

New NAFTA: Text of U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) Revealed

By Christian Gomez, October 1, 2018

Late Sunday night, Canada agreed to join the new renegotiated NAFTA — officially named the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA — meeting the self-imposed midnight deadline in order to complete an agreement in time for current Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto to sign it before he leaves office on December 1.

In a joint statement United States Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer and Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister Chrystia Freeland said:

Today, Canada and the United States reached an agreement, alongside Mexico, on a new, modernized trade agreement for the 21st Century: the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). USMCA will give our workers, farmers, ranchers and businesses a high-standard trade agreement that will result in freer markets, fairer trade and robust economic growth in our region. It will strengthen the middle class, and create good, well-paying jobs and new opportunities for the nearly half billion people who call North America home.

We look forward to further deepening our close economic ties when this new agreement enters into force.

We would like to thank Mexican Economy Secretary Ildefonso Guajardo for his close collaboration over the past 13 months.

Within hours of their announcement, the full text of the agreement was posted on the USTR website and can be read here: <https://ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/united-states-mexico-canada-agreement/united-states-mexico>

The USMCA has a total of 34 chapters, 12 more than the original 1994 NAFTA, which only had 22 chapters. Unlike the 1994 NAFTA, the USMCA includes chapters on labor, the environment, anticorruption, regulatory policy, competitiveness, and Mexico's exclusive ownership of its gasoline and natural gas resources, among others.

The following is a list of the USMCA's 34 chapters, along with their annexes:

1. Initial Provisions and General Definitions
2. National Treatment and Market Access for Goods (US Tariff Schedule, US TRQ Appendix, MX Tariff Schedule, CA Tariff Schedule, CA TRQ Appendix)
3. Agriculture (Agriculture Chapter, Mexico-US Bilateral Annex, Canada-US Bilateral Annex, Alcohol Annex, Proprietary Food Formulas Annex)
4. Rules of Origin, with Product Specific Rules
5. Origin Procedures
6. Textiles and Apparel
7. Customs and Trade Facilitation
8. Recognition of the Mexican State's Direct, Inalienable, and Imprescriptible Ownership of Hydrocarbons
9. Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures
10. Trade Remedies
11. Technical Barriers to Trade

12. Sectoral Annexes
13. Government Procurement
14. Investment
15. Cross-Border Trade in Services
16. Temporary Entry
17. Financial Services
18. Telecommunications
19. Digital Trade
20. Intellectual Property
21. Competition Policy
22. State-Owned Enterprises
23. Labor
24. Environment
25. Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises
26. Competitiveness
27. Anticorruption
28. Good Regulatory Practices
29. Publication and Administration
30. Administrative and Institutional Provisions
31. Dispute Settlement
32. Exceptions and General Provisions
33. Macroeconomic Policies and Exchange Rate Matters
34. Final Provisions

In total, the USMCA is a whopping 1,809 pages —1,572 pages for the treaty itself, 214 pages for annexes, and 23 pages for side letters. In comparison, NAFTA was over 1,700 pages long — 741 pages for the treaty itself, 348 pages for annexes, and 619 pages for additional footnotes and explanations.

Once in force, the agreement will have a 16-year life, after which it will automatically be terminated unless the countries agree to renew the agreement for another 16 years. According to Article 34.7 of Chapter 34, entitled “Final Provisions,” the "Agreement shall terminate 16 years after the date of its entry into force, unless each Party confirms it wishes to continue the Agreement for a new 16-year term." In other words, if the USMCA goes into effect in 2019, the agreement would not terminate until the year 2035 unless it is renewed for another 16 years, at which point it would not expire until 2051.

However, the United States, Mexico, and Canada will have an opportunity to review the agreement every six years, at which time they can decide whether to renew it or not, or propose changes. If during the review, the head of state of one of the countries expresses a desire to remain in the agreement, their agreement will be given an automatic renewal. Countries also have the opportunity to withdraw from the agreement with a six-month written notice. Even if one country withdraws, the agreement remains in effect for the other countries.

According to Article 34.6, "A Party may withdraw from this Agreement by providing written notice of withdrawal to the other Parties. A withdrawal shall take effect six months after a Party provides written notice to the other Parties. If a Party withdraws, the Agreement shall remain in force for the remaining Parties."

