NAFTATHOUGHTS

A Newsletter on the North American Free Trade Agreement

Vol. 2, No. 5 December 1992

NAFTA SIGNED, DEBATE HEATS UP

On 17 December, official signing ceremonies for the North American Free Trade Agreement were held in Washington, Ottawa and Mexico City. At each site, the ceremonies were marred by protests from citizens' groups.

Outside the headquarters of the Organization of American States, where President Bush was signing the accord, activists led by Greenpeace USA staged a spirited demonstration to denounce the NAFTA's anticipated impact on the environments and workers of North America. In Canada, NAFTA opponents invaded the signing ceremony, covering the Canadian and Mexican flags with a U.S. flag and asserting that Prime Minister Mulroney had lied to the Canadian people about the agreement.

At the same time, the Mexican Action Network on Free Trade (RMALC) denounced the "antidemocratic, exclusive and secretive climate" in which the NAFTA was negotiated and reiterated its demand for the inclusion of a Social Agenda in the NAFTA that would deal with "social and democratic participation in its widest sense, and include matters of labor, the environment, human rights, migration and compensatory programs as recognition of the asymmetries" in the levels of development among the three countries.

The signing ceremony marks the last official act of the Bush Administration vis-a-vis NAFTA. The new Clinton Administration will have the responsibility for completing and submitting the implementing legislation to Congress, which will, under fast-track law, then have 90 legislative days to approve or reject the agreement. It is still unclear when the submission might occur, but President-elect Clinton this month repeated his intent to negotiate supplemental agreements on labor and environmental matters before submitting the NAFTA implementing legislation to Congress.

At a press conference held the day before the signing ceremony, leaders of the Alliance for Responsible Trade (formerly MODTLE) and Citizen Trade Campaign called on Clinton to reject or renegotiate the agreement. The Rev. Jesse Jackson stressed at the event that "Bush's NAFTA represents the failed policies of a defeated administration."

The coalition also released a letter signed by over 50 U.S. unions, environmental, labor rights, religious and development groups and sent to President-elect Clinton and to members of Congress. The letter outlined 13 problems with the NAFTA that would inhibit achievement of many of the goals and targets set out during Clinton's campaign and in his book, Putting People First. These include threats to U.S. food, safety, labor and environmental standards, the lack of trade-related enforcement of standards, and the undemocratic dispute resolution mechanisms.

Citizens' groups in all three countries have also been busy analyzing the NAFTA text released on 6 September. The executive summary of the U.S. analysis, released on 14 December, is included in this issue of NAFTAThoughts. (This issue also includes a sample petition on NAFTA designed by the Fair Trade Campaign; see page 9.) Representatives of the U.S., Canadian and Mexican analysis teams and NAFTA networks will meet in Mexico City in mid-January to formulate a trinational analysis of the accord. •

Sources: "Jackson set to lead NAFTA opposition with factory protests," by Robert Trautman, Washington Times, 17 December, 1992; "Ante la Firma del Tratado de Libre Comercio: La Sociedad y su Agenda Están Austentes del Contenido del Tratado de Libre Comercio (TLC) Que Solo Responde a los Intereses de la Gran Empresa," Red Mexicana de Acción Frente al Libre Comercio, 16 December 1992; "NAFTA Pact Signed," Washington Post, 18 December 1992; "Trade Pact Signed in 3 Capitals," by Keith Bradsher, New York Times, 18 December 1992.

THE MEXICAN ECONOMY: THE REALITY OF THE "MIRACLE"

by Mary Purcell, Equipo PUEBLO

President Carlos Salinas de Gortari continues to win praise from business leaders and the international financial institutions for his handling of the economy. Yet the macroeconomic growth he has presided over since 1987 has been achieved largely through declining real wages and increasing poverty.

"The Pact for Efficiency, Competitiveness, and Jobs"

On 20 October government, business, labor and campesino leaders signed the sixth macroeconomic stabilization pact, setting the rules for national economic management through December 1993. The new Pact reflects the government's continued drive to achieve single-digit inflation at all costs in order to provide a more attractive investment climate. The result will likely be lower growth and fewer jobs.

