

Lee	Oberstar	Roybal-Allard
Lewis (KY)	Paul	Smith (WA)
Loeb	Pitts	Stark
Maloney (NY)	Ramstad	Westmoreland
McDermott	Rohrabacher	Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 1832

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3222, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. MATSUI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-435) on the resolution (H. Res. 806) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3222) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3688, UNITED STATES-PERU TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 801 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 801

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3688) to implement the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill are waived. The bill shall be debatable for three hours, with 45 minutes in favor of the bill controlled by Representative Rangel of New York or his designee, 45 minutes in favor of the bill controlled by Representative McCrery of Louisiana or his designee, 45 minutes in opposition to the bill controlled by Representative Michaud of Maine or his designee, and 45 minutes in opposition to the bill controlled by the Minority Leader or his designee. Pursuant to section 151(f)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 3688 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MATSUI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 801 provides for consideration of H.R. 3688, the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, under the closed rule required by the fast track law. The rule provides for a total of 3 hours of debate, equally divided by proponents and opponents of the underlying bill.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 3688, the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act. I want to congratulate Chairman RANGEL, Chairman LEVIN and members of the Ways and Means Committee on bringing this trade agreement before us today.

Mr. Speaker, last week we passed legislation to help strengthen our current trade adjustment assistance program to protect American workers. Our country faces increased pressure as a result of globalization, and we must continue to reaffirm our commitment to the American workforce. It is evident that we need to change our current trade strategy.

At the same time, we must also acknowledge the positive impact that international trade has had on our economy. International trade currently accounts for a quarter of our gross domestic product.

Competition has proven to spur innovation and create new jobs. In my home State of California, we know that our IT companies need exports of semiconductor chips. Our farmers need the markets of Europe, Asia and Latin America. And our entertainment industry, financial services and telecom companies need to sell their services to grow and create jobs.

But it also affects industry in America. We know that, and that is why we have a balanced approach to our trade agreements.

Mr. Speaker, the trade agreement before us today is part of the broad context in which we should consider trade policy. It will establish an important precedent for how we craft future trade agreements.

Under the new Democratic Congress, free trade agreements must provide strong labor and environmental protections. They are essential to promoting healthy workplaces and competition for American employees and around the world.

Congress must consider each agreement on its merits. In some cases, these agreements will meet increased access for American producers and service providers. In other cases, these agreements could mean more competition and would significantly impact our workers and communities.

I understand that many of my colleagues have strong views on trade, but one thing we can all agree on and be proud of is the fact that our leadership worked vigorously to ensure that democratic principles were included in the Peru agreement.

In previous free trade agreements, these principles were noticeably absent. The initial Peru Free Trade Agreement draft reflected the "business as usual" approach that this administration has based its trade policies on. Democratic leadership went to Peru, met with the Peruvian president and prominent members of its Congress and developed a new free trade agreement, one that includes the strongest labor and environmental chapters in any of the world's over 300 bilateral free trade agreements.

It is not CAFTA. This is the first free trade agreement of its kind. It is a new free trade agreement, one that incorporates fully enforceable internationally recognized labor standards; that also promotes international environmental standards, including combating illegal logging, protecting the ozone layer, and our oceans; and an agreement that will provide Peruvians with lifesaving medicines. All three provisions are unprecedented in any free trade agreement and all three are core democratic principles that we should all be proud of.

This agreement is also about leveling the playing field for U.S. companies to compete in the Peruvian market. The Andean Trade Preference Act passed in 1991 and expanded in 2001 allowed Peruvian companies to benefit from duty-free trade with the United States. Meanwhile, U.S. goods exported to Peru continued to face tariffs as high as 12 percent.

The agreement before us today will give U.S. businesses immediate, duty-free access for more than 80 percent of U.S. consumer and industrial goods. This agreement will also allow us to forge a closer alliance and relationship with one of our southern neighbors. It is no secret that other countries are investing heavily in that part of the world. This agreement will send a strong message to our southern neighbors that the United States is here to help promote openness in their government and their economy.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to look at each free trade agreement based on its merits. It is easy to promote or oppose free trade unequivocally and not look at the facts of each agreement. I am confident that this agreement will benefit our Nation, benefit our workers, and benefit our businesses. This agreement will serve as a model free trade agreement for years to come.

Once again, I want to congratulate Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LEVIN for their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I express my appreciation to my colleague from Sacramento for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I have to begin by saying that as I saw my friend from Sacramento stand up, I couldn't help but think about the many years in the early 1990s that I worked very closely with her late husband, Bob Matsui, on trade agreements. We worked very closely on the North American Free Trade Agreement and a wide range of other agreements. I would just like to say that I know that he would be very proud to see his wife, DORIS, here participating and working very hard on this agreement.

I also have to say that I am very pleased to see so many of my colleagues and for us to, as the gentlewoman from Sacramento just said, working in a bipartisan way on this. We have the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my very good friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL), talking to JERRY WELLER from Illinois, who has been a great champion of free trade for a long period of time.

I am particularly glad to see people like the distinguished chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. LEVIN, with whom I have, over the past several decades actually, engaged in a rigorous discussion and exchange on a lot of trade issues. We have had a different perspective in the past.

While I am not in complete agreement with every single aspect of this, I am very proud to be joining in support of his initiative here. Of course, I see Mr. CROWLEY who has worked hard.

On our side sitting right here, Mr. Speaker, we have our distinguished friends from Florida, the DIAZ-BALART brothers, sandwiching our great friend, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, as they have demonstrated a very strong commitment to security and economic development within this hemisphere.

So I will say that we are at this moment beginning a debate on what I truly believe is one of the most important national security issues as well as economic growth issues for the United States of America, the U.S.-Peru trade agreement.

The vote on this implementing bill has been a long time in coming, as my colleague from Sacramento said. We have pending trade agreements with three Latin American countries, Colombia and Panama, in addition to this Peru agreement. And I hope very much, Mr. Speaker, since from my perspective, and I know not everyone agrees with me, but I believe very passionately, as I know my colleagues sitting here with me on the second row agree, that these three trade agreements are very, very important and the arguments in behalf of their passage

are, in fact, very, very similar. As I said, we begin today with Peru, and I believe we will pass this bill with a large bipartisan majority.

I want to again commend my great friend, CHARLIE RANGEL, and our ranking member, JIM MCCRERY, with whom Mr. RANGEL has worked very closely on these trade agreements. I congratulate both of them for having worked so hard on this. They have worked to restore what I believe is so critically important, and that is the bipartisan tradition of trade.

I failed to mention Mr. NEAL. I do, of course, recognize my friend from Massachusetts, who is obviously working on and has got to be supportive of this since he is sitting next to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are now restoring this great bipartisanship when it comes to trade and I think it's a great day for this institution.

The Peru agreement is an excellent place to begin to renew that support for open trade as an institution, because the economic benefits will be largely focused on the one thing we all seem to agree on. What is the one thing that every single American agrees on when it comes to the issue of trade? That is exports.

We all agree that we want to open up new markets. I don't believe that a single one of my colleagues would consider arguing that exporting goods and services from the United States of America is a bad thing.