Submission to International Authority

Consistent with other globalist schemes, the USMCA follows the “rules-based system” of compliance to international authorities such as the World Trade Organization, International Labor Organization, a

plethora of United Nations conventions including the Law of Sea treaty, and the furtherance of “sustainable development,” which is mentioned no less than six times in the environment chapter.

One example of the USMCA's complete subordination to international authority can be found in Article 24.18 of the new environment chapter, regarding fisheries, which states in part:

3. Each Party shall base its fisheries management system on the best scientific evidence available and on internationally recognized best practices for fisheries management and conservation as reflected in the relevant provisions of international instruments aimed at ensuring the sustainable use and conservation of marine species.

The footnote below for that section defines what exactly those "international instruments" are, stating:

These instruments include, among others, and as they may apply, *United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea* (UNCLOS), *the United Nations Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks*, done at New York, December 4, 1995 (UN Fish Stocks Agreement), *the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries*, *the 1993 FAO Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas (Compliance Agreement)*, done at Rome, November 24, 1993, *the 2001 FAO International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated (IUU Fishing)*, and *the 2009 Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate IUU Fishing*.

Toward a North American Union

In a bold step toward a potential North American Union, the USMCA establishes a new governing international bureaucracy. Chapter 30 of the agreement establishes the creation of a Free Trade Commission as a regional governing bureaucracy overseeing various lower regional committees. Article 30, section 1, of the agreement states, “The Parties hereby establish a Free Trade Commission, composed of government representatives of each Party at the level of Ministers or their designees.” Article 30, section 2, outlines the various functions and powers of the Free Trade Commission as follows:

1. The Commission shall:

- (a) consider matters relating to the implementation or operation of this Agreement;
- (b) consider proposals to amend or modify this Agreement;
- (c) supervise the work of committees, working groups, and other subsidiary bodies established under this Agreement;
- (d) consider ways to further enhance trade and investment between the Parties;
- (e) adopt and update the Rules of Procedure and Code of conduct ; and
- (f) review the roster established under Article 31.8 (Roster and Qualifications of Panelists) every three years and, when appropriate, constitute a new roster.

The Free Trade Commission requires the United States, Mexico, and Canada to “establish and oversee a Secretariat comprising national Sections.” All three countries will be responsible for establishing and maintaining a “permanent office of its Section and be responsible for its operation and costs.” The role of the Secretariat will be to assist and promote the work of the Commission, provide administrative

assistance to any dispute-settlement panels, and to cover the costs and expenses for panelists, assistants, and experts involved in a dispute-settlement proceeding.

Beneath the Free Trade Commission, the USMCA authorizes all three countries to establish the following subordinate committees:

- Committee on Agricultural Trade,
- Committee on Rules of Origin and Origin Procedures,
- Committee on Textile and Apparel Trade Matters,
- Customs and Trade Facilitation Committee,
- Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade,
- Committee on Government Procurement,
- Committee on Transportation Services,
- Committee on Financial Services,
- Committee on Telecommunications,
- Committee on Intellectual Property Rights,
- Committee on State-Owned Enterprises and Designated Monopolies,
- Environment Committee,
- Committee on SME (Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises) Issues,
- North American Competitiveness Committee,
- Committee on Good Regulatory Practices, and an
- Advisory Committee on Private Commercial Disputes

The specific functions for each committee are outlined in their corresponding chapters. Nevertheless, all of these committees are to be comprised of representatives from the governments of all three countries. The committees are responsible for overseeing and helping to implement the agreement in their particular area. They will also be tasked with addressing any issues that arise under their area.

Committees will meet regularly or on an annual basis, and they are supposed to help encourage or foster greater cooperation and trade among all three countries in their given areas. Committees can also propose changes or revisions to the chapter in the agreement that corresponds to their area. All of the committees' work, discussions, findings, and recommendations are to be submitted to the Free Trade Commission for consideration.

And much like the TPP Commission, the Free Trade Commission can make changes to the USMCA without the consent of Congress. In fact, the agreement completely undermines Congress' Constitutional Article I, Section 8 power to regulate trade with foreign nations, such as Mexico and Canada, and to impose tariffs on them should the need arise, as in the case of national security.

