

# THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

## WHAT TO DO WHEN YOU DON'T LIKE ANY OF THESE CANDIDATES

*By Tom DeWeese*

Hillary Clinton. John McCain. Barack Obama. Those are our choices for the next president of the United States. Are you happy with that selection? If not, what is your alternative? As the saying goes, “The lesser of two evils is still evil.”

Beyond the presidential race we have congressional candidates, governors, state legislators, county commissioners, mayors, and city council candidates. Are you happy with whom the parties have chosen to offer for election? If not, what’s your alternative?

The real issues of the day are not even being addressed in the campaigns. The falling dollar that will render our money worthless; the rising gas prices that grab the last of our worthless money; the invasion of illegal aliens that are changing our society; the globalization of our economy; assaults on our private

property; the loss of American jobs to foreign countries; and now the threat of food shortages.

These are real problems facing every American, yet it is apparently politically incorrect to discuss them. There are no questions concerning these issues during debates, on Sunday morning political talk shows, or anywhere in the news media in relationship to the candidates. It’s not there. Not to be discussed. The powers in charge are picking the issues – no matter how frustrated the electorate is.

Is it any wonder that there are millions of Americans who don’t vote or participate in our nation’s debate because they think it doesn’t matter anyway. The “average voter” increasingly feels that the decisions have been made for them.

College students, just starting out in the world, wide eyed and ready to make a difference, end up just shrugging their shoulders at the selection of candidates and stay home.

Those who hold conservative points of view that our nation should live within the Constitution now believe socialism is inevitable, so why bother going to the polls.

And the poor think they are simply pawns in a vice grip between big money and special interests which control the elections. Why bother? Helplessness now rules the world’s greatest representative democracy. As people stay home or

trudge to the polls to unenthusiastically vote to the next lesser of two evils, 93% of incumbents are routinely returned to office – year after year after year.

The instant a candidate is elected and joins the ranks of the incumbents he/she begins the dance. Get the money for the next campaign. How? Special interests groups, corporations and foreign interests flood into their offices to make deals, promote their personal agendas and show the way to fame, fortune and perpetual office – if only the incumbents go along. They have the whole process well in hand. Campaigns become little more than big PR projects, promoted in positive platitudes, specifically designed to assure nothing negative sticks. Just get through it and keep the gravy train running.

Above all, do not talk about controversial subjects like dollar values, global trade or immigration; just stick to issues like health care and the environment – coincidentally, two issues bought and paid for by the special interests. See how it works?

So year after year we officially hold elections and politicians pontificate about how our going to the polls is a revered right; a valued tradition; the underpinning of a free society. And they wonder why there is such division in the nation. How did we end up in such a mess? We voted for these guys. But did we enjoy it? Are we satisfied with the

### IN THIS ISSUE:

4. ABSOLUTES:  
National Survey Reveals  
Strong Opposition to NAU
6. INSIDERS REPORT:  
SPP “Busted” - Now Called  
NASRA. It’s Time to Call a  
Halt to the SPP!
8. SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY:  
Fire Mary Peters

results? Would we like to demand a do over?

Don't despair. Don't give up. There is a logical, effective way out of this. But it won't happen by depending on political parties to lead the way. We have to take things into our own hands. We need an effective, binding form of protest to say NO to bad candidates. There is such a way.

Imagine going into the voting booth and looking down the list of candidates offered. None really appeal. None seem to offer satisfaction as an answer to the issues that concern you. If only there was something else you could do. A write in won't help. It would take such a difficult, expensive effort. It rarely works.

Then you look further down the ballot. Something new. It says "NONE OF THE ABOVE." It's a final choice after the candidates – after the candidates in every category, from president, to congress to city council. What does it mean?

It means you have the power to decide who will hold office – not the power brokers. When the votes are tallied, if "NONE OF THE ABOVE" gets a majority of votes over any of the candidates listed, then "NONE OF THE ABOVE" wins. And that means none of those candidates will win the office. The election will have to be held again and new candidates will have to try to win the public's support.