The terms of the Pact restrict minimum wage increases to between 7 and 8.2 percent, depending on the sector. Price increases for public-sector goods and services, such as gasoline and electricity, will be held to no more than 9.9 percent. Meanwhile, the private sector "promises" that it will also restrict price increases. The Pact also calls for devaluing the peso by 4.6 percent in 1993, a relatively modest rate which mollified the fears of investors and those with savings who had expected a "maxi-devaluation". However, it still leaves the peso significantly overvalued (by 30 percent according to some estimates), and by the second half of 1993 there could be extreme pressure for a much larger devaluation.

Balance of Payments

A combination of factors, including a growing trade deficit, point to a serious balance-of-payments crisis sometime in 1993. As evidence of its growing concern over the trade balance, the government recently took administrative measures to curb the growth of imports, including a reduction in the tax-free personal allowance on border transactions and a new "Buy Mexican" campaign.

Faced with very low levels of internal savings, the government is betting on capital inflows of $15 billion per year over the next ten years, an unlikely proposition given the scarcity of capital in the international markets.

Labor Market: Employment and Salaries

Between 1982 and 1987 the real minimum wage in Mexico fell 40 percent. Since the initiation of macroeconomic stabilization pacts in 1987 it has decreased another 43 percent. The salaries of contract workers have grown more than the minimum wage in recent years, but they have still been insufficient to permit Mexicans to regain the purchasing power they lost in the 1980s.

The government claims that open unemployment is 2.9 percent, a gross underestimate. According to official estimates, the informal economy has grown from 12.9 percent of GDP in 1986 to 22.5 percent in 1991. Independent researchers, however, claim that the informal economy accounts for as much as a third of the GDP and one half of the employment of the active labor force. An estimated 800,000 workers enter the labor force each year, but between 1988 and 1992 only 583,208 new jobs were created (an average of 145,802 per year). This leaves Mexico with an estimated job deficit of 2.6 million.

(Continued on page 7)

NAFTATHOUGHTS

Editor................................ Karen Hansen-Kuhn
Managing Editors........... Steve Hellinger
Ross Hammond
Design & Production........ Cynthia Power

Published by The Development GAP in cooperation with the Alliance for Responsible Trade (formerly MODTLE).

NAFTATHOUGHTS provides information and perspectives on developments in Canada, the United States and Mexico related to the proposed North American Free Trade Agreement. Views expressed in NAFTATHOUGHTS are those of the writers and do not necessarily represent those of the affiliated organizations. Contributions are welcomed.

 Volume 2, Number 5

Editorial Offices:
The Development GAP
1400 I Street, NW - Suite 520
Washington, DC 20005 USA
Phone: (202)898-1566 Fax: (202)898-1612
Peacenet: dgap

U.S. CITIZENS' ANALYSIS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENVIRONMENT

The NAFTA lacks the funding mechanisms to ensure that a sufficient share of the wealth it may generate will go towards improvements in infrastructure and the strengthening of environmental cleanup and oversight. Funding for necessary NAFTA-related expenditures should be explicitly linked to the Agreement itself and sourced from those who benefit from it.

No provision is included in the NAFTA to ensure that hazardous wastes generated by NAFTA-induced investments will be managed properly. The NAFTA comes the closest to addressing enforcement problems in its investment chapter, which meekly encourages, rather than requires, countries not to lower their standards in order to attract investment. If a country believes that environmental standards have been lowered by another country to attract investment, its only recourse is to non-binding consultations.

The NAFTA leaves U.S. environmental and consumer protection open to challenges as unfair trade barriers. In contrast to earlier drafts, the NAFTA puts the burden of proof on the challenging nation rather than on the defendant. Yet a U.S law that is subject to a challenge must meet a series of highly subjective requirements, including that it be "consistent" in its level of protection and applied "only to the extent necessary" to achieve a NAFTA-approved policy goal. Under the NAFTA, a dispute panel, meeting in secret and heavily biased in favor of free trade to the exclusion of all other concerns, will judge whether or not the challenged regulation represents an unfair trade barrier.

Global treaties may run into problems with the NAFTA. While the NAFTA would appear to protect international environmental agreements (IEAs), it nevertheless opens up two possible complications. First, for the treaties listed under the NAFTA, the NAFTA itself becomes the arbiter of what is, and what is not, allowed under the treaty. Second, it requires all signatory nations to submit in writing their desire to include new IEAs under the NAFTA. The difficulty in getting all the parties to the NAFTA to agree to add other IEAs could be compounded if additional countries accede to the NAFTA.