The Free Trade Commission would also have the power to consider or adopt any changes to a country's scheduled tariff commitments by accelerating the elimination of tariffs or by making "adjustments to the Tariff Preferential Levels established in Chapter 6 (Textile and Apparel Goods)."

Among the most revealing and unsurprising aspects of these transnational committees, which underscores the value of the USMCA to the Deep State, is the stated objective of the North American Competitiveness Committee. In the USMCA's Chapter 26 on competitiveness, all three countries agree to establish a Committee on Competitiveness, or a North American Competitiveness Committee, with "a view to promoting further economic integration among the Parties and enhancing the competitiveness of North American exports." In other words, the committee's objective is not about making the United

States, Mexico, and Canada more competitive with each other, but making the three of them as a bloc more competitive with the rest of the world, hence its function to promote “further economic integration” between the three countries.

USMCA will not help the United States, Mexico, or Canada be more competitive individually or boost any one of three countries' economies. The Deep State does not wish for the United States alone to be competitive with the rest of the world, or maintain global economic dominance; instead it must surrender its sovereignty — along with that of its neighbors — to a new supranational body that will supposedly protect “North American” jobs, industry, and economy.

Rather than putting “America first,” as President Trump has repeatedly promised, or to “Make America Great Again,” his new NAFTA, the USMCA, demotes the United States to second tier in pursuit of making North America great. The USMCA makes North America great at the expense of the United States and its national sovereignty.

Under this scheme, the United States will be required to surrender its sovereignty in order for a chance to be a member of the winning team. Americans have been lied to and duped by their government into believing that their elected leaders are working in their interest, only to subordinate America's interests to those of North America. It's only a matter of time before the same charade is pulled on North America in order to integrate it with the world's other regional trade blocs (i.e. the European Union, African Union, Union of South America, Eurasian Economic Union, RCEP, TPP, T-TIP) into one world economic union and commission, under the auspices of the United Nations and the World Trade Organization.

The result of “promoting further economic integration” among the United States, Mexico, and Canada, necessitating the creation of an all-powerful, unelected so-called Free Trade Commission will be nothing less than a North American Union, and that alone should motivate patriotic Americans to vehemently reject the new United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

Far from making America great again, the USMCA is a bag of goodies for globalists and a death certificate for American national sovereignty.



USMCA: A NAFTA Reboot?

By Christian Gomez - October 3, 2018

Heralded as a “big win” for President Trump, the newly negotiated NAFTA replacement, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) appears to have all the earmarks of Obama-era trade agreements, as former Obama officials see stark similarities.

“Throughout the campaign I promised to renegotiate NAFTA, and today we have kept that promise,” Trump said from the Rose Garden on Monday, as he spoke about the “incredible new U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement called USMCA.”

Unbeknownst to most of Trump’s base and strongest supporters is that much of the USMCA’s text is virtually identical to that of President Obama’s Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) — a “free trade” agreement negotiated among 12 Pacific Rim nations (Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, the United States, and Vietnam) and at the time representing 40 percent of world GDP.

During the 2016 presidential elections, Trump staunchly opposed TPP, making it the centerpiece of his belief in “Americanism, not globalism.” Much like how NAFTA was a beachhead for globalism, the USMCA does not disappoint globalists.

It's important to remember that Trump did not personally negotiate the USMCA, nor did he pen any portions of the document. Trump's lead NAFTA/USMCA negotiator was U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer, who's been a longtime member of the globalist, one world government-building Council on Foreign Relations, and who previously applauded the Obama administration's TPP agreement. In addition to Lighthizer, another of Trump's negotiators was his son-in-law Jared Kushner, who has had business ties with the Deep State, including Goldman Sachs and George Soros.

In addition to Lighthizer and Kushner, many of the negotiators working within both the State Department and USTR Office are career diplomats and employees, having also worked in the previous Obama administration.

According to the Huffington Post, “At least half of the men and women standing behind Trump during his Rose Garden ceremony praising the new deal were the same career service staff who negotiated nearly identical provisions in TPP, which Trump had railed against.”