Fixing the election process could be that simple. You, the voter, would be completely in the driver's seat with the power to reject candidates, forcing a new election with new choices. The political parties would be forced to provide candidates the people want -- or face being rejected. They would have to talk about real issues – or face being rejected. Incumbents would have to answer for their actions in office – or face being rejected. "NONE OF THE ABOVE." Period. The power of labor unions and international corporations would be broken.

Think of the consequences. No longer would voters have to settle for the lesser of two evils. If all the candidates are bad – none would be able to force their way into office. It would mean that powerful special interests could no longer rely on their money to buy elections. They could buy all the ads

they wanted, spend millions on "volunteers" going door to door, and sling their dirt, but if the voters aren't buying, none of it will save their candidate from being rejected by "NONE OF THE ABOVE."

Moreover, the power of entrenched incumbents who have been unbeatable because of their massive war chests and party ties would be broken. Picture Ted Kennedy unable to run for office because he was rejected by "NONE OF THE ABOVE."

However, in order to work, "NONE OF THE ABOVE" would have to be binding. It would have to have the power of law behind it. It cannot be just a "protest" vote that has no other meaning.

"NONE OF THE ABOVE" is completely non-partisan. There is no way to control its outcome. There is no need for a massive campaign chest to support "NONE OF THE ABOVE," although it could certainly be done. But the option, once permanently placed on the ballot, would always be there. America's representative system would be restored.

To get the job done, activists in every state would have to begin a campaign to demand that "NONE OF THE ABOVE" be given a permanent spot on the ballot. It would have to be done state by state. Some states have ballot referendums and initiatives using petition drives to get an issue on the ballot so the people can decide. It's difficult and expensive to do, but popular ideas have a chance.

In other states, "NONE OF THE ABOVE" advocates would have to find a friendly state representative or senator to introduce the idea before the state legislature and then get enough votes to pass it in both houses and then signed by the governor. And if the effort is successful then every one of those legislators is an incumbent who will have to face "NONE OF THE ABOVE" or the ballot for their re-election. They probably won't be too excited about the idea.

Of course, one of their main objections to the "NONE OF THE ABOVE" idea would be the requirement for holding a new election should it win. Too expensive, our responsible public servants would say as they dismissed the idea. The fact is, such a need would probably not arise often (*Cont'd on Page 3*)

## THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 14, No. 6 June 2008

Published by  
American Policy Center

Editor  
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor  
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment  
Sascha McGuckin  
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout  
Kristy Wilson

The DeWeese Report  
70 Main Street, Suite 23  
Warrenton, VA 20186

Phone: (540) 341-8911  
Fax: (540) 341-8917

E-mail:  
ampolicycenter@hotmail.com

Web Page:  
www.americanpolicy.org

© 2008 American Policy Center  
ISSN 1086-7937  
All Rights Reserved

Newsletter of the  
American Policy Center

Permission to photocopy, reprint and quote articles from The DeWeese Report is hereby granted, provided full acknowledgment is included. All reprinted articles must say: "Written by Tom DeWeese, editor of The DeWeese Report (unless another author is listed). All reprints must carry The DeWeese Report address and phone number. Samples of the reprint must be provided to The DeWeese Report.

**CANDIDATES...***(Cont'd from Page 2)*

once political power brokers began to understand that they must offer candidates acceptable to the people rather than to the special interests. That's all they really have to do. It's all we want.

The fact is, the idea of "NONE OF THE ABOVE" has been around for a long time. Over the years, most states have had some kind of legislation introduced supporting the concept. Nevada actually has it on the ballot – but it is not binding. It doesn't force a new election. It is just a measure of protest. That's not good enough to make it effective.

One of the reasons it has not been successful is because there has never been a serious national drive to promote the idea. However, with the growing dissatisfaction voters are feeling with the quality of candidates running for public office, particularly in the presidential campaign, perhaps there has never been a better time to start a national discussion on the issue.

The best part is that "NONE OF THE ABOVE" isn't a conservative or liberal idea. It's not a Republican or Democrat proposal. In fact, Republican leadership might see it as a good way to break the back of big labor's influence over elections. Equally, Democrats could see it as a way to stop the power and influence of the Republican's big business money. However they want to look at it, the bottom line is that the voters win.

