

corporations to move overseas? Why would we agree to an agreement that would displace peasant farmers who would be forced to migrate to the United States?

The American public aren't fooled. Campaign finance reform hasn't stopped the incredible financial influence of multinational corporations. These corporations are weighing in with the candidates, even Citibank. Take, for example, the provisions hidden in the Peru FTA. As Senator Edwards points out, "Buried deep in the 800-page text of the Peru FTA are ambiguous provisions that could allow U.S. banks to demand compensation if Peru reverses its disastrous social security privatization."

The Peru FTA contains provisions that could allow Citibank to demand compensation in FTA foreign investor protection tribunals from the Peruvian Government if Peru seeks to reverse its failed social security privatization. The Peruvian archbishop and both labor federation presidents asked the Ways and Means leaders to fix this problem. And it hasn't been fixed.

The House floor will be voting on this in a couple of weeks. As a Democratic Party, we have stood united against privatization of Social Security. We have not backed down. That is why it shocks me to hear that Senator OBAMA supports the Peru FTA. Yes, Senator OBAMA does support the Peru FTA.

Senator Edwards has it right. It is time to stick up for the American workers. It is time to reject the same NAFTA model that has devastated our industry. It is time to listen to the broad list of groups who do not support the Peru FTA. Not one union, environmental, consumer, small business, faith, family farm group supports the modified Bush Peru NAFTA Expansion FTA. So why would any Presidential candidate?

It is important to hear what the candidates are saying about protecting our jobs and fighting for fair trade deals. It is important that we stick together in this fight to keep our jobs here at home. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the Peru FTA.

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

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

#### THE PERU TRADE DEAL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Peru trade deal will also be bad for U.S. agriculture and all farmers in our country and, amazingly, in Peru. So both here at home and abroad it will result in more harm.

Let's look at the facts. This current trade deficit chart with Peru tells us we are already in the red with Peru, as we are in the red with China and in the red with Mexico and in the red with almost every other trading country, Japan, et cetera. The U.S. vegetable trade deficit with Peru is already a part of this. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service, just the vegetable deficit component is already over \$200 million in 2006. So America's vegetable farmers will lose more market share. They have already lost market share, especially those who farm asparagus, onions and peas. Their situation will be similar to the plight of America's tomato, bell pepper and cucumber farmers who learned well what happened after NAFTA was signed. They all lost production as it relocated.

Several global corporations have already indicated what they are going to do. They are already putting their processing plants in Peru. Green Giant has done it. Del Monte has done it. The pattern is the same, the same as under NAFTA. As was the case with Mexico where millions of peasant farmers were upended under NAFTA with no adjustment provisions for them, Peru's farmers will also be hurt when these same global corporations take over their farming operations and flood their markets with rice, corn and chicken.

We expect that an additional 3 million Peruvian agricultural workers will be directly affected and millions of Peruvian farmers, as Mexico's farmers well know, will be upended. This will force increased migration of those individuals to cities that are already swelling with large numbers of poor, and it is projected expanded illegal drug production as people try to stay in their home countries with no crops to sell, they turn to those illegal choices.

Similar to the lack of protection for Mexico's corn and bean farmers under NAFTA, which that corn and bean tariff is going to phase out at the end of this year, and another 2 million of Mexico's farmers will be hurt, we know that what happens is that they either emigrate to adjoining cities or to the United States, many of them illegally, or they turn to the illegal sector where they literally risk their lives in order to survive.

What kind of a plan is this that would treat the people of developing countries with such derision? What kind of a plan is it that would hurt our farmers to that extent? Why does it always have to be a negative? Why can't trade be a plus plus? Importantly, Peru was the world's top coca producer in 1996, and coca production remains a viable alternative for farmers forced to give up their legal crops.

Is anybody listening? Is anybody thinking? It is pretty clear what is going to happen because there is nothing in the agreement to help Peru adjust. We saw what happened when that didn't occur under NAFTA. There were no adjustment provisions for Mexico's

farmers. CAFTA, the same thing, and now we add Peru on top of the pile. There is nothing in the Peruvian agreement for adjustments inside of Peru. The displaced farmers have few options. If they do not turn to coca production or other illegal industries, they will be forced to move. And we can ask where. To the overcrowded cities of Peru, further straining those resources? To another country? With the debate raging about illegal immigration and with us unable to reach a civil accommodation across this continent, wouldn't it be truly cruelly irresponsible to support another trade agreement that could result in more devastation to small holders?

Shouldn't we be helping these farmers adjust inside their own homelands? That is long overdue inside of Mexico, in order to help people earn money in their own countries, rather than wipe out hundreds of thousands of people as if their lives and their cultures didn't matter. And then we get the added problem of illegal labor trafficking into this country, which we can't control.

The Peru agreement doesn't do anything to address these serious human concerns. It does have some of the glossy language like NAFTA and CAFTA did that ends up toothless in terms of enforcement.

Madam Speaker, why would the American people be given more of the same out of this Congress? We ought to be changing these trade agreements to development agreements and treating people with the respect they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her 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 gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Tonight I rise to address the House and the American people regarding the U.S. Peru Free Trade Agreement and its effect on working families. But before I launch into my remarks, I want to be clear. I am committed to trade. I believe trade is an essential component to the development and strengthening of our economy.

Done the right way, trade can increase our access to raw material for production and create American jobs. It can open foreign markets to our goods and services and bring new and unique products into the United States. Done the right way, trade can not only contribute to the economic prosperity of America and its working families, it can also strengthen the economic and political stability of our trading partners. It is because I believe in the many positive impacts that trade can bring when done the right way that I have been fighting for a new trade model.