□ 1845

We're all in agreement increasing our exports to foreign markets is very positive for American workers, producers and our economy at large. And the reality is that exports are central to the issue of trade with Peru. Why? Because we have long had an open door to products coming from Peru into the United States. Congress created and extended a system of trade preferences for Peru, Colombia and other countries as well, which allows their goods to enter the U.S. market. So the U.S. consumer can have access to those tariff free. These preferences have enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support, overwhelming bipartisan support for these preferences that allow Peruvian, Colombian, Panamanian goods and services to come into this country duty free. That's existed and, again, that has enjoyed bipartisan support.

What we need to do now is we need to make sure that we take the step, having opened up our markets to them, to make sure that we open up their markets for U.S. goods and services.

That's what all three of these agreements, Mr. Speaker, are all about. We unilaterally extended duty-free access to our market because we wanted to help create real opportunities for workers and producers in this region to enter the worldwide marketplace.

Now, these preferences have been very successful. They've boosted exports to the United States and gave

workers in those countries, Colombia, Peru and Panama, they gave these workers an alternative to the drug trade and other illicit industries. They've helped to usher in a new peaceful, prosperous era for all three of these countries, Peru, Colombia and Panama, where poverty is diminishing and, as well all know, democracy is solidifying.

Now it's time to make this a reciprocal arrangement. U.S. exports, things made by Americans, our workers, should get the same treatment in their markets as Panamanian, Peruvian and Colombian workers get with access to our markets. With this Peru Free Trade Agreement, we will begin to level the playing field for American workers.

I happen to believe that comprehensive, broad-based liberalization brings about the greatest economic benefits. I know some in this body might disagree. But as I've said, we all recognize the benefits of increased exports. Having opened the door on imports, we now must give our own exports equal footing.

Those who would oppose this agreement today should recognize that they oppose nothing less than the promotion of American exports, the promotion of products made by U.S. workers.

A vote, Mr. Speaker, against the Peru Free Trade Agreement is not a vote against free trade. It is a vote against giving Americans, American workers, a fair shot.

But the significance of this agreement reaches far beyond economics, as I said at the outset. Just as our system of trade preferences was rooted in foreign policy, so is this agreement; our system of trade preferences dealing with the drug problem that Mr. RANGEL's been involved in for decades, and I've enjoyed working with him in that battle. Just as that is, this also is very similar in that it is dealing with a foreign policy objective of ours.

We have come to realize that one of the greatest challenges of the 21st century is the promotion and strengthening of democratic institutions throughout the globe.

This is a battle for hearts and minds. It is a struggle to ensure that liberty and the rule of law prevail over tyranny. And we heard that stated so eloquently right in this Chamber at 11 o'clock this morning when we had that spectacular speech delivered by Nicolas Sarkozy, France's new President. It is a struggle to ensure that opportunity and prosperity prevail over hopelessness that turns into extremism.

Mr. Speaker, this is a challenge that has risen in the far corners of the globe, but it also exists right here in our own backyard. Today, Latin America, as we all know, is at a crossroads. Where armed conflict, drug wars, poverty and stagnation were the norm just a few years ago, a quiet revolution of economic and political liberalization has begun to transform a continent. Slow, steady reform has put much of this hemisphere on the right path.

But there has been a resurgence in antiliberalization forces that does threaten this reform. We all know that Hugo Chavez in Venezuela is systematically dismantling the institutions of democracy and free markets in his own country and exporting his authoritarian agenda to his neighbors. We all know that all we need to do is look at his circle, his close circle of friends: Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Fidel Castro, Daniel Ortega. That demonstrates the level of tyranny to which he aspires. He has already drawn Evo Morales in Bolivia and Rafael Correa in Ecuador into his orbit. Hugo Chavez and his assault on free government and free markets is a direct threat to the American ideals and the ideals, again, that were outlined so eloquently by President Sarkozy this morning, those ideals of liberty and prosperity. We want them prevailed throughout the world and we certainly want to take every step that we can to ensure that those principles of freedom and liberty and prosperity thrive right here in this hemisphere.

And yet there are bulwarks for these American ideals in the region, and Peru is a key example. Peruvian President Alan Garcia himself embodies the struggle between these two visions. He first served as President of Peru in the 1980s, governing with antiliberalization philosophy. He presided over a withering economy that offered very little hope to Peruvians. And he said to us when we, in a delegation, visited with him when we were with our great Commerce Secretary, Carlos Gutierrez, that the statist populace vision of the past has failed. At that point, Mr. Speaker, he presided over that withering economy that offers, as I said, very, very little hope to Peruvians. But unlike most of us in politics, President Garcia is today getting a second chance. Nearly two decades after his first term, he has returned to the presidency and he has learned from his mistakes. He's been a champion of this agreement and our goal of solidifying the economic and political reform that has taken place. He is part of the anti-Chavez vision for Latin America, and he is joined by other allies in reform like President Uribe in Colombia, like President Torrijos in Panama.

We have a very clear choice today, Mr. Speaker. We can strengthen the hand of Hugo Chavez, or we can strengthen the hand of the liberalizers and proponents of democracy and free markets. This is the battle for hearts and minds, and it's taking place right here in the Western Hemisphere. We know who our good friends are, and Peru, Colombia and Panama lead the pack. It's no coincidence that we embarked on trade negotiations with all three of these very important allies of ours.

I would have liked to have had a vote on each of these critical agreements today. I very much wish that we could be voting on all of them today. But I'm pleased to at least begin with Peru. And I will say again that I very much

look forward to our voting, I hope just as soon as possible, on the agreements with Colombia and Panama, because the exact same arguments that I have propounded are similarly applied to Colombia and Panama, the arguments I've made for Peru. All three share the same benefits and all three pose the same risks if we fail to implement them. All three extend our trade system, our trade preference system to American workers and producers, and all three are critical to our quest to strengthen and solidify political and economic freedom throughout Latin America.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying trade agreement. And I urge the Democratic leadership, Mr. Speaker, to move as quickly as possible to bring forward the pending agreements with Colombia and Panama. And I urge them not to let politics undermine liberty in our hemisphere.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER).

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm really not sure why we're under this great rush to make these agreements, especially with a couple of countries that were named that do not have good human relations records and are not bastions of freedom. I don't understand, and I think most Americans don't understand, why we are so anxious to cut some kind of a deal, when we know that Americans are losing jobs.

I walk through my own community and I see empty factories. I look around the State of New Hampshire and I see people have lost jobs, and people shrug and say to me, the jobs have gone overseas. They may not understand exactly what the trade agreement was, but they know they lost their jobs.

And in December, once again, we'll see a factory close in New Hampshire. This is a great tragedy. We may discount 20 jobs, 100 jobs, 200 jobs here and there, but ultimately what we're saying to Americans is we're sending your jobs overseas, and we hope that you'll be retrained, and we hope that you'll be able to finance your home and finance your car and educate your children. But really, this globalization effort is in your best interest. And you know, sometimes it is.

Democrats are not against free trade. But what we are for is fair trade and making sure that our own people can maintain their lifestyle and that they'll have worker benefits and that they'll be able to retire, just like the generation before.

I'm holding in my hand an article from The Washington Post from today, and Harold Meyerson wrote, and he's so right, "Why the Democratic rush on trade? Globalization does pose real challenges to working and middle-class Americans. Democrats should wait until they're in a position, say, in 2009,

to begin to restore some security to Americans' economic lives before they return to cutting trade deals. Their electoral prospects, and the Nation's economic prospects, demand no less."