So as we sigh and moan over the choices of Obama, Hillary and McCain, let's start the debate and as Larry the Cable Guy says, "let's get 'er done." Perhaps by the next election cycle we won't have to take it anymore!

**MARY PETERS...** *(Cont'd from Page 8)*

"Do you show a driver an octagonal STOP sign at the border and qualify him if he explains the sign means 'ALTO,'" Dorgan asked with obvious agitation, "ALTO is the Spanish Word for STOP," he said.

"Yes," Scovel answered, hesitatingly. "If the stop sign is identified as 'alto' the driver is considered English proficient."

"In other words," said Dorgan, "the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration is allowing Mexican drivers in the demonstration project to prove their proficiency in English by responding to the examiner's questions in Spanish?"

Mary Peters responded, "U.S. highway signs comply with international standards. I drive frequently in Mexico and I always recognize the octagonal 'ALTO' signs as 'STOP' signs."

"Excuse me, Madame Secretary," said Dorgan, "the question is not whether you understand Mexican highway signs when driving in Mexico but whether Mexican drivers entering the U.S. in your demonstration project can pass an English proficiency test by answering the questions totally in Spanish."

Answered Peters, "But answering in Spanish, the drivers explain they understand the English-language highway signs." Countered Dorgan, "If you answer in Spanish, you're not English proficient."

Continued Dorgan, "My main concern is safety. We've established (in the Senate hearing) that there are no equivalencies between Mexican trucks and U.S. trucks. There are no equivalent safety standards. Mexico has no reliable database for vehicle inspections, no accident reports or driver's records. Now you tell us Mexican drivers can pass their English proficiency tests in Spanish. The Department of Transportation is telling Congress – 'We're doing this and we don't care'--" Senator Dorgan concluded.

In a news release issued just prior to the March 10, 2008 Senate hearing, Peters tried to take the offensive against Senate efforts to stop the Mexican truck project. In the release she said, "Our drivers and our workers don't deserve a timeout for success and prosperity. So my message to Congress is clear. If you want to help American businesses thrive,

support American agricultural success, and champion American highway safety, then keep on trucking with cross border shipping."

Obviously Secretary Peters is pandering to American workers. None of what she said is true. American workers are being destroyed by agreements like NAAFTA and the SPP. Wages are down. American jobs are disappearing and America's trade deficit is out of control because of these agreements.

Moreover, American trucking companies are not seeking "markets" in Mexico. They don't want to drive their trucks into that country. As James Hoffa said, "It's ridiculous when the State Department issues regular warnings to alert U.S. citizens to the dangers of kidnapping and murder if they travel Mexico's roads...No trucker wants to drive a load of automobiles into Mexico to park them somewhere."

Hoffa went on to say, "It's a disgrace that Mary Peters is still in office. She has broken the law and defied the will of the American people by exposing them to dangerous trucks from Mexico." The Teamsters Union has filed suit to stop the Mexican trucks from crossing the border and has called for Mary Peters to be fired.

The fact is, the Bush Administration, represented by Mary Peters, is determined to force the Mexican truck project on the American people because of agreements it has made with Mexico to open our borders. Further, it has made agreements with international corporations, through Public/Private Partnerships, to use the power of government to allow them to plunder the U.S. economy with little regard as to the impact on the American people.

As Senator Dorgan said, the Bush Administration doesn't care what Americans think about these policies. Mary Peters should be fired as a way to send a very strong message to the Bush Administration that the American people are fed up with its arrogance. Her firing would be a major blow to efforts to impose the North American Union, which of course President Bush denies exists. Fire Mary Peters first, and we'll get the rest of the gang later.



# ABSOLUTES....!

## National Survey Reveals Strong Opposition To North American Union

*APC News Release*

While President Bush and his counterparts in Mexico and Canada continue to deny that the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) is the beginning of a North American Union, Americans around the nation are expressing their growing opposition to the scheme.