ENERGY TRADE

The NAFTA directly conflicts the goal of energy conservation and the development of alternative energy technologies by promoting increased reliance on fossil and uranium fuels and on large-scale projects such as the James Bay hydroelectric dams in Quebec. The energy chapter of the NAFTA fails to include conservation and resource efficiency goals and timetables. Rather, its stated objective is to "strengthen the important role that trade in energy and basic petrochemical goods play in the North American region...through sustained and gradual liberalization" (Article 601). The NAFTA would prevent the U.S. and Canadian governments from restricting the import or export of energy resources from other parties except under conditions of war. The NAFTA also sanctions continued direct subsidies to the oil and gas industries, while making no provision for incentives to promote energy efficiency projects or the development of renewable energy programs.

AGRICULTURE

The agriculture provisions of the NAFTA are contrary to the goal of economically and environmentally sustainable agriculture and rural development. It would provide many opportunities for increased corporate concentration in agriculture through the elimination of import restrictions, lowered food-safety standards, and lower world prices for farm products.

NAFTA, in concert with the Dunkel proposal for the renegotiation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, would eliminate the best farm programs in North America. U.S. farmers could lose the only programs that have established supply management and reasonable prices for farmers. Sugar, dairy, peanuts, cotton, beef, fruits and vegetables are the commodities that would be most negatively affected by NAFTA in the U.S. Mexican farmers would also suffer as NAFTA, coupled with changes in the Mexican land tenure system, places an unprecedented burden on family farmers to enter the competition in global commodities markets without the infrastructure, technology and resources currently available to their northern neighbors.

LABOR

Studies show that up to a half million high-wage U.S. jobs could be lost over the next ten years due to shifts in investment resulting from the NAFTA. The NAFTA dramatically alters the incentives and rules for investors, enhancing corporate mobility within the North American continent. If ratified in its current form, it would significantly increase the shift of productive investment from the United States to Mexico. While Mexico would likely gain some manufacturing jobs due to new investment, it will also experience significant labor surplus growth due to the large-scale displacement of small grain farmers and agricultural workers.

If ratified in its current form, the NAFTA could cost U.S. workers up to $320 billion over the next decade in lost jobs and lower wages. Liberalizing trade and facilitating the shift of investment from the United States and Canada to Mexico will put downward pressure on U.S. and Canadian wages without necessarily pulling Mexican wages up. Median wages for U.S. workers, especially those lacking a high school degree, have fallen dramatically in the last decade. This suggests that workers at the bottom of the wage scale have borne the brunt of the "globalization" of the U.S. economy, though all workers have felt its impact. Recent immigrants, women, and people of color are disproportionately concentrated in some of the labor-intensive industries that may be most vulnerable to wage erosion and job loss due to the NAFTA.

The NAFTA would, if implemented, undermine labor standards. Any trade agreement among the nations of North America should integrate basic labor rights and protections to prevent "social dumping", i.e., violating worker rights to gain an advantage in the international marketplace. Several U.S. trade statutes set forth compliance with basic worker rights as a condition for receiving trade benefits under programs such as the Generalized System of Preferences. Since the NAFTA does not include an equivalent formulation of basic worker rights in trade, it would actually displace other U.S. trade statutes, leaving unguarded those worker rights now protected under U.S. law.

INVESTMENT AND CORPORATE RIGHTS

The NAFTA gives corporations extensive rights without attendant responsibilities. The investment section lays out the framework for the further liberalization of investment rules for corporations operating in the three nations. The basic principle is that a corporation should be able to operate freely and without discrimination in any of the three countries. This includes freedom from government-imposed performance requirements, freedom to repatriate profits and freedom to shift top management from country to country. At the same time, the NAFTA draft requires nothing from corporations in terms of advancing worker rights, community investment or environmental health. A NAFTA under these terms would benefit a few hundred large corporations at the expense of the vast majority of the people in all three countries.

AUTOMOBILE SECTOR

The NAFTA would encourage auto plant closures. The goal of the NAFTA negotiators was the integration of auto production in the three countries into a single "rationalized" production system. For the companies, this means closing inefficient plants, easing rule-of-origin requirements, taking advantage of the lowest cost production site and forcing workers, communities and suppliers to compete with one another to lower production costs. The NAFTA would accomplish these goals for the companies at the expense of auto workers.