I'm a freshman here, and I came in with a lot of other freshmen who heard across their districts the worries of middle-class, working-class Americans worried about their futures. We share that worry, and that's what's made us stand here tonight.

Why can't we have a moratorium? Why rush? Why take the chance?

Moving to other nations for cheaper labor is not fair to Americans and, in the end, will hurt our own country.

So I urge my colleagues to say "no" to these deals.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm very happy to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and hardworking colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Miami (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), a great champion of freedom.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my friend and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The goal, Mr. Speaker, of our trade policy should be free trade among free peoples. And this agreement that we bring to the floor today, I think, is so important for many ways. If there is a nation that not only is a friend, but that has withstood extraordinary challenges, including violence, terrorism, extraordinary attacks to its free institutions, it is our neighbor and our friend, Peru. And they have, the prior administration with President Toledo, now the administration of President Alan Garcia, they have repeatedly demonstrated that they wish to deepen their relations with the United States, that they wish to tie their economic future to the United States. And tonight is our opportunity to respond and say to our friend, Peru, we recognize the steps you have made. We recognize not only the good-faith efforts that you've made to come to this agreement and to, by the way, renegotiate it after the political dynamic change. The situation changed here a year ago, and a renegotiation was required by the new leadership in this Congress of President Garcia.

□ 1900

And the Peruvian Government demonstrated once again good faith and walked the extra mile to come to this agreement. This agreement is in the interest of the United States, of the workers in the United States, and it's in the interest of Peru.

When I say "free trade among free peoples," Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to realize that peoples throughout the world should have an opportunity to raise their voices, to be heard, to form civil society, environmental groups, labor groups, to fight for their rights, to fight for their human rights, for their legal rights. In Peru, despite extraordinary challenges, there is freedom, and people can organize, as they can in the United States,

in civil society, in environmental organizations and labor organizations and others to demand their rights are violated. That's the great difference when we, for example, trade with a democracy with great challenges like India or a tyranny like, for example, Communist China. I always like to point out the difference. Free trade with free peoples.

Tonight we enter into an agreement with a free people that is, in addition to being free, a great friend of the United States. So it is my privilege tonight to ask for our colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, my friend (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be extremely brief because I expect to be speaking at a later time on the bill. But I could not resist coming to the floor to protect the integrity of the Speaker and the members of the Ways and Means Committee, both Republican and Democrat.

There may be, as a matter of conscience, that people feel that they have to oppose this bill or oppose trade or commitments they have made to other people. But to suggest that the leader of this House and those Republicans and Democrats who worked on the Ways and Means Committee and passed this out with a recorded vote without a vote against it were trying to have Americans lose their jobs here is not only unfounded, but it's unfair.

And if anyone really just wants to count the numbers, then ask our farmers, ask our machine people, ask our television or electronic people how much they are going to export to Peru because of the removal of tariffs and how much is coming into this country.

So you can be against trade. You can be against the agreement. It may not go far enough. It may not be everything you want. But I think it is wrong and unfair to suggest that we are deliberately trying to have people here, hardworking people, many who have suffered because of loss of jobs, and perhaps it has been because of trade or the indifference of people to invest in these families or in these communities, but this bill does not cause Americans to lose jobs. It's abundantly clear that the balance is on America's side in terms of removal of the tariffs. And for those of you who come from agricultural communities, ask your farmers. For those of you who come from machines that remove communities and mining materials, ask those manufacturers. And ask the people that would create the jobs whether or not it's good for them and good for the community.

So you can be against trade. You can be against South America. You can be against anything. But to suggest that those that do support this bill will cause Americans to lose their jobs is untrue and unfair.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I'm happy to yield 3½ minutes to my very good friend from Miami (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from California for the time.

I am extremely pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we are considering the Peru Free Trade Agreement tonight. The decision to move forward with legislation that expands our commercial relations with Peru signals the importance that this agreement holds for U.S. economic and security interests in the Andean region and, in fact, in Latin America as a whole. The benefits to both of our countries are significant.

By removing barriers on our exports to Peru, this agreement will add \$2.1 billion per year to our U.S. economy. The positive impact will be felt across the country. With almost one-fifth of the total bilateral merchandise trade between the U.S. and Peru moving through my home State of Florida, I know firsthand the importance of this agreement for our home State economies and our constituents.

Within the first year of the agreement's implementation, Florida's total economic output is estimated to rise by \$143 million and total earnings for Florida's workers are estimated to be \$35 million higher than in the absence of this free trade agreement. The benefits that Peru currently enjoys under the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act only stand to multiply under passage of this FTA. By enhancing these opportunities for economic growth via the free trade agreement, the U.S. is strengthening legal economies that provide viable alternatives to illicit drug production. More than mere trade deals, these agreements are a major factor in defining the future of U.S. interests in the Western Hemisphere and our commitment to a strong, stable, democratic neighbor.

Therefore, although we are focused tonight, Mr. Speaker, on the agreement with Peru, we cannot lose sight of its importance within the broader regional context of the pending agreements with Colombia and Panama. For example, recent studies show that if the Colombian Free Trade Agreement is not approved and those with Peru and Panama are, Colombia's GDP will be hurt by over 2 percent. Reinforcing Colombia's economy is a prerequisite to its ability to continue to fight the drug lords and the FARC terrorists. President Uribe of Colombia has committed himself and his country to the principles of a secure, more democratic society amidst a growing tide of authoritarian regimes in the region. And there will be a significant cost to the American economy from the failure to approve the Colombian Free Trade Agreement. Over 600,000 jobs in the United States are estimated to depend on exports to Colombia, jobs that will be put at risk if that trade agreement is not approved.

Each of the trade agreements is an important element in our twin goals of ensuring our continued economic growth and reinforcing our allies in the region.

I strongly support passage of this bipartisan agreement, and I urge my colleagues to do as well.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the Peru Free Trade Agreement.

This Peru Free Trade Agreement does not guarantee American jobs will stay right here in the United States. That is the bottom line: jobs that need to stay right here in the United States.

American families have lost jobs because past trade agreements did not lead to the creation of jobs right here at home. American families are earning less now than they did before. Three million jobs have been lost, and we have an \$800 billion trade deficit.

We need to create jobs here. We need to help hardworking families who are struggling. Many of these American families that are struggling today to make it, we need to help them. American workers deserve it. Americans at home deserve to benefit from the global economy. We need to protect jobs, and I state we need to protect jobs from further offshoring caused by unfair trade agreements, and we have seen what has happened.

Now is not the time to rush ahead with more of the same damaging NAFTA-CAFTA style trade policies that have proven to hurt the American workers, and we have seen how it has hurt the American workers and the livelihoods of many, that will benefit all and not just the wealthiest few.

Vote for American workers and not for the Peru Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas who serves on the Ways and Means Committee (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today we take an important step forward in developing a comprehensive 21st century trade policy, recognizing that the benefits of trade cannot be measured solely in the volume of commerce that crosses international borders. A modern trade policy considers the impact of trade on workers and the environment, and this pact does that. Yet we have not fully achieved the goal of effective safeguards, and I believe that we are taking a step in the right direction; we're just not quite to the final destination. I believe it is better to approve this agreement as a step of genuine progress than to reject it.