The American Policy Center, (APC) a grassroots activist organization located in suburban Washington, DC has just concluded a survey of one million American households. The survey, titled "Do Americans Support a North American Union" asked a series of questions concerning the SPP and the Trans Texas Corridor (TTC). The survey package also included a four-page report prepared by APC entitled "NAU Fact Sheet," providing details about the SPP, the TTC and how these programs are being implemented quietly, behind closed-door meetings like the one just completed in New Orleans.

It is important to note that APC did not select households that might represent specific ideological positions. The chosen households represented neither conservative nor liberal positions. Instead the recipients were a wide variety of Americans who live in the direct path of the proposed Trans Texas/NAFTA Corridor, from Texas to Minnesota.

The questions on the survey were:

1. **Have you heard of the Security and Prosperity Partnership?** 58% of those responding said they had NOT heard of the SPP.

2. **Do you think private corporations should have the power to enforce trade policy that may adversely affect our national sovereignty and independence?** This question relates directly to the establishment of Public/Private Partnerships between private corporations and government which grant no-compete clauses and Comprehensive Development Agreements (CDA) which provide guarantees by

government to the corporations on investment returns. As such, projects like the TTC are not free enterprise but rather government-sanctioned monopolies. As APC explained this process in the survey, fully 95% of the recipients OPPOSED such policy.

3. Chapter 11 of the NAFTA Agreement states that, disputes over NAFTA-related issues will be heard in NAFTA courts superseding U.S. local, state and federal courts, including the Supreme Court. Question three asked, **Do you think this would be a threat to U.S. Sovereignty?** 91% responded YES.

4. The SPP calls for expanding the U.S. security perimeter to include the borders of Canada and Mexico. Question 4 asked, **Do you think it would strengthen U.S. Security to expand our borders to the outer borders of Canada and Mexico?** 87% of responders answered NO.

5. **Do you think it will strengthen U.S. Border security to allow trucks from Mexico and Canada to travel, free of inspection, up a corridor which has been built and controlled by foreign corporations into the heartland of the United States?** Texas Department of Transportation has already signed a 50-year agreement with a Spanish company named Cintra to build the TTC. In September of 2007 the Bush Administration started a pilot project to allow Mexican trucks to cross the U.S. border without inspections and are free to travel inside the United States. Meanwhile, the Senate passed the 2008 omnibus spending bill that "was clearly written and designed to put the breaks on the current pilot program," according to sponsor Senator Bryon Dorgan. Yet, the Bush Administration, under the leadership of Transportation Secretary Mary Peters, continues the program, now in violation of federal law. 95% of responders to the APC survey OPPOSED the Mexican truck project.

## ...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

**6. Would you support efforts to replace the U.S. dollar with a common North American currency some call the “Amero?”** Though denied by the Bush Administration, there has been much discussion in economic and academic circles about the creation of a North American currency much like the Euro. In October 2007, during an appearance on the Larry King Show on CNN, former Mexican President Vicente Fox answered in the affirmative when King asked him about the creation of a united currency. In the May/June issue of the Council on Foreign Relations magazine *Foreign Affairs*, in an article entitled “The End of National Currency” economist Benn Steil said the dollar is “a temporary currency.” 92% of survey responders said NO, they would not support such a common North American currency.

**7. Do you believe there should be public hearings and debate on this policy before it is allowed to move forward?** To date, there has been no congressional legislation, no congressional hearings and no congressional oversight concerning the establishment or operation of the SPP. No federal money has been officially allocated by Congress. No official authority has been provided for the creation of the SPP. Obviously, Americans feel it is wrong to make such significant changes in our national policy without open debate as 95% of survey respondents said YES, there should be debate and discussion.

**8. Should the Bush Administration be allowed to move forward with its plans to create a “North American Community” without Congressional approval?** Again, the American people have shown they understand that it is Congress which decides such policy as they responded with a resounding 97% NO to this question.

**9. Do you believe the United States should be “harmonized” or merged into a union with Mexico and Canada?** The words most often used by the Administration concerning the SPP are “harmonize,” and “integrate.” The United States

is a representative Republic; Mexico is a socialist government; and Canada is part of the British Crown. There are no grounds for “harmonization” unless drastic changes are made to the US judicial and financial system. 88% of survey responders said NO to harmonization with Mexico and Canada.

