a declaration of American sovereignty. Our freedom depends on keeping our sovereignty — with our own borders — and on avoiding European mistakes. **It is essential that our next President be a man who will stand up for American sovereignty.**

### **The Phyllis Schlafly Report**

PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Periodicals Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Phone: (618) 462-5415.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50¢ each; 3 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.

<http://www.eagleforum.org>

[eagle@eagleforum.org](mailto:eagle@eagleforum.org)