This agreement includes unprecedented action to prevent illegal logging that is decimating rainforests in South America. For the first time in this agreement, environmental infractions can be enforced with something that is

more than a mere parking ticket. That's what was done in prior agreements where governments wrote fines to themselves no matter how great the environmental degradation. And today, finally, we have recognition in this trade agreement of the importance of multilateral environmental agreements that have been totally disregarded in previous trade pacts.

So this is real progress. But I am pleased that our chairman and the Trade Subcommittee chairman have recognized that there is more work that we can do and there are plans to conduct hearings, the first ever hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, on the environmental effects of trade as well as on the investor-state provisions.

While our legislative intent is unequivocal regarding the agreement's preamble that "no foreign investors have greater rights than do American citizens," the potential harm to our health, our worker safety, and our environmental laws from abuse of investor-state provisions demand the removal of outmoded and flawed language that keeps cropping up in these agreements and should not appear in future agreements.

Acknowledging that we are making real progress with this agreement is really a recognition of just how far behind we have been. After years of total indifference to the concerns of workers and the environment, this agreement addresses those concerns, and almost any change represents progress. Today we move forward, and eventually together I believe that our ultimate goals will be fulfilled.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my new colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I am for fair trade, not simply free trade. And I would associate myself with comments already made today, "free trade for free people." Yet already reported recently, miners in Peru are facing having their strike declared illegal and shut down. That doesn't sound very free to me.

This Peru FTA, I will acknowledge I am happy to see the positive developments in the labor and environmental standards. For me, however, they don't go quite far enough. I believe that the Congress has a constitutional role and responsibility to be able to amend these trade agreements no matter whom they are with or how large or small they may be.

□ 1915

Trade negotiations have successfully passed before without fast track authority or closed rule type of treatment, and I think that should be the case today.

The Peru agreement, as currently structured, to me is symptomatic of the larger problem: allowing an unelected trade representative, and not

the duly elected representative of the American people, to decide what is best in our trade policy.

The current agreement does not provide for enforceable environmental protections, especially with regard to the lumber industry in sensitive areas of Peru's environment. The agreement, as currently written, would help force the privatization of Peru's Social Security system. The agreement would devastate Peru's already faltering rural agricultural economy.

Congress forced the trade representative to include minimal standards, in my opinion, and these things have been called a breakthrough. I think there should be credit where credit is due, and they have been an improvement. But at the end of the day, if we are to rely on the trade representative and the Bush administration to enforce the trade agreement, I don't think that's an enforceable agreement.

I tried to offer an amendment which would allow for a private right of action to allow American citizens to enforce the provisions of the trade agreement to be carried out and enforce those labor and environmental provisions to be fully fulfilled. But, however, due to the nature of this debate, no such amendment was allowed, and I think that's to the detriment of us all.

I believe that we must work to return to a time when Congress and the elected representatives of the people were allowed to amend our trade agreements. Organized, negotiated and fair trade amongst nations is one of the most important issues facing our Nation, indeed, our world. Its great importance demands that it be given the attention that such an issue deserves.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the United States-Peru Free Trade Act.

In the past few weeks, I have heard time and time again from many of my colleagues that the Peru Free Trade Agreement is a groundbreaking agreement crafted by the Ways and Means Committee and the Bush administration. I've been told that this agreement incorporates enforceable obligations that require Peru to adopt and enforce labor standards and uphold international environmental standards. That is a start. But I ask my colleagues, who will enforce the labor standards? Who will enforce the environmental standards? The Bush administration? I don't think so. This administration has a disgraceful record of enforcing trade agreements and trade laws. We cannot assume this administration will now start to enforce trade agreements. Furthermore, this agreement doesn't provide the administration any funding to enforce the free trade agreement if they wanted to. Most importantly, the Peru Free Trade Agreement fails to address food safety, toy safety and drug safety concerns facing our constituents.

As chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, I have conducted numerous hearings and investigations on drug and food safety. Our committee found that products are entering our country every minute without appropriate inspection. We found that importers don't know how the product was made and whether the imports are safe. Why do we Americans allow countries to bring their inferior, unsafe toys, food and drugs into our country?

The Peru agreement includes the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement. By incorporating the WTO's Sanitary Agreement, the U.S. will be giving up the ability to increase inspection of imports to ensure safety.

The goal of the WTO Sanitary Agreement is to allow free passage of food. This means our food can move freely between the two countries without proper inspection and without proper regulation on how the food is grown, processed, stored or shipped here to the United States.

At a time when we're questioning the ability of the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the FDA to protect the health and well-being of our children, our seniors and, indeed, all Americans, I don't think we should be allowing Peru "free passage" of food and drugs into the United States.

We simply cannot afford to pass another harmful trade agreement that fails to protect our families from contaminated foods and drugs and toys.

The changes the proponents of the Peru Free Trade Agreement keep touting are minimal at best, and are inadequate to assure a level playing field for American businesses, American jobs and the American economy but most importantly it does not protect the American people.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the Peru Free Trade Agreement.

Protect the American consumer.

Vote no on the final passage.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I'm happy to yield 4 minutes to a very hardworking and thoughtful member of the Trade Subcommittee of Ways and Means, a great champion of economic and democratic liberalization in this hemisphere, my friend from Morris, Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule as well as this trade agreement.

You know, exports are pretty important to the State that I represent. We have jobs at stake that are dependent on exports in Illinois. In fact, for manufacturing, one out of five manufacturing jobs in Illinois depend on exports. 17,000 Illinois companies depend on exports. And when it comes to agriculture, 40 percent of all the corn and soybeans and farm products produced in Illinois depend on exports. So trade makes a big difference, and trade agreements are important.

We win with trade agreements. You look at the record; since 2002, we have nine countries that we have free trade agreements with. In those countries,

our exports grew by 19 percent, which is 50 percent faster than the overall growth in exports. Morocco grew 67 percent, Bahrain grew 40 percent, Chile grew 30 percent. We have free trade agreements with 7 percent of the world's countries, representing 14 percent of the gross domestic product of the globe, but those free trade agreements represent half of the exports from America. And free trade in the last dozen or so years has created 16 million new jobs.

We've got a good trade agreement before us tonight. Peru is a strong ally and friend of the United States. We have an agreement before us that's good for Illinois and it's good for America. On day one, 80 percent of our exports of consumer and industrial products become duty free immediately. Illinois already exports \$198 million in exports to Peru. And it's predicted that exports from key industries will rise as much as 57 percent as a result of this agreement. That's not just the big companies. Small and medium-size enterprises also benefit from tariff elimination. My biggest manufacturer is Caterpillar. They make the yellow construction equipment; 8,000 workers in my district dependent on Caterpillar for their jobs. Today, they face a 12 percent tariff on the equipment that they want to export to Peru. On a million dollar mining truck, that's \$120,000 tariff tax. It goes away on day one.

And those union workers at Caterpillar, and I would note, 8,000 workers, half of the production in Joliet, the biggest city in my district, is exported today. So they depend on trade.

