economy, the schools, and the small businesses that supplied goods to Maytag.

Now Galesburg is trying to rebuild its identity.

The November 2006 election showed that most Americans understand our past trade policies, which gave us NAFTA and the WTO, have failed; yet President Bush continues to bring more flawed trade agreements to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on May 10, Chairman RANGEL of the Ways and Means Committee reached a landmark deal with the Bush administration to include labor and environmental protection in free trade agreements. The deal requires our trading partners to adopt, maintain and enforce in their laws and practice the five basic international labor standards: freedom of association, right to collective bargaining, elimination of forced labor, abolition of child labor, and elimination of discrimination.

As positive as this deal was, I have absolutely no faith that this President will enforce any labor provisions included in any trade deal. In a statement released on May 11, AFL–CIO president John Sweeney reminded us of the Bush administration's enforcement failure in past agreements by saying, ''The Bush administration's consistent unwillingness to enforce trade violations against nations like Jordan and China reminds us that there is no guarantee that this executive branch will enforce any new rights workers may gain through these negotiations.''

This administration can't even enforce OSHA regulations here at home. How can we expect this President and this administration to enforce laws in these two countries? Recently, I received a letter from two Peruvian labor federations concerned about the labor provisions in the pending FTA between the United States and Peru. In reference to the May 10 announcement, the letter states, ''These changes are important. Nevertheless, in order for there to be real progress that does not only exist on paper, it is necessary that the administrations of President Bush and Garcia adopt significant change that they do not appear willing to do.''

Mr. Speaker, no one seems to have faith in this President or the Peruvian Government to enforce the law. The problem is that those who support the FTA in Peru are the same people that oppose labor reform in Peru.

Mr. Speaker, our trade policies must start to serve the interests of American working families and workers around the globe. I urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to say ''no'' to President Bush's trade agreement with Peru. We have a moral responsibility to save the manufacturing jobs that this Nation has lost and to try to regain those jobs that we have outsourced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PERU FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow on Mr. HARE's remarks this evening and also oppose the pending Peru Free Trade Agreement, which we think is scheduled to come up on this floor in early October.

My question really is: With the United States trade deficit galloping out of control, this year it is likely to hit a trillion dollars in the red, as we continue to outsource jobs across this country. Recently, Ford Mazda in Monroe, Michigan, just north of our district, announced another 2,000 to 3,000 jobs gone. Those are not counting all the supplier jobs outsourced. So why would we be considering another NAFTA-like trade agreement here in this Congress?

The trade deficit with Mexico after NAFTA's passage has gotten worse every single year, going deeper and deeper and deeper into debt, more of our jobs outsourced to that country. Right before NAFTA's passage, there was a positive balance and they tried to make it look good to convince Congress it is getting better. Then we fell into heavy deficit every single year.

We are already in deficit with Peru. In fact, every year it has been getting worse and worse and worse with that nation. So we are even in worse shape with Peru than we were with NAFTA when that was signed. Why would we want more of the same based on that trade model?

Now, one can ask what is happening down there that we have to do this now, with the communities across this country, some of them like my own with over 8 percent unemployment, and why should we sacrifice more U.S. jobs to these flawed trade agreements.

I think I put my finger on it with Peru. There is something called the Camisea Natural Gas Project. In 2004, that country started exporting through this mega gas project exports to our country and other places in the world. Two pipelines started to deliver natural gas from the Amazon River basin at that time. One of the problems with this project is the number of spills and the environmental degradation that is occurring in that region due to this pipeline.

With America so energy dependent, rather than using our power to become energy independent here at home, we are getting ourselves involved in these trade agreements to try to bring more and import more power to this country rather than investing those dollars here. The price of that import of power is a loss of more of our jobs. That is not a trade-off this Member is willing to make.

In addition to that, the Peru Trade Agreement, as we understand it, has several really terrible provisions in it. First of all, the privatization of social security. In Peru, under their system, the agreement would allow private companies like Citibank or other U.S. investors to sue Peruvian taxpayers if Peru itself tries to reverse the partial privatization of the social security system that occurred in that country in the last decade. What a terrible, terrible provision to have for the people of Peru. We believe in the integrity of our Social Security system. Why should we impact theirs?

In addition to that, the Peru agreement as proposed would affect the access to generic medicines to people who live in a very impoverished country like Peru where over half of the people are poor. A number of nongovernmental organizations based in the United States and Latin America have confirmed that this agreement would reduce access to essential medicines by the poor population of Peru and that the agreement's provisions far exceed international standards established by the WTO. Why would we want to do that to the people of Peru?

Moving on to food safety, why would we want to harm the people of our country, because the agreement does not address serious food safety issues that currently plague our relationship with Peru. Indeed, it is one of the 20 top exporters of shrimp to the United States market, and FDA inspectors have consistently rejected seafood from Peru for numerous reasons, including filth, adulteration, misbranding, and presence of various dangerous food pathogens.

There has been poisonous swordfish, salmonella in shrimp, dangerous histamines in mahi-mahi. Shipment after shipment of dried, canned, frozen and fresh fish products from Peru have proven to be damaged. Why would we want to encourage more of that?

Let me also say one of my concerns about this Peru agreement, as with Mexico, it has no adjustment policies for the poorest of the poor. In other words, the Peru Free Trade Agreement does not take into account many farmers in Peru who are going to be displaced because, as other First World agricultural products flood in there, there are no provisions in the agreement to take care of the poor farmers who will be displaced. Why would we do this to our continent?

Mr. Speaker, there are many other reasons to oppose the Peru Free Trade Agreement which I will put in the RECORD and come to the floor in future days to discuss.