The NAFTA-style trade free trade agreements negotiated by the Bush administration are the wrong way to do trade. They bring nothing more than empty promises and harm to the American working class. My support for smart trade agreements that work for working people means that I cannot support the U.S.-Peru FTA. It is based on the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, which has resulted in job losses in America, pushed small farmers off the land in Mexico, and jeopardized public health and safety policies in the U.S., Mexico, and Canada.

When the administration announced its new policy on trade earlier this year, I, along with the rest of my colleagues in the House Trade Working Group were hopeful that the administration had taken bold steps to improve its trade policy. Unfortunately, it soon became clear that the Peru FTA, along with the rest of the pending trade agreements, retain the basic structure of NAFTA and CAFTA. The bold promises of new protections for workers turned out to be nice promises that had little chance of being enforced.

The American people are fed up with trade agreements that only benefits the "haves" while making it harder for the "have-nots" to get ahead. A recent Wall Street Journal survey identified the declining public confidence in the NAFTA-style trade model. According to the survey, 60 percent of conservative Americans, those who would have been most apt to support the expansion of free trade, now believe that free trade is harmful to the U.S. economy.

The promises of U.S. job creation and an increased standard of living for the working class have not been fulfilled. Instead, we continue to see the rich get richer and the rest, the middle and working class, get left behind. The administration asserts that the new additions to the Peru agreement will add long-sought labor and environmental protections; however, a careful analysis reveals that there are few changes from the basic NAFTA-CAFTA text. And even when there are changes, the new provisions offer few new protections.

If the Peru FTA is so great, where is all the union support for it? Why do so many environmental groups oppose it? NAFTA-CAFTA provisions that have

caused downward pressure on wages, the export of U.S. jobs and an import of unsafe products and food have saved little. This so-called new deal is a bad deal. It is an old clunker with a new coat of paint. But even if this new deal contained the most stringent labor and environmental protections in the world, it would be dependent on the executive branch for enforcement. And enforcement of labor and environmental standards is something the current administration is unlikely to do. Let's be honest. The Bush administration has a consistent record of non-enforcement.

We need a real new deal, not another NAFTA clone. Simply put, the NAFTA model doesn't work. It has failed to bring the jobs and prosperity that we were promised. Remember when we were promised that NAFTA would create jobs in Mexico and stem the flow of immigration? Remember when we were promised that NAFTA would ensure our trading partners would uphold the same strong labor and environmental standards that we have here in the U.S.? And now, this administration is asking us to believe its promise that the labor and environmental provisions of the Peru agreement will be stringently enforced.

Well, if the experience of the last 10 years hasn't convinced you, I have some swamp land in Florida that I would like to sell you. So long as we have to rely on this administration to protect the rights and safety of working men and women, we will continue to be disappointed. This administration's track record does not reflect a real commitment to the working families of America. The truth of the matter is that the NAFTA model heavily favors the wealthiest few leaving small businesses to fend for themselves on an unequal playing field. The Peru Free Trade Agreement has been advertised as the new model for trade deals. This sounds eerily familiar to what we were told when CAFTA was being pushed. CAFTA was supposed to include bold new wage protections for workers. But those protections were disappointingly weak allowing countries to downgrade their own labor laws.

Minor adjustments in NAFTA-style deals such as the U.S. Peru FTA are not good enough. We need to reject the Peru FTA agreement, and I urge all my colleagues to oppose it.

□ 2000

#### ENDING THE GENOCIDE IN DARFUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES of Ohio) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to re-

vised and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, another opportunity to be here on the floor on Monday night during the Congressional Black Caucus message hour, and you are in the chair. What a privilege.

I rise tonight, Madam Speaker, during this message hour to pause to address an ongoing crisis in Darfur. For many years now we have seen the devastating atrocities taking place in the Darfur region of Sudan. With the support of the Sudanese Government, the janjaweed militia has ravaged the people of Darfur, raping, torturing, murdering and forcing hundreds of thousands of Darfuris to flee to refugee camps in neighboring Chad and the Central African Republic. We saw the same devastation in Rwanda over a decade ago; and the American people have made their voices heard on this issue, vowing never again to remain silent when humanity is threatened.

The Congressional Black Caucus has been a leader on this issue. I, along with many of my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues, were some of the first Members of Congress to speak out about this issue. We have been to the Sudanese embassy to protest. Many were arrested. We have visited the region numerous times and we have repeatedly addressed this issue with President George Bush in meetings, asking him to take immediate action. Yet, once again, we come to the House floor to challenge this administration to take a stand in Darfur.

Madam Speaker, today's Washington Post had this to say about our progress in Darfur: "A year and a half later, the situation on the ground in Darfur is little changed. More than two million displaced Darfuris, including hundreds of thousands in camps, have been unable to return to their homes. The perpetrators of the worst atrocities remain unpunished. Despite a renewed U.N. push, the international peacekeeping troops that Bush has long been seeking have yet to materialize. Just this weekend, peace talks in Libya aimed at ending the 4-year conflict appear to be floundering because of a boycott by key rebel groups."

"Many of those who have tracked the conflict over the years, including some in his own administration, say Bush has not matched his words with action, allowing initiatives to drop because of inertia or failure to follow up, while proving unable to mobilize either this bureaucracy or the international community."

I continue to quote from the Washington Post: "The President, who famously promised not to allow another Rwanda-style mass murder on his watch, has never fully chosen between