Under the NAFTA, current Mexican requirements for each auto assembler to export as much as it imports into Mexico would be phased out over ten years. While the Mexican requirement that foreign investors purchase inputs from domestic parts companies would also be phased out over the ten-year period, the Mexican parts industry would still be assured of a large share (declining to 50 percent) of the growth in the Mexican market. The Canadian government retains the safeguards of the Auto Pact, but the U.S. has no comparable protection. The rule of origin for automotive vehicles and parts will be gradually raised to 62.5 percent, but this would allow too much non-North American value to be incorporated into products that qualify for NAFTA benefits. The rapid phase-out of tariffs on light-duty trucks and the negotiated rules for Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) would lead to increased production of trucks and small cars for the North American market in Mexico without compensating benefits for U.S. production and employment.

RULES OF ORIGIN

Loose rules of origin in the NAFTA would favor transnational corporations over local workers and producers. The conflict over rules of origin is essentially a clash between economic forces anchored geographically in this country or region -- such as labor, small businesses and resource-based producers (e.g., agriculture and mining) -- and transnational corporations producing outside North America and still claiming privileges under the NAFTA. Tight rules favor the former, loose rules the latter. In this agreement, the corporations appear to have won. Regardless of the social or environmental standards inside the region, the loose rules of origin in the NAFTA would allow producers to escape these regulations by conducting labor-repressive or environmentally damaging aspects of production elsewhere.

For most goods, "substantial transformation", meaning a change in tariff classification, is all that is required for materials originating outside of the region to be considered regional goods and have the full benefit of the free-trade regime. This makes it possible for all the raw materials for many goods to come from outside the region, while the finished product is given totally free treatment.

Where substantial transformation has not taken place, or where goods are made up of components from both inside and outside the region simply assembled into another good, a percentage of "regional content" was agreed upon for goods to qualify for regional treatment. The figure is 60 percent for most goods, 80 percent for most textiles and 62.5 percent for automotive products. When up to 40 percent of a product can be shipped into the region from outside and have the whole treated as a domestic product, as would be the case for most goods, a strong incentive is given to non-regional producers to suppress the value of the non-regional components and to use NAFTA rules as a Trojan horse to acquire free access to markets in the U.S. and Canada.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The NAFTA text establishes highly secretive dispute-resolution procedures that eliminate citizen oversight on vital concerns such as food safety, consumer-product standards and environmental regulations on hazardous substances. Provisions promoting, or even recognizing, worker rights as a factor in continental trade are completely absent from the Agreement. Provisions treating panel proceedings as secret must be changed to guarantee public access to the dispute resolution panel proceedings for private citizens, as well as governments.

The NAFTA dispute-resolution procedures permit, but do not require, advice from outside experts. Although the agreement specifies that lists from which consultative or arbitral panels should be comprised of individuals with experience and expertise in trade law and commercial affairs, it sets no such requirement for familiarity with labor, environmental or human rights matters.

PRE-EMPTION OF STATE LAW

NAFTA clauses that speak to the role of state governments are cautiously drafted and contain less explicit pre-emptive language than did the earlier Dallas draft text. The NAFTA leaves intact current law and practice on pre-emption, whereby Congress can define the relative power of the states to act on trade-related issues. Thus, implementing legislation will effectively determine the degree of autonomy left to the states under the NAFTA and, correspondingly, the degree of pre-emption of states' rights by the federal government.

Both the Standards chapter and the subchapter on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures explicitly bind the states to extensive access, assessment, notification, publication, information, consultation and cooperation procedures. These requirements are procedural matters, not substantive constraints on state powers to enact environmental, consumer or public health provisions.

The Government Procurement chapter commits the parties to further negotiations commencing no later than December 31, 1998 "following consultations with state governments." NAFTA specifically exempts federal set-aside programs for small and minority businesses from the Government Procurement provisions and presumably also leaves state set-aside programs undisturbed.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROVISIONS

The main beneficiaries of the NAFTA provisions on intellectual property rights are pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies and the computer software industry. The potential losers are the consumer, the individual inventor or creator or performer, the indigenous, and the poor. They are the likely payers of the high costs implied by the intellectual property protections offered in the NAFTA. Clearly, the intellectual property rights proposed in the NAFTA were designed to support the continued technical and scientific advantage of transnational corporations.