10. Finally, responders were asked to provide their own comments and thoughts on the SPP. The word most often used was “**Treason.**” Another said, “**I want no part of the social health care of Canada and I do not want to incorporate Mexico’s turmoil and poverty into our United States.**” Many others said, “**I want secure borders, not easy traffic between the US, Canada and Mexico.**” Said another, “**Bush’s actions formulate a horrifying destruction of our proud nation.**” Stronger language was used by many more responders. Clearly Americans, once they learn about the SPP are strongly opposed.

However, once again this week (April 21-22) in yet another closed door SPP meeting in New Orleans, President Bush and his fellow heads of state from Mexico and Canada continued to deny the SPP is anything more than a “dialog” among the three nations.

“Yet,” said Tom DeWeese, president of the American Policy Center, “as the Texas Department of Transportation signs an agreement with the Spanish company Cintra, containing no-compete clauses and guaranteed returns; as the Kansas City council loans \$2.5 million to build the inland truck port called KC Smart Port; as the twenty SPP working groups continue to write policy; as the Mexican trucks roll over our borders; as high level meetings go on – the Bush Administration dares to deny that ANYTHING is happening. Why? The responses to APC’s survey show why. When Americans understand the truth, they say NO in resounding numbers.” Concluded DeWeese, clearly the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to the harmonization of North America. We just want our country -- strong, independent and secure.”



# INSIDER'S REPORT

## SPP "Busted" - Now Called NASRA. IT'S TIME TO CALL A HALT TO THE SPP!

By Kathy Lehman

The "Three Amigos" are attempting an old-fashioned switcheroo, much like the 1930's grifters portrayed by Newman and Redford in "The Sting." Frustrated that alert and clear-thinking Americans and Canadians see the nefarious purposes behind the "Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP)," President Bush has apparently concluded "that dog won't hunt" - at least not under the moniker of "SPP." In a surprisingly simple-minded approach, the President has apparently decided changing a skunk's name changes the fact that it still stinks. **Shame on President Bush!** If he weren't up to his neck in treachery, he would not need to hide his activities from the nation.

Last year's **secret** SPP summit meeting in Montebello focused on finding ways to get the people to swallow the idea of the collaboration leading to the North American Union, and to quiet its critics. Presumably, these were the topics of discussion when members of the North American Competitiveness Council (NACC) met with the leaders behind closed doors. The NACC is a largely secretive advisory council to the SPP consisting of representatives of such companies as Wal Mart, Chevron Oil, and Lockheed-Martin.

An internal memo from Canada's Foreign Affairs and Internal Trade ministry documents that the NACC was urged to **launch a public relations campaign** to counter growing criticism of the trilateral cooperative that is a cornerstone of the building North American Union. According to the memo, "Leaders discussed some of the difficulties of the SPP, including the lack of popular support and the failure of the public to understand the competitive challenges confronting North America." The memo emphasized the "NACC members should (play) a role in communicating the merits of North American collaboration." Am I the only one who remembers the definition of "collaboration," at least as it applies to nations and their citizens?

Further, in point of fact, these "competitive challenges" do not face North America...they face global corporations doing business in North America. **The SPP has nothing to do with ensuring the security**

**and prosperity of the United State's citizens, or U.S. corporations would first and foremost conduct business as Americans.** The "Partnership" is between government and business; it values the nation's citizens only as human resources.

Many corporate CEOs now seem to favor former CEO of GE Jack Welsh's advice (as far as they practically can) that, "the ideal factory would be built on a barge" so it could be hauled around the world to low-wage areas, where it could operate without labor rules, environmental protections or other standards.

Following the advice in March of the Frazier Institute, a Canadian think tank, the "SPP" will forthwith and hereafter (until another name is required) be known as the "**North American Standards and Regulatory Area.**" I say "until another name is required" in full faith that as growing numbers of Americans learn of this treachery at the highest levels of our government, they will resoundingly oppose it.

**Of greater significance than the name change is the Institute's call to expand and speed up the process of integration.** One Canadian reporter said of last year's SPP Summit that the SPP was "dead" and "defunct." Another recently stated the SPP has "collapsed under a heap of conspiratorial rubbish." This is pure garbage.