Trevor Kincaid, the USTR spokesman for the Obama administration, told the Post that it's the same USTR team that worked under Obama. “Ironically, he called them horrible negotiators when running for office,” Kincaid said, later adding, “It's really the same with a new name. It's basically the ‘22 Jump Street’ of trade deals.”

“New” NAFTA Revision or Copy Cat TPP?

Appearing on CNBC's *Squawk Box*, former U.S. Ambassador to Canada Bruce Heyman praised the USMCA.

“It's obviously welcome news. This is welcome news for North America; it's welcome news for the markets obviously this morning.”

Heyman — a Democrat, former Goldman Sachs vice president, and board member for the pro-one world government Chicago Council on Global Affairs — was appointed U.S. ambassador to Canada by President Obama in 2013. Upon his Senate confirmation in 2014, Heyman served in the capacity as ambassador to Canada for the duration of Obama's term.

The night the text of USMCA was released on the USTR website, Heyman reviewed various portions and chapters of the agreement, only to discover that they were identical to those in the TPP. Ironically, Trump has repeatedly lambasted the TPP as the worst trade deal ever negotiated. “[From] some of the reads I got over night, two-thirds of this agreement is essentially going back to TPP,” Heyman said. “All they did was take so much of the language of TPP and implement it here, as it pertains to Canada.”



VIDEO: https://youtu.be/p3_bH3WZixY

Speaking on the same program, Fordham Law Professor Matthew Gold explained how Trump's “big win” in regards to the USMCA/NAFTA renegotiations with Canada comes directly from the TPP. “He got a large number of small updates most of which were in the TPP agreement, which he pulled out of. He got us back to a small increased access in the Canadian dairy market, almost all of which was in the TPP,” Gold said.

Trump's “big win” in gaining limited access to the Canadian dairy market would have already been achieved by Obama and his team of negotiators had the sovereignty-destroying trans-Pacific agreement been approved by Congress. Now those same provisions have found themselves in yet another

sovereignty-killing arrangement. In the first case, TPP was rejected because of the ends didn't justify the means; in the case of the USMCA, they are being celebrated.

Gold currently teaches international trade law at Fordham University School of Law. According to his bio, on the Fordham University website, Gold served in the Obama administration as a leading figure on North American affairs and was involved in the TPP negotiations:

Professor Gold previously held an appointment within the Executive Office of the President as the Deputy Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for North America, in which he was the United States' lead negotiator and policy advisor focused on North American trade. In that capacity, he was a trade advisor to the President for the North American Leaders Summit, and [...] was a participant in the talks that brought Canada and Mexico into the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations.

Gold is correct: A side-by-side comparison of the USMCA and the TPP shows extensive overlap. Virtually, all of the problems inherent with the TPP are likewise contained in the USMCA, such as the erosion of national sovereignty, submission to a new global governance authority, the unrestricted movement of foreign nationals, workers rights to collective bargaining, and regional measures to combat climate change. In fact, according to Roll Call, USTR Lighthizer admittedly said that the USMCA is "built on" many aspects of the TPP.

USMCA; basis for a new TPP?

Instead of calling it the USMCA, the new agreement could have easily been called the "TPP group of three" (TPP-3), with United States, Mexico, and Canada as the three. In fact, Jared Bernstein, formerly Vice President Joe Biden's top economic adviser, told the Huffington Post, "It's not the slightest bit credible to argue that NAFTA or TPP were massive disasters but that USMCA is perfection."

Following the release of the USMCA, Ricahrd N. Haass, chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, tweeted his praise for the agreement and aspirations that it would be the basis for future U.S. participation in the TPP. "The USMCA looks to be the trade pact formerly known as NAFTA plus 10-20%. Hope it becomes a precedent for TPP. I suggest the US-Pacific Trade Agreement (USPTA)," Haass said on Twitter. Adding, "What matters is that the US joins it; doing so would bolster our strategic position vis-a-vis China and our economy."

The next day, Haass again took to Twitter, where he reiterated his renewed hope of the U.S. rejoining TPP; Haass tweeted:

USMCA is NAFTA plus TPP plus a few tweaks. Whatever...if @realDonaldTrump and the Congress are now prepared to embrace a pro-trade agenda, it is all to the good. Ideally, US participation in TPP by another name would be next; failing that, a US-Japan FTA would be second best.