So, the Peru agreement creates jobs in Illinois. Illinois manufacturers are expecting to see a 51 percent increase in exports. And I would note that Peruvian products coming into Illinois today face no tariffs, but Illinois products going to Peru do.

And the Peru Trade Agreement is also good for Illinois farmers. Soybeans become duty free immediately; many new markets for Illinois farmers. And before this agreement, Illinois pork and corn were at a competitive disadvantage with our competition in South America, Chile and Argentina, who don't face the high tariffs we do, and so they undercut us on prices, hurting our farmers. This agreement helps Illinois pork, corn, soybean, and other agricultural producers. In fact, farm organizations will tell you, those representing producers will tell you that the Peru and Colombian agreements are the best ever negotiated to break down barriers for American farm products. It is estimated that agriculture alone will see a \$700 million increase in exports as a result of the Peru Free Trade Agreement.

This trade agreement also has broader implications. As you know, there are some negative forces threatening democracy in Latin America today, and Peru is a shining example of a working democracy with strong leadership. And President Toledo and President Garcia,

his successor, are making a difference. Poverty is being reduced; real jobs are being created.

Peru is an economic success story. You don't see Peru resorting to anti-American rhetoric and populist rhetoric. You see Peru being a responsible partner with its neighbors. This trade agreement is part of their strategy to reduce poverty.

Let's vote for this agreement.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we're voting on a historic trade agreement with Peru. Let me thank CHARLIE RANGEL and SANDY LEVIN for the diligence they demonstrated in negotiating with the administration.

This trade deal is about exports. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the labor and environmental provisions in the Peru FTA are big steps towards a more progressive trade policy where trade benefits are spread more broadly in a global economy.

Regarding labor, the FTA includes a fully enforceable commitment that Peru adopt and maintain the five basic international labor standards. Peruvian President Garcia has already implemented changes to Peru's legal framework to allow compliance with international labor standards. A key provision allows the United States to challenge any violation of Peru's commitments to labor standards. Like the labor provision, the environmental provisions in the Peru FTA are also unprecedented. This legislation before us not only makes significant steps in the right direction, but it also moves aggressively in stopping illegal logging.

In addition to the significant reductions in tariff and nontariff barriers to U.S. exports, again, it's about exports, the agreement also includes important provisions relating to generic medicines, government procurement, and investment protections.

Mr. Speaker, the importance in progress associated with the Peru FTA will allow a lot of Democrats tonight for the first time to vote for an FTA. I know the decision is not easy, but it's a testament to the new and improved course that American trade policy has undertaken, which reflects the best of American values.

Mr. Speaker, the legally binding labor and environmental standards in the Peru FTA is a universe apart from CAFTA. This is not CAFTA. This is not NAFTA, which only received a handful of Democratic votes. Implementation of the FTA will give momentum to other efforts to secure forward-thinking FTAs.

This is the result of CHARLIE RANGEL and SANDY LEVIN's hard work and dedication, and I urge support of this legislation.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and rise in opposition to the rule, which should be open.

Every time we sign a free trade agreement with a developing country, we end up outsourcing more wealth and middle-class jobs. If these agreements were working, America wouldn't have an \$800 billion trade deficit, with 20,000 jobs lost for every billion dollars of that deficit. What an unprecedented wipe out of jobs and productive wealth in this country. The sliding value of the dollar proves it, our staggering debt levels prove it, and the growing stock market instability proves it.

Let me give you some history. When they said we had to pass NAFTA back in the 1990s, we had a trade surplus with Mexico. Since NAFTA's unfortunate passage, every single year we have fallen into greater and greater debt with Mexico. A million of our jobs are outsourced. We didn't create a million jobs. And 2 million Mexicans were thrown off their farms and created an unending flow of illegal immigration to this country.

Then they told us, well, sign China PNTR; that will make a big difference. We were already in debt with China when PNTR was signed, and guess what? It only got worse. We have an historic trade deficit with China now, and we're getting from them contaminated dog food and toys with lead and all of the rest. And now they tell us, well, Peru is next. We've already got a trade deficit with Peru. Del Monte and Green Giant have opened up production facilities in Peru to absorb some of the 2 million Peruvian farmers that are going to be upended by this agreement, just as what happened with Mexico's campesinos under NAFTA.

Jordan, they said, was a breakthrough agreement, had environmental provisions, labor provisions; So, what's happened, even the Jordanians admit, it's not enforced.

You know, in considering another free trade agreement today, this New Direction Congress offers up more of the same, again, out of step with the American people.

The environmental and labor provisions are nonbinding; they're in the general preamble. This is like saying you support the preamble to our Constitution but not the Bill of Rights and all the case law that supports it. That's why no labor unions are supporting this in the United States or Peru. In fact, a major Peru miners' union is on strike right now, and they were told by the Government of Peru today that the strike was illegal and said if the workers don't return to work, they will be terminated in 3 days.

So I ask, why are no U.S. or Peruvian trade unions supporting the agreement?

Could it be because the agreement does not require the Parties to comply with core labor "rights", but rather with vague and unenforceable labor "principles, which are then cleverly placed in the Preamble or Declaration of the agreement, not in the enforceable and binding core standards as do the International Labor Organization Convention?

Oh, let us grow up.

So, I have a better idea. Rather than pass another so called "free trade" agreement with another foreign country, that has weak rule of law and masses of poor people, let's negotiate a free trade agreement with ourselves! That would be a first. For Congress to pay some attention to the American people.

A free trade agreement with the U.S. might result in jobs from other places being returned here to workers who have fallen out of the middle class.

It might mean we would again be a nation that produced something rather than just traded in foreign goods.

Can you imagine—America might again make televisions, electronics, shoes, clothing, washing machines and irons, windshield wipers, electric wiring harnesses, toys, crayons, dishes, forks and spoons, well, the list is endless. Imagine if we had a trade agreement that put our workers and communities first. Now there's a novel thought.

Imagine, if the diminishing middle class believed this Congress actually represented them.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this Peru agreement and finally begin to develop a new trade model that results in job creation in America and balanced global trade accounts. When that happens, America's middle class will again begin to grow.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this Peru agreement, and submit the following article for the RECORD:

[From Dow Jones Newswires, Nov. 7, 2007]

UPDATE: PERU DECLARES NATIONAL MINING
SECTOR STRIKE ILLEGAL
(by Robert Kozak)

LIMA.—Peru's Labor Ministry Wednesday declared a national mining sector strike to be illegal.

Peru's National Federation of Mining, Metallurgy and Steel Workers Monday started the nationwide strike, aiming to pressure the government to pass laws to give mining sector workers more benefits.

The ministry said workers had defied a government resolution ordering them back to work and in some cases had blocked highways. Workers now have three days to return to work or face being fired.

An official with the mining federation said directors are meeting with government officials to see whether advances made in formulating laws giving them more benefits would allow them to lift the strike.

The government said 6,300 workers were on strike as of Tuesday, some 5.26% of the total work force in the sector.

The strike hasn't seriously cut production at any of the major mines in Peru, and mining sector activity has returned to a more normal state, a high-level mining sector official said Wednesday.

"Today the activities are practically normal at the companies. I think that the workers have come to understand that they don't need to paralyze activities to insist on the platform that the federation has," the president of the private-sector National Society of Mining, Petroleum and Energy, Ysaac Cruz, said in a broadcast interview.