The "conspiratorial" label is pretty amusing, though, considering the Frazier Institute report suggested the name "North American Union," or NAU, be dropped in favor of the new name. Unfortunately, the SPP is far from dead. But the growing public attention, and profound disapproval, obviously worries those sneaking around to secret meetings in dimly lit corners with secret files.

**Results of a brand new American Policy Center survey** on the SPP clearly show when Americans understand the truth, they say "No!" in phenomenal numbers. People are overwhelmingly opposed to the "harmonization" and "integration," both economically and politically, of Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.

Even the name of the “Fourth SPP Annual Summit” was changed to the “North American Leaders’ Summit.” There’s an oxymoron for you; “Leaders” indeed!

Enough, already! **President Bush, it’s time to tell the American people:**

- What’s on the table; what’s the “big picture?”
- What have the 20 SPP Working Groups been working on these past three years, specifically?
- What promises have been made to the leaders of Canada and Mexico; to members of the NACC?
- Will the 51 NACC proposals made to SPP negotiators last year, these “regulatory changes that don’t require legislative approval,” favor narrow corporate interests over American’s welfare, freedom, and liberty?
- What regulatory changes have already been made?
- Why, President Bush, are you involved in **secret** meetings and negotiations involving the very sovereignty of the United States without the advice and consent of Congress, the American people, or even under scrutiny of the Fourth Estate, even as largely worthless as it is?

### ACTION TO TAKE

It’s time to **FLOOD** your Senators and Representatives with emails and faxes.

- Contact Speaker of the House, **Nancy Pelosi** at (202) 225-4965, or fax at (202) 225-8259. Tell Speaker Pelosi you are **outraged** at these continuing secret SPP/NAU meetings and activities. Tell her:
  1. **Congress has TOO LONG shirked its oversight duty to the American People!**
  2. **You want the SPP stopped!**
  3. **You want an immediate halt to funding for any SPP activities involving employees of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security; and,**
  4. **You want immediate hearings on, SPP activities participated in by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security.**
- Contact House Majority Whip, **Steny Hoyer**.
- Contact House Minority Leader, **John Boehner**.
- Contact House Minority Whip, **Roy Blunt**.
- **Contact your member of Congress.**
- **Call the Congressional switchboard at (202) 224-3121.** A switchboard operator will connect you directly with the House office you request. Tell these Congressmen you are **outraged** at these continuing

secret SPP/NAU meetings and activities. Tell them:

1. **Congress has TOO LONG shirked its oversight duty to the American People!**
  2. **You want the SPP stopped!**
  3. **You want an immediate halt to funding for any SPP activities involving employees of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security; and,**
  4. **You want immediate hearings on, SPP activities participated in by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security.**
- Contact Senate Majority Leader, **Harry Reid** at (202) 224-3542, or fax at (202) 224-7327. Tell Leader Reid you are **outraged** at these continuing secret SPP/NAU meetings and activities. Tell him:
    1. **Congress has TOO LONG shirked its oversight duty to the American People!**
    2. **You want the SPP stopped!**
    3. **You want an immediate halt to funding for any SPP activities involving employees of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security; and,**
    4. **You want immediate hearings on, SPP activities participated in by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security.**
  - Contact Senate Assistant Majority Leader, **Richard Durbin**.
  - Contact Senate Minority Leader, **Mitch McConnell**.
  - Contact Senate Assistant Minority Leader, **Jon Kyl**. Tell these Senators you are outraged at these continuing secret SPP/NAU meetings and activities. Tell them:
    1. **Congress has TOO LONG shirked its oversight duty to the American People!**
    2. **You want the SPP stopped!**
    3. **You want an immediate halt to funding for any SPP activities involving employees of the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security; and,**
    4. **You want immediate hearings on, SPP activities participated in by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Homeland Security.**

You will find a complete list of fax numbers and email addresses for House and Senate members at [www.conservativeusa.org/mega-cong.htm](http://www.conservativeusa.org/mega-cong.htm).