The only major differences between the TPP and the USMCA are its geographic scope and accession chapter. Unlike the TPP, which allowed for the accession of new member countries — requiring only the approval of the TPP Commission, rather than the governments of each country deciding — the USMCA does not appear to include a provision for adding new members to the agreement.

However, considering how much of its text is taken straight out of the TPP and how both Mexico and Canada are TPP members, the USMCA may serve as the basis for rejoining the TPP or at the very least as a potential backdoor for U.S. entry into the Pacific Rim agreement that Trump withdrew from.

Backdoor Entry to TPP

Moving beyond NAFTA and the USMCA, Lighthizer wants to negotiate new bilateral free-trade agreements with the United Kingdom, Japan, India, Colombia, the Philippines, Vietnam, and additional countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Two of those (Japan and Vietnam) are also in the TPP (renamed the CPTPP for Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership), with Japan having ratified it on July 6, 2018.

Colombia, with whom the United States has a trade promotion agreement, reportedly “tops a list of Latin American deals the Trump administration plans to re-open,” according to Inside Trade. On October 2, 2017, Lighthizer said that once the “NAFTA problem” is resolved the United States would be able to shift its focus to modernizing its trade agreements with countries in Central and South America, such as Colombia.

On June 15, 2018, Mexico’s economy minister, Ildefonso Guajardo, told reporters at a news conference that Colombia had formally requested to join the CPTPP. Colombia is expected to be among the first countries to begin accession talks in 2019.

Mexico was the first to ratify the CPTPP, ratifying it on June 28, 2018. And the United States already has bilateral trade agreements with other TPP countries: Australia, Chile, Peru, and Singapore — the third country to ratify the CPTPP on July 19, 2018.

In August 2018, South Korea, with whom the United States also a free trade agreement (KORUS, the Korea-United States Free Trade Agreement), announced its decision to join the CPTPP. On July 19, 2018, negotiators from the 11 CPTPP countries agreed to start accession talks for new members in 2019, when the agreement is scheduled to go into effect.

Despite President Trump’s executive action to pull out of the TPP, his trade representative Robert Lighthizer appears to be rebuilding U.S. participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership by piecemeal. And considering how much of the USMCA’s text is taken almost word-for-word from the TPP agreement, Lighthizer and his team of negotiators and career diplomats within the USTR office and State Department are making it easy for a future Deep State president to officially and seamlessly rejoin the U.S. back into the greater Pacific Rim TPP trade order and further subsume American sovereignty in the process.



Number Two Senate Republican Doubtful About Passage of USMCA/NAFTA 2.0 Deal

Written by Bob Adelman - October 5, 2018

Following last-minute approval of the new NAFTA “free-trade” deal — the USMCA — that now includes Canada, the number two Senate Republican John Cornyn from Texas expressed doubts it could pass Senate muster. Cornyn told reporters: “I know people are still going through the details but it’s not a foregone conclusion that it will get confirmation by the Senate.” He said the earliest the Senate could vote on the USMCA would most certainly be after the November 6 midterm elections.

There are political considerations, however, in trying to pass the trade deal after the midterms but before the Congress is sworn in in January 2019, during the Senate’s “lame duck” session. Oregon Democrat Ron Wyden said that, given the current political climate in Washington following the harrowing Senate confirmation hearings over the confirmation of Judge Brett Kavanaugh, “The last thing that is needed right now, at a time of great public frustration with what’s going on with Washington, is ramming this through.”

As more and more of the details of the trade deal are exposed to the light of day, the more resistance to the sovereignty-damaging package builds. Thanks to journalists at The New American, details that have come to light include replacing the odious Chapter 19 of NAFTA with “a new governing international bureaucracy,” wrote Christian Gomez, called “a Free Trade Commission as a regional governing bureaucracy.” In fact, added Gomez, much of the language in the new updated “deal” steals language from the sovereignty-threatening Trans-Pacific Partnership — the TPP — that President Trump railed against while running for office. And according to Gomez, “Much like the TPP Commission, the Free

Trade Commission can make changes to the USMCA without the consent of Congress. In fact, the agreement completely undermines Congress' Constitutional Article I, Section 8 power to regulate trade with foreign nations."

