

Resistance grows to NAFTA trade pact

Trade representatives from the United States, Mexico, and Canada are scheduled to meet at the end of July to try to initial a formal draft of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which can be put to the respective national legislatures this fall. Even without the niceties of a treaty, various companies and banks are launching sweeping "free trade" practices, as if national borders and interests did not exist. This, in turn, is sparking new public opposition to a NAFTA treaty.

In the United States, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT) in June launched a petition campaign against federal attempts to lift licensing requirements for low-paid Mexican truck drivers. The petition, titled "Save Good Jobs: Stop Deregulation and 'Free Trade,'" points out that since 1980, deregulation has destroyed at least 160,000 good jobs in the trucking industry, and now "free trade" legislation is making matters even worse.

The following are excerpts from a letter to Congress from

the IBT president and a resolution passed June 16 by the Los Angeles City Council.

Teamster president's letter to Congress

June 23, 1992

Dear Representative:

I am writing to urge you as a matter of the highest priority to support House Concurrent Resolution 246 co-sponsored by Representatives Gephardt and Waxman and to call for an immediate floor vote on it, free-standing and subject to a closed rule.

HCR 246 states that Congress will not implement any international trade agreement that jeopardizes U.S. labor, environmental, health or safety laws.

As you know, the Bush administration is now involved in negotiations both on GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] and on the North American Free Trade Agreement. In both cases, there are serious questions about the administration's commitment to defend the right of our federal, state, and local governments to set standards to protect workers' rights, environmental quality, consumer safety, and other public interests.

An apparent signal of the administration's intentions is an order issued in April to the state of California to stop requiring commercial drivers from Mexico to obtain non-

N.D. Board of Elections, AP hand victory to Perot

On June 24, at the North Dakota Board of Canvassers meeting, which included the secretary of state, the Board of Elections reversed its previous returns finding Lyndon LaRouche the winner of the state's June 9 Democratic presidential primary, and certified the following results instead: Ross Perot, 9,516 (write-in); Lyndon LaRouche, 7,003; Nevada businessman and populist Charles Wood, 6,641; Miami comedian and Clinton stand-in Tom Sheikman, 4,866; and Bill Clinton a dismal fifth as a write-in with 4,760.

LaRouche in '92 campaign representatives found the results highly suspicious, in part because the secretary of state had reported LaRouche as the winner during the entire week of June 9-12, before "finding" thousands of additional Perot write-in votes on June 15, most of them (over 3,600) in the Democratic primary, despite the fact that the Perot vote was most probably a protest against George Bush. (Perot was credited with only 3,852 votes in the Republican primary.)

The major ground for suspicion, however, was the

fact that Associated Press had first declared, "Perot Wins in Write-in Contest," in a story released in the early morning hours following election night. At that time, their own figures showed LaRouche leading Perot by over 2,000 votes.

This was the same hour that the AP office in Bismarck, N.D. began advising reporters from elsewhere in the country, "I don't think you want to print this: Our big vote-getter out here is Lyndon LaRouche."

At the same time, the television networks, and national press like the *Washington Post* and *USA Today*, were deciding to impose a blackout of the LaRouche victory—or even of the fact that a North Dakota Democratic presidential primary had occurred. (See *EIR*, June 26, "Establishment Media Throw Tantrum Over LaRouche North Dakota Victory.")

However, any further investigation of these suspicious features is stymied by a state law which prohibits inspection of the ballots, even under a court order, when the margin between first and second place in the official tally is over 2%.

Nonetheless, word of LaRouche's victory has reverberated throughout the world, through coverage by foreign press services, word of mouth, and through a 2 million-run LaRouche in '92 campaign leaflet.—*Steve Komm*