"The strike has had very little impact, and at some mines only a small group took part," Cruz added.

A spokesman for Minera Yanacochia, Latin America's largest gold mine, said that all

workers there were back on the job. That mine is run by Newmont Mining Corp. (NEM), with a 51.35% stake. Compania de Minas Buenaventura SAA (BVN) holds a 43.65% share in Yanacochia.

The mining federation had held a similar strike from April 30 to May 4. The government said then that only 10% of workers in the mining sector supported that walk out, although union members said the number was higher.

The mining federation wants, among other things, to increase the number of workers on staff, to increase worker profit sharing to 10% of profits from 8%, and to eliminate a ceiling on that profit sharing, which limits the extra payments to a total of 18 monthly salaries.

Peru is the world's largest producer of silver, and among the top five in zinc and copper. It is also a major producer of gold, and produces other minerals such as tin and molybdenum.

□ 1930

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to my friend from Ohio with two quick points, and, that is, we do, in fact, have tremendous opportunities for Peruvian products to come into the United States. This agreement, in fact, responds to that by opening up the Peruvian market.

The second point is that Whirlpool, which is a great company in Ohio, will see 9,000 jobs from exports to Peru with a 400 percent increase.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just say to the gentleman, Peru's chief export to us is gold, gold from the second largest gold mine in the world, and those Whirlpool jobs and Maytag jobs are half of what they used to be in this country because they shut them down in Galesburg, Illinois and in Newton, Iowa. Don't talk to me about washing machine jobs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should heed the gavel and get additional time when their time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for maintaining order here in the House.

At this time I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Miami (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my strong support for the Peru Free Trade Agreement. I am also a strong supporter of free trade with free nations. It is important to note that we already have a unilateral trade deal with Peru. That deal has helped Peru fix and help solve a big part of their poverty problem. It has helped stem the violence and the insurgency that were so prevalent there in the 1980s.

In the last decade, Peru has become one of fastest growing economies in Latin America, with a GDP growth of 8 percent last year. The United States is Peru's number one trading partner. En-

acting this bilateral trade preference will increase the number of American small- and medium-sized businesses that benefit from trade. More trade and more exports to this democratic neighbor means more jobs for American workers.

Not only is Peru, Mr. Speaker, a strong trade partner, it has become a strong partner fighting narco-trafficking and countering that anti-democratic sentiment that is fueled in the region by Fidel Castro and Hugo Chavez. It is in our national security interest to strengthen our ties with this strong democracy, this democratic ally.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support free trade with free, democratic nations, and I support free trade that is beneficial to American businesses and American workers and American jobs. That is why I am pleased that we are voting today to enact this vital trade agreement with this strong ally in Latin America. I hope that this vote will lead to the swift enactment of the already negotiated trade deals with our other strong allies in Latin America, and those being Panama and Colombia.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to one of the key brokers of this agreement, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. As the Speaker and the majority leader made clear months ago, and Mr. RANGEL and myself, what we are talking about today is about Peru, not Colombia, not Panama, not Korea. We are talking about a basic issue, and that is in terms of liberalization, do you try to shape its course or let it happen willy-nilly?

The crucible in terms of that issue has been core labor standards and environmental standards. That was the basis of the fight over NAFTA, over CAFTA and over the trade bill of 2001. The basic fact is that in this agreement, not in the preamble, in this agreement, ILO core labor standards are there, enforceable like everything else, and so are environmental standards. So it's a question of whether you shape trade agreements or just let it happen. And we say shape them.

Again, the crucible has been initially labor standards and environmental standards. So this is the antithesis of CAFTA. This is a historic breakthrough. This is the first step towards a new trade agreement. We should not turn our back on it. We should build on it.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I am asking Members who are committed to fair trade to vote against the Peru Free Trade Agreement. I can think of a million reasons to oppose this agreement. Let's start with over 3 million jobs lost because of NAFTA.

Workers in my State have lost their jobs due to trade. They don't want trade adjustment assistance. They want their jobs.

The bill's supporters claim that enhanced environmental standards in this FTA will preserve our natural resources. So where is the strong support from the Sierra Club, Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth? Supposedly the new labor provisions will improve conditions for workers in Peru and create jobs for workers here at home. So where is the support from labor? The two largest Peruvian labor unions are asking us to oppose this trade deal because it will hurt their workers.

If this is, in fact, a new direction on trade, don't you think we'd hear from the support from these groups? It is time for a trade policy that benefits workers and creates jobs, not policy that encourages companies to take their investment elsewhere. Yet we are not listening. By passing this bill, we are continuing the same disastrous results that came under NAFTA and CAFTA.

I didn't come to Washington so that I could ignore the needs of my constituents back home. I came to Washington to give a voice to those who need it. So let's start listening to the voices of the people back in our districts and take a new direction on trade, to start creating a new trade regime that will benefit all of us.

I ask Members to oppose the Peru Free Trade Agreement. Speaking about trade adjustment assistance that passed this body last week, before it left this body the President came out and said he was going to veto trade adjustment assistance. Is that working in a bipartisan manner? No, it is not.

I encourage Members to oppose the Peru Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 1 minute to a very strong free trader, my friend from Mesa, Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to pay tribute at this time to Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCCRERY and everyone who has put this trade deal together. This is a difficult thing to do. It is always easier to see the shuttered business and to say that's because of trade rather than to look at the opportunities and jobs that are created because of free trade. Free trade lifts our standard of living. It lifts the standard of living for those in other countries that enjoy its benefits as well.

This is the best part of Congress, to see on a bipartisan level people coming together to do what is best for people everywhere. I just want to commend those who put this together. This is a good rule. This is a good bill. Let's move forward with this. Let's move forward with the other free trade agreements with Panama, Colombia and Korea.

Mr. DREIER. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and thank her for her excellent work as a member of the Rules Committee in managing this important rule to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is a difficult issue for Members to decide upon because it goes right to the heart of family life in America. It's about the job security, the economic security, the health security of America's families. And the issue of trade has been one that has been controversial, and frankly, I have largely been more on the other side of it than I am tonight.

I rise in support of the Peru Trade Agreement, and I want to tell my colleagues why. They will have to make up their own minds. But I want to take the opportunity to talk about it in the context of the last, say, 20 years. That is how long I have been in Congress.

For most of that time, I have fought with a Democratic President and a Republican President, starting with President Bush 41, Father Bush, and throughout the Clinton administration on the issue of China trade. I saw it clearly as a threat to the economic security of America's working families. I could see the patterns that were developing there. But all along, those powers that be always said, no, this is the enlightened course.

At the time, when we started this debate on China, which was right after the massacre in Tiananmen Square, the trade deficit between the U.S. and China, the trade deficit we suffered, was around \$5 billion a year. \$5 billion a year. It sounded like all the money in the world to us at the time, \$5 billion a year. How much leverage could we have to open China's markets? To stop them violating our intellectual property? To have them free the prisoners arrested in Tiananmen Square? To have them stop proliferating weapons of mass destruction? We fought so much leverage.

But Washington, D.C. was very much influenced by the Government of the People's Republic of China. And so all of the powers that be told us, if only we went down the path that they were recommending, that markets would be open to us, that political reform would come, all of these things, China would stop proliferating weapons of mass destruction to places like Iran and Pakistan, to name a few.