# SPOTLIGHT ON TYRANNY

## FIRE MARY PETERS

By Tom DeWeese

The Bush Administration has directly defied, not only the will and intent of Congress, but it is now openly ignoring legislation that the President himself signed into law. As a result a Constitutional crisis is rapidly developing over a project to let Mexican trucks on U.S. roads. As a result, many are now calling for the firing of U.S. Transportation Secretary Mary Peters.

In September 2007, the Bush Administration began a pilot project to allow Mexican trucks to drive on U.S. highways. The project is, frankly, necessary if goals for the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) are to be achieved. The SPP openly calls for “harmonizing” the borders between the U.S. Mexico and Canada. In fact, the Bush Administration sites the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) as its authority to push the project.

Congress was not happy with the program. Several members immediately sighted problems with safety of the Mexican trucks, including the inability of Mexican drivers to read English road signs in the US. Within weeks of the beginning of the project, both houses of congress began to draft legislation to put a stop to it.

Quickly, Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) introduced an amendment to the Department of Transportation (DOT) appropriations bill to remove funding for the project. The amendment was passed by a bi-partisan majority of 74-24 and subsequently became part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, signed into law by President Bush on December 26, 2007.

To make it perfectly clear that the legislation was a demand for the Administration to stop the Mexican truck project, Senator Dorgan received a letter from the Senate Legislative Council to confirm the law’s intent. The letter said, *“No funds made available under the Consolidation Appropriations Act, 2008, were to be used in fiscal year 2008 to establish or implement a cross-border motor carrier demonstration program to allow Mexican-domiciled motor carriers to operate beyond the commercial zones along the international border between the United States and Mexico.”*

Can it be more clear? Further, it is the Constitutional duty of the Congress to fund or not to fund programs. Yet, in defiance of this clear intention of Congress, Secretary Peters continues to move forward, spending funds for the truck project unabated and against federal law.

Melissa Delaney, spokeswoman for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Association (FMCSA), indicated the administration will simply ignore the congressional funding issue. In an all-too-familiar display of contempt for the concerns of the American people and in defiance of Congress,

Delaney said, “We are committed to incremental steps in demonstrating the safety of the cross-border program, but there is no requirement to have a demonstration project.”

Apparently hoping to convince Congress to back off its plan to kill the program, on October 17th Secretary of Transportation Mary Peters called a press conference. She then instructed a Maryland state trooper to inspect a Mexican truck in front of DOT headquarters, claiming this action would “prove” that Mexican trucks are as safe as U.S. trucks.

This childish charade prompted Teamster President James Hoffa to ask, “Does the Bush administration think we’re stupid? It’s insulting to the intelligence of the American people to suggest that a staged truck inspection before the news media proves anything.”

In fact, actual inspections of the Mexican trucks prove that they are not safe to be on U.S. highways. A law firm (Cullen Law Firm of Washington, D.C.) has been compiling safety inspection reports on Mexican trucks in preparation for a lawsuit to stop the trucks from crossing the border. Their findings on Mexican truck safety are frightening and very telling about the agenda of the Bush Administration.

According to the Cullen documentation, in the span of one year, September 2006 to September 2007, four of the Mexican companies participating in the Bush administration’s test trucking program collected more than 1,700 safety violations. One company was Trinity Industries de Mexico, which was cited more than 1,100 times, averaging 112 violations per truck.

Another major concern about the safety of the Mexican trucks crossing our border is the ability of the drivers to read and understand highway signs. The Bush Administration has falsely assured that the drivers are required to be proficient in English before crossing the border. A brochure aimed at Mexican drivers on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration’s website says, “Did you know? You MUST be able to read and speak English to drive truck in the United States.”

Yet, under heavy questioning during a Senate hearing in March, 2008, Transportation Secretary Peters and DOT Inspector General Calvin Scovel reluctantly admitted that Mexican drivers were being approved at the border as “proficient in English” even though they could only explain U.S. traffic signs in Spanish.

Here is the verbatim exchange between Senator Dorgan, Peters and Scovel. Dorgan asked, “Does the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration test for English proficiency at the border include questions about U.S. highway signs?” (Cont’d on Pg. 3)