In general, the NAFTA has granted corporations the privileges of intellectual property without recognizing corresponding obligations to the broader society. It is not so much that Chapter 17 creates new inequities; rather, it endorses and exacerbates existing inequities. The NAFTA does not recognize the intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples; it does not protect the intellectual property of large numbers of creators and performers in the entertainment and mass media industries; and, it does not protect the public's right-to-know. It does protect industry's right to keep trade secrets; it endorses the privatization, commodification, and ownership of life itself by compliance with the notion of life-form patenting; and it effectively shackles the use of compulsory licensing, one of the few existing means for ensuring the public access to new products at affordable prices.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

The NAFTA, unless recast, would allow U.S. banks to gain greater control of the Mexican financial system. Limits on foreign ownership of Mexican banks would be phased out by the year 2000. If, after that time, the total foreign ownership of the Mexican banking industry reaches a certain defined limit, Mexico would have the right to temporarily freeze further foreign investment in its banking sector once during the four years following the transition period. No individual foreign bank would be allowed to own more than 4 percent of the total commercial banking sector, although there are no limits on the percentage of the sector that U.S. banks as a whole may own. This effectively protects Mexico's large banks from being taken over directly by U.S. banks, but would allow the U.S. banking industry to gain control over many of the smaller banks and over a significant percentage of the larger banks.

ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS INITIATIVE

The NAFTA and subsequent free-trade agreements are intended to reinforce World Bank/IMF structural adjustment programs throughout the hemisphere and guard against any changes by future governments. The Enterprise for the Americas Initiative (EAI) is President Bush's plan to establish a free-trade zone stretching from "Anchorage to Tierra del Fuego", expand private investment and provide limited debt relief for countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. Each of these components is conditioned on or supports the implementation of a structural adjustment program, programs that have resulted in falling wages, increased poverty, environmental degradation, and the weakening of unions and other organizations representing the interests of working-class people.

The "accession clause", article 2205 of the NAFTA, specifies that other countries or groups of countries (not limited to countries in the Americas) may join the NAFTA, making it the model for any future trade agreements. Thus, future negotiations could proceed much more quickly than the NAFTA, leaving very little time for informed debate with or within these countries. The resulting agreements would severely limit future governments' abilities to implement industrial policies, sustainable development programs or other alternative economic programs. •

See next page for coupon to order the complete analysis.

THE MEXICAN ECONOMY (from page 2)

Over one third of Mexican government workers will be laid off or retired during 1993, as the federal government cuts a total of 462,916 positions as part of its restructuring. It is expected that approximately 20 percent of the employees in the banking sector will lose their jobs within the next 18 months. Ninety percent of the businesses that make up the Mexican Stock Exchange are laying off workers as a consequence of economic stagnation, scarce profits, and the inability to compete in the international market.

Poverty

According to official figures, one half of the population lives in poverty, with the number of poor people in Mexico growing by 9.2 million between 1981 and 1987. In addition, 60 percent of Mexicans suffer from malnutrition, with rates of 80 percent in some rural areas and among indigenous people. Infant deaths due to malnutrition have been rising at an alarming rate, from 972 cases in 1980 to 2,626 cases in 1990.

The concentration of wealth has been a major result of the structural adjustment of the economy. Between 1983 and 1989, the richest 20 percent increased their share of national wealth from 63 percent to 72 percent, while the poorest 30 percent saw their share fall from 8 percent to 5 percent.

In his 4 October speech on the NAFTA, President-elect Clinton said that "President Salinas has taken some important steps. He's privatized corporations, he's reduced his debt, he's tamed inflation and he's brought down trade barriers." It remains to be seen whether the benefits of these measures will eventually extend to the middle class and the poor. So far, the Mexican "miracle" has not been so miraculous from the viewpoint of a majority of Mexicans. •

Coffee Initiative Promotes Fair Trade

A coalition of development agencies, small-scale coffee producers and alternative trading organizations recently established The Coffee Initiative to promote the fair trade of coffee. Based on a similar program in the Netherlands -- the Max Havelaar Foundation -- the Coffee Initiative will establish and offer a seal to coffee businesses that follow the principles of fair trade: a fair price linked to the cost of production; long-term contracts and commitments to producers; direct purchasing from small-farmer cooperatives; and making credit available to producers early in the season.

For more information, contact Rink Dickinson, The Coffee Initiative, 10 Forest Street, Providence, RI 02906. Tel./fax: (401) 831-0572.