What happened was none of the above. But strictly on the issue of trade, say, 17, 18, years ago, a trade deficit of about \$5 billion a year. Stick with us, they told us, and great things would happen in this relationship. Oh, they did. For China. The trade deficit now with China is approximately \$5 billion a week. A week. It went from \$5 billion a year to \$5 billion a week. And all of the economic consequences that go with it, and all of the inferiority of product, threatening the food safety, the medicine safety, the toy safety in our country. That's what the sophisticated people told us that we should do was to go along the course that we

have. The violation of intellectual property. That piracy is legendary. Of course, nothing has changed except we are now in about a \$250 billion deficit to China.

I bring that up because many of us in this room fought that fight. We invested a lot into it. And we were always cast aside as Luddites and unsophisticated people and Stone Age and didn't understand. But we do understand that the American workers paid a price for that. The markets didn't open to our products. Even with WTO that didn't happen. And, again, the deficit speaks for itself.

So I say from that level of passion and familiarity with the issue and being in the fight for a long time, that when I saw an opportunity for us to have labor and environmental standards as a core part of our trade agreements, it marked a drastic difference from what even a Democratic President was willing to give on that score, even a Democratic President. We couldn't get that in the Clinton administration.

So I want to commend Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LEVIN, the two chairmen, for the excellent work that they did. I tell you the China story just as a background as to how difficult it was before. No matter what the evidence, no matter how clear it was, others saw it differently, and they saw it wrong.

So here we are today trying to make some distinctions, trying to make some distinctions about trade agreements that are better than others. I don't think any of them are perfect on either end. And so my reason for supporting this is, as a leader in the Democratic Party, is I certainly believe that part of the legacy of our great party is the legacy of John F. Kennedy who said that free trade was a part of who we are as a country and that international trade would be good for our economy. But we want not only free trade, we want fair trade.

□ 1945

We are going to be Uncle Sam instead of "Uncle Sap" in these trade relationships. It had to be fair. It had to be right for our workers.

As I say, this opportunity came along in a bipartisan way to say that unless labor and environmental standards were part of a trade agreement, it couldn't even be considered. It didn't mean it would be considered, but that was the threshold that all of these agreements had to cross. And then they would be judged on their individual merits in terms of the agreement between our two countries.

Recognizing the fear and apprehension and uncertainty that exists in many families and homes across America because of their jobs going overseas, the businesses closing, their communities having a downturn, can't sell their home, all the consequences that go with that, the chairman put forth legislation that passed the House last week, which I hope that the President

of the United States will sign. I think it is essential, essential, if we are going to accomplish anything on trade, on immigration or anything else, that people know that we share the concerns that they have and that we are doing something about it. So the trade adjustment in terms of training and opportunity and health care and all of those things was very, very important.

That was done in the context of other things to address the needs of America's working families. Hopefully we can pass SCHIP to get 10 million children to have their health insurance, pass legislation to make college more affordable, raise the minimum wage, have an Innovation Agenda that says if we are going to compete in the world, we must innovate. We can't just complain about trade, we must innovate. And that innovation begins in the classroom, and it takes us right back to our college affordability, our initiatives of K-12, early childhood education and the rest.

So I think we have to certainly be concerned about the impact of trade. It is self-evident and it is a challenge for us. But we cannot turn our backs on it. And I absolutely refuse to have the Democratic Party be viewed, and I say this to my Republican colleagues, I know you don't want to be viewed, but I have a responsibility also to my Democratic colleagues, I don't want this party to be viewed as an antitrade party.

So, let's make some distinctions. Take every trade agreement on its own merit. The Peru Free Trade Agreement rises to the level of acceptance. I am not saying it is perfect. It rises to the level of acceptance. Labor and environmental principles are in the core of the bill. Other changes we wanted to see were made by the Parliament in Peru. They passed the laws or they made the changes we said they needed to have.

So if you are ever going to support any trade agreement, I would think this would be the easiest one to do. Other trade agreements have other obstacles that have to be dealt with. I don't think we should shut the door on anything, because that gives nobody any motivation to make any change in what we would like to see as a free flow of goods to and from these countries.

It is frustrating, and I respect everything that has been said by my colleagues in this debate. I think it is all legitimate. Some, like Marcy Kaptur, have been in this fight for a long time. Working families in America have no greater champion to advocate for the best possible outcome for them.

But, again, viewing in the context of we want to have an economy that is fairer, that we have a progressive economic agenda where many more people participate in the economic success of our country, that is why we raised the minimum wage and make college more affordable, et cetera, and that is why we are promoting our Innovation Agenda for energy security and reversing global warming, so we can create many

more jobs, so America's farmers can fuel America's energy independence, where we will send our energy dollars to the Midwest and not to the Middle East. This is a bigger picture than the Peru Free Trade Agreement.

The Peru Free Trade Agreement is not a big deal in terms of trade agreements, but it is an important step into saying we can make distinctions about trade relationships that are grossly unfair to the American worker, greatly oppressive to the workers in their own countries and are not making people freer. And to those that are in furtherance of growing our own economy while helping to lift other economies in the world, I think in this case the Peru Free Trade Agreement goes in that direction.

So, that is why, my colleagues, I am supporting this. It may seem to be a departure to some of you from where I have been on other trade agreements. But it is a marked difference, a marked difference from where we were before, whether it was President Bush I, whether it was President Clinton, and where we are now.

Those many who have been on one side or the other of this all say it is an amazing accomplishment to have gotten that done. And for that, whatever the outcome of this vote is, for that I want to once again pay tribute to Chairman RANGEL and Chairman LEVIN, chairman of the subcommittee, for the great leadership and the work they did. I just want you to know why I was supporting this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to rise and join my California colleague, Speaker PELOSI, in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

We began this morning here with a brilliant address delivered by the new President of France, Nicolas Sarkozy. In that speech, he talked about the need for greater economic liberalization and the move towards markets. He talked about a new day in France and the fact that he is doing everything that he possibly can to make sure that they create new opportunities for economic growth and success in that country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the United States of America, as President Sarkozy said, is the strongest, most powerful nation in the world, economically, geopolitically and militarily. And, Mr. Speaker, this agreement is about making sure that within our hemisphere, we have an opportunity, an opportunity to open up new markets for U.S. workers.

Now, I stumbled through an exchange with my friend from Ohio when I was talking about a great Ohio company, Whirlpool. What I was trying to say is that Whirlpool has projected that they will have a 400 percent increase in their

level of exports from Ohio to Peru. And what does that mean? Whirlpool projects that it will create 9,000 new jobs for workers in Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, Peru, Colombia, Panama, through trade preferences that we have joined together in a bipartisan way in granting, have had access to the U.S. consumer. This agreement is not about free trade. It is about opening up new opportunities for U.S. workers, and it is about the security of this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement represents a new kind of policy, a new generation of free trade agreements. Since World War II, our international trade policy has been driven by a broad commitment to expanding economic opportunity for Americans. Producers from across the country must have access to international markets to stay competitive in an increasingly global economy.

However, we must carefully construct each agreement in a way that is fair, sound and beneficial to all countries involved. The administration's initial agreement with Peru was none of the above. I am proud that our leadership took an unprecedented and hands-on approach to ensure that this particular agreement incorporated the values and principles of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is different than previous agreements. The labor and environmental protections in this agreement are stronger than any other previous free trade agreement. As our Nation's trade policy moves forward, I urge our colleagues to consider each potential free trade agreement on its merits. We cannot dwell on past flawed agreements. We must look toward the future with full confidence in our companies and in our workers and say that American products can compete with anyone, anywhere, at any time.

Mr. Speaker, we must lead by example, and I commend Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LEVIN for the diligent work on this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 349, noes 55, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 1059]

AYES—349

Abercrombie	Dreier	Lee
Ackerman	Edwards	Levin
Aderholt	Ehlers	Lewis (GA)
Akin	Ellsworth	Lewis (KY)
Alexander	Emanuel	Linder
Allen	Emerson	LoBiondo
Andrews	Engel	Loebsack
Arcuri	English (PA)	Loftgren, Zoe
Baca	Eshoo	Lowey
Bachmann	Etheridge	Lucas
Bachus	Everett	Lungren, Daniel
Baird	Fallin	E.
Baker	Farr	Lynch
Barrett (SC)	Fattah	Mack
Barrow	Feeney	Mahoney (FL)
Bartlett (MD)	Ferguson	Maloney (NY)
Barton (TX)	Flake	Manzullo
Bean	Forbes	Marchant
Becerra	Fortenberry	Markey
Berkley	Fossella	Marshall
Berman	Fox	Matheson
Berry	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Biggert	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)
Bilirakis	Galleghy	McCaul (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Garrett (NJ)	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (NY)	Gerlach	McCrery
Blackburn	Gilchrest	McDermott
Blumenauer	Gillibrand	McGovern
Blunt	Gingrey	McHenry
Bonner	Gohmert	McHugh
Bono	Gonzalez	McKeon
Boozman	Goodlatte	McMorris
Boswell	Gordon	Rodgers
Boustany	Granger	McNerney
Boyd (FL)	Graves	McNulty
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	Meek (FL)
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)
Broun (GA)	Harman	Melancon
Brown (SC)	Hastert	Mica
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Miller (NC)
Burton (IN)	Heller	Miller, Gary
Butterfield	Hensarling	Mitchell
Calvert	Herger	Moore (KS)
Camp (MI)	Herse	Moore (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Higgins	Moran (KS)
Cannon	Hill	Moran (VA)
Cantor	Hinchey	Murphy (CT)
Capito	Hirono	Murphy, Patrick
Capps	Hobson	Murtha
Capuano	Hodes	Musgrave
Cardoza	Holt	Nadler
Carnahan	Honda	Napolitano
Carney	Hooley	Neal (MA)
Carter	Hoyer	Neugebauer
Castle	Hulshof	Nunes
Castor	Inglis (SC)	Obey
Chabot	Inslee	Olver
Chandler	Israel	Ortiz
Clarke	Issa	Pascarella
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Pearce
Clyburn	(TX)	Pence
Coble	Jefferson	Peterson (PA)
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Petri
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Pickering
Conaway	Johnson, E. B.	Pitts
Cooper	Johnson, Sam	Platts
Costa	Jones (OH)	Poe
Cramer	Jordan	Pomeroy
Crenshaw	Kagen	Porter
Crowley	Kanjorski	Price (GA)
Cuellar	Keller	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)
Davis (AL)	Kind	Putnam
Davis (CA)	King (IA)	Ramstad
Davis (KY)	King (NY)	Rangel
Davis, David	Kingston	Regula
Davis, Lincoln	Kirk	Rehberg
Deal (GA)	Klein (FL)	Reichert
DeGette	Kline (MN)	Renzi
Delahunt	Knollenberg	Reyes
Dent	Kuhl (NY)	Reynolds
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lamborn	Richardson
Dicks	Lampson	Rodriguez
Dingell	Lantos	Rogers (AL)
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Donnelly	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Doolittle	Latham	Rohrabacher
Drake	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Simpson
Ross	Sires
Rothman	Skelton
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter
Royce	Smith (NE)
Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)
Rush	Smith (TX)
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)
Ryan (WI)	Snyder
Salazar	Solis
Sali	Souder
Sarbanes	Space
Saxton	Spratt
Schiff	Sullivan
Schmidt	Tancred
Schwartz	Tanner
Scott (GA)	Tauscher
Scott (VA)	Terry
Sensenbrenner	Thompson (CA)
Serrano	Thompson (MS)
Sessions	Thornberry
Sestak	Tiahrt
Shadegg	Tierney
Shays	Towns
Shea-Porter	Tsongas
Shimkus	Turner
Shuster	Udall (NM)

NOES—55

Altmire	Grijalva
Baldwin	Gutierrez
Boyd (KS)	Hall (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Hare
Ginny	Hayes
Burgess	Hoekstra
Conyers	Holden
Costello	Hunter
Courtney	Jones (NC)
Culberson	Kaptur
Davis (IL)	Kennedy
DeFazio	Kildee
DeLauro	Kucinich
Doyle	Langevin
Duncan	Lipinski
Ellison	McCotter
Filner	McIntyre
Goode	Michaud
Green, Gene	Mollohan

NOT VOTING—28

Bishop (UT)	Giffords	Paul
Boehner	Hinojosa	Radanovich
Boren	Jindal	Stark
Boucher	LaHood	Stearns
Braley (IA)	Lewis (CA)	Udall (CO)
Buyer	Miller (FL)	Watson
Carson	Miller, George	Young (AK)
Cubin	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)
Davis, Tom	Myrick	
Diaz-Balart, L.	Oberstar	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2023

Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WATERS and Mr. PAYNE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WAMP, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, HALL of Texas, and GOHMERT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2602. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility in Iron Mountain, Michigan, as the “Oscar G. Johnson Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility”.

The message also announced that the Senate, having had under consideration the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3043) “An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.”, it was

Resolved, That the Senate defeated the conference report on a point of order raised under Rule XXVIII, paragraph 3; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate recedes from its amendment, to the aforesaid bill, with an amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I know this will come as an extraordinary disappointment to all of the Members in the House, but in consultation with my friend the minority whip, and in consultation with Mr. LEVIN, the chairman of the subcommittee, and Mr. RANGEL, and I have not talked to Mr. MCCRERY and I apologize for that, but I think that the way we will proceed, we will proceed to debate tonight, I’m trying to elongate this announcement because so many times people are so angry at me for scheduling. I think it’s one of the few opportunities I get to make people a little bit happy. But we will save 20 minutes of debate. We will do all but 20 minutes of the allocated debate. There are four sides to this. Five, five, five and five, we will save for tomorrow, and we will commence that at the conclusion of the 1-minutes. There are 10 a side. So that will take about 20, 25 minutes, and we will commence the closing of debate, and then we will have the vote on this bill immediately following that debate.

Mr. RANGEL. Would the gentleman yield on this?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANGEL. You know, the committee’s put a lot of time on this bill, but after considerable thought, I just thought it would be fair to tell the majority leader that I agree with you 100 percent.

Mr. HOYER. I knew this was going to be a good night.

UNITED STATES-PERU TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 801, I call up the bill (H.R. 3688) to implement the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,