Gomez explained just how dangerous the "new," "revised," "updated," and "wonderful" the new deal really is:

Under this scheme, the United States will be required to surrender its sovereignty in order for a chance to be a member of the winning team.

Americans have been lied to and duped by their government into believing that their elected leaders are working in their interest, only to subordinate America's interests to those of North America.

It's only a matter of time before the same charade is pulled on North America in order to integrate it with the world's other regional trade blocs (i.e., the European Union, African Union, Union of South America, Eurasian Economic Union, RCEP, TPP, T-TIP) into one world economic union and commission, under the auspices of the United Nations and the World Trade Organization.

This writer believes he rightly dubbed the new USMCA "treachery":

There's the treachery: giving up essential constitutional guarantees with long-term negative implications for national sovereignty in order to cut a deal with socialists in Canada, Mexico, and supporters inside the Trump administration who cherish a global community in place of sovereign nations making their own enforceable decisions according to the will of their people.

Faux conservatives, however, want to hurry things along and not wait for the next Congress in 2019 to consider the matter. Included in that group is Senator Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) who said the Senate "ought to move on Nafta [the new version] as soon as we can."

But Senate rules, if they aren't abrogated in the name of expediency, require that an economic impact analysis be presented to that body before it can vote, and that process usually takes 90 days. This is upsetting to the president who wants the deal done quickly: "In theory, there should be no trouble [getting confirmation from the Senate], but anything you submit to Congress is trouble," he said, complaining of Democrats' penchant to "delay, obstruct, resist."

Those Democrats seeking to "delay, obstruct [and] resist" are giving Americanist activists working with The John Birch Society's "Get US out! of NAFTA" program additional time not only to expose to the light of day the odious threat to national sovereignty contained in USMCA but to bring pressure to bear on their elected representatives to vote it down altogether.



The John Birch Society

USMCA Far Worse Than NAFTA!

Written by Kristin Stockheimer – October 8, 2018

Many times something happens in the news, like the Kavanaugh hearings, and it dominates the news cycle. Little do many know, what's happening behind the scenes while everyone else is discussing the hot topic. This time, what's been under the radar is the new North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) deal that U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer, who is also a Council on Foreign Relations member, negotiated with Canada and Mexico. NAFTA, even though Trump claims it's been replaced, is very much alive in the new deal named the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA).

Not only is it still alive, it is larger and much worse than NAFTA! The text of the USMCA, according to former U.S. Ambassador to Canada Bruce Heyman, has portions and chapters of the agreement that are identical to those in the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP). Robert Lighthizer even admitted it is “built on” many TPP aspects. These facets, according to The New American writer Christian Gomez, have the potential to strip the U.S. of its sovereignty:

Much like the TPP Commission, the Free Trade Commission can make changes to the USMCA without the consent of Congress. In fact, the agreement completely undermines Congress’ Constitutional Article I, Section 8 power to regulate trade with foreign nations.

With Trump formerly criticizing the TPP, why is he supportive of this USMCA regional government-promoting agreement? Even more alarming, Richard N. Hass, chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, shared his support of USMCA, “The USMCA looks to be the trade pact formerly known as NAFTA plus 10-20%. Hope it becomes a precedent for TPP. I suggest that US-Pacific Trade Agreement (USPTA).”

USMCA, TPP, and even the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), are all designed with one mission: to integrate regional governments into an eventual world government. Signing off on the USMCA provides the ammunition for all of these alphabet soup agreements to fall like dominoes. Stopping the USMCA is an urgent matter; we’ve even heard U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer discussing trade deals with the European Union furthering the globalists’ agenda.

With many Americans being distracted by the Brett Kavanaugh and Christine Blasey Ford hearings, it is crucial they be informed on the dangers of the USMCA deal. With the globalists and Deep State advocates hard at work, there is no time to waste! The earliest that Congress can pass the USMCA would be during the lame duck session sometime in November or December before the next Congress begins in 2019.

TAKE ACTION

Phone your representative (202-225-3121) and senators (202-224-3121), and urge them to preserve our national sovereignty by voting no on the USMCA. Follow up with an email.

For more information:

<https://www.jbs.org>

<https://www.thenewamerican.com>

jbs-kal@centurytel.net