CHANGE OF NAME, NOT OF PURPOSE

The Mobilization on Development, Trade, Labor and Environment (MODTLE) has changed its name to the Alliance for Responsible Trade (ART). The switch from MODTLE, the name adopted in 1991 in response to the Wall Street Journal's reference to the broad range of participants as a "motley crew", was made to better reflect the network's purpose.

Otherwise, there are few changes in the U.S. network of development, labor, environmental, religious, human rights, women's, farmer, consumer and research organizations that comprised MODTLE. Members of the Alliance are united in the effort to make trade and investment contribute to social and economic development characterized by dignified jobs, viable communities, a healthy environment and basic human rights.

The Alliance is committed to working with citizens'organizations with similar goals in other countries as a matter of principle. In its work on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) the Alliance collaborates with counterpart coalitions in Mexico and Canada -- the Mexican Action Network on Free Trade (RMALC) and the Action Canada Network (ACN) -- to define common interests and development strategies for North America. It is also consulting with citizen groups in other Latin American and Caribbean countries to develop common strategies and coalitions as the free-trade debate expands.

While the Alliance's programmatic emphasis at present is NAFTA and any subsequent extension in the western hemisphere, it is committed to work in a global context and for universal rules of trade that advance just and sustainable development. The Alliance is not opposed to growth in trade per se, but will vigorously oppose NAFTA, or any other free-trade agreement, that serves to undermine social and environmental standards.

The principal approaches to trade and development supported by the Alliance are contained in the statement developed in 1991 by MODTLE titled "Development and Trade Strategies for North America," which has been endorsed by more than 50 U.S. citizens organizations. The network and member organizations regularly produce analyses on various aspects of the NAFTA.

Together with ACN, RMALC and other citizens' organizations and coalitions in the three countries the Alliance is currently producing a trinational analysis of the NAFTA text. The analysis will form the basis for a comprehensive alternative approach to trade that would raise environmental, labor and social standards throughout the Americas, rather than depressing them to the lowest common denominator.

The steering committee of the Alliance is elected annually from among the member organizations with a view to representing diverse sectors and assuring both national and grassroots representation. All policy statements issued by the Alliance are distributed to all member organizations for comment in advance and issued in the name of those members which specifically authorize their names to be used.

Press statements may be issued by the steering committee in response to developments related to NAFTA, within the parameters of policy guidelines established by "Trade and Development Strategies" or subsequent policy statements endorsed by all member bodies.

The Alliance is currently expanding its organizational membership. Those interested in joining or wanting more information may contact ART at 100 Maryland Ave, NE (Box 74), Washington, DC 20002, Tel: (202)544-7198, Fax: (202)543-5999 •

Canadian Analysis of NAFTA Available

"Which Way for the Americas: Analysis of NAFTA Proposals and the Impact on Canada", a 114-page analysis of the NAFTA by Canadian citizens groups is available from the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA). This analysis includes sections on investment, energy, wa---, intellectual property, automotive sector, rules of origin, agriculture, cross-border trade in services, transport, telecommunications, financial services, dispute settlement, social programs, labor mobility, health care, accession (Enterprise for the Americas Initiative), provincial powers, environment and textiles.

To order, contact CCPA at #804-251 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5J6, telephone (613) 563-1342, fax (613) 233-1458.

PETITION TO CHANGE U.S. TRADE POLICY

Save our Jobs!
Save the Environment!
Dump the Reagan & Bush Agreements!

Dear Congressmember

Ronald Reagan and George Bush negotiated "free trade" agreements that guarantee big profits for corporations and wealthy investors--by eliminating U.S. jobs, lowering wages and destroying the environment.

Time has run out for Ronald Reagan and George Bush. But corporate lobbyists are pressuring Congress and President Clinton to approve the Reagan/Bush GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs & Trade) and the Bush agreement with Mexico & Canada, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). We, the undersigned, oppose these old trickle-down trade agreements of Ronald Reagan and George Bush that will:

- ***Destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs and reduce wages*** *for workers in the United States.*
- ***Condemn workers in poor countries*** *to miserable wages and living conditions.*
- ***Erode environmental laws*** *in the U.S. and increase abuse in Mexico and other nations.*
- ***Force taxpayers to pay billions*** *for environmental clean-up that should be paid by industry.*
- ***Encourage trade with nations that violate human rights*** *and/or democratic reform.*

	Name	Address	Phone
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

This petition circulated by: ______________________ (phone) ______________

Please send this petition to appropriate Congressmember. Send a copy to your local contact: