

Peru-United States Free Trade Agreement / Agreement should be ratified

< Peru-United States Free Trade Agreement

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

Position: Agreement should be ratified

This position addresses the topic Peru-United States Free Trade Agreement.

For this position

“The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) estimates the agreement would result in a larger increase in U.S. exports to Peru (\$1.1 billion a year) than in Peru's exports to the United States (\$439 million). According to the American Farm Bureau Federation, U.S. farm exports could increase by \$705 million a year. U.S. GDP may rise by \$2.1 billion or more annually under the agreement, according to the ITC.”

From A good Peru trade pact, by Barbara Bowie-Whitman (*The Washington Times*, September 17, 2007) (view)

“At home, the trade pacts would provide opportunities for American exporters and help create jobs. In Latin America, the pacts would contribute to economic growth, shake off dependence on the narcotics trade and cement relationships in a region where Washington's influence is increasingly trumped by the well-oiled diplomacy of Venezuela's Hugo Chávez.”

From Democrats Talk Sense to Democrats, by The New York Times editorial board (*The New York Times*, October 8, 2007) (view)

“Letting it expire with nothing else in place would deal a heavy blow to the U.S. war on drugs. If Congress turns its back on these Andean countries, it will be playing into the hands of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and others trying to encourage the spread of anti-Americanism in the region.”

From Peru's Path to Prosperity, by Los Angeles Times editorial board (*Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 2006) (view)

“Democrats are right to worry about the stagnation of workers' wages and to be concerned about those who lose their jobs because of increased competition from cheaper labor overseas. But these problems should be addressed through better education and training, a more robust social safety network and more progressive taxation to mitigate the impact of stagnating wages. Throttling trade would hurt more people than it would help.”

From Pass the Peruvian F.T.A., by The New York Times editorial board (*The New York Times*, November 7, 2007) (view)

“ "Trade has helped America transform itself into a middle-class service economy. Yes, the country's lost a net 3.3 million manufacturing jobs in the past decade - but it's added a net 11.6 million jobs in service and other sectors where average wages are higher than in manufacturing. Most of these new jobs are in better-paying categories, like professional and business services, finance and education and health services." ”

From The Truth on Trade, by Daniel Griswold (*New York Post*, November 7, 2007) (view)

“ "A remarkable statistic: Every three months, 7 million to 8 million U.S. jobs disappear and roughly an equal or greater number are created. Trade is a relatively minor factor in job loss. It is, however, an easy scapegoat." ”

From 'Fair Trade' Foolishness, by Robert J. Samuelson (*The Washington Post*, November 30, 2006) (view)

“ "Politicians who oppose trade agreements typically claim they cost U.S. jobs, especially in manufacturing. They contend such pacts only benefit big business. Yet over the past decade, a period of expanding trade under both Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, the United States has added more than 16 million jobs. The U.S. economy has grown nearly 40 percent." ”

From Wins, not losses, by Orlando Sentinel editorial board (*Orlando Sentinel*, November 27, 2006) (view)

“ "In short, trade helps people while protectionism hurts them. Imports give people a wider choice of goods, often at lower prices; protectionism helps local industries--steel companies in the Bush protectionism case--maintain higher prices at the expense of broad social and economic prosperity." ”

From Protection Racket, by Pete du Pont (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 22, 2006) (view)

“ "If Democrats want to help American workers, there are many things they could do: Make health insurance and pensions more portable, promote competition for failing public schools, reduce the cost of litigation that drives companies overseas. Trade protection, however, will be an economic and political loser." ”

From Protectionist Party?, by The Wall Street Journal editorial board (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 18, 2006) (view)

“ "Just how the defeat of these two trade pacts is supposed to benefit American democracy, security or living standards is a riddle. The opposite is true: If a U.S. goal is to increase stability and prosperity abroad and to make the homefront safer and living standards higher for Americans, killing the U.S.-Peru deal is dumb. Knocking off the agreement with Colombia is even dumber." ”

From Don't Close the Door on Free Trade in the Andes, by Mary Anastasia O'Grady (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 17, 2006) (view)

“ "U.S. trade and investment in the Andean region create jobs that offer alternatives to growing coca and exporting narcotics to the United States. Such jobs can help counter the anti-capitalist pull of Venezuela's Hugo Chávez and his partners. If Congress turns away from free trade, U.S. industry will lose ground in the region to China and other Southeast Asian nations." ”

From Congress, priorities and power shifts, by The Miami Herald editorial board (*The Miami Herald*, November 16, 2006) (view)

“ "According to the American Farm Bureau Federation, farm exports to Peru could increase by \$705 million a year. U.S. producers of machinery, plastics, cereals and mineral fuels, as well as wheat, cotton and coarse grains all expect strong export growth if it passes. On the other hand, if the U.S. walks away from Peru, the leadership in Lima will likely look to the EU and its Latin American neighbors for trade agreements, putting U.S. producers at a disadvantage." ”

From Democrats and Trade, by The Wall Street Journal editorial board (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 15, 2006) (view)

“ "As a political issue, free trade often suffers its share of partisan and industry-specific bashing. As an economic issue, no other force is more responsible for raising global prosperity in recent decades than the elimination of protective barriers and the creation of a more efficient system of trade. And few countries have benefited more than the United States." ”

From Congress finally gets on free trade track, by San Antonio Express-News editorial board (*San Antonio Express-News*, November 14, 2007) (view)

“ "Critics contend the government of President Álvaro Uribe hasn't done enough under these circumstances to protect human rights. What's certain is that he'll be able to do far less if his government is abandoned by the United States. The United States has better leverage over labor conditions, environmental issues and human rights in Latin America with these free trade agreements in place than without them." ”

From Don't turn U.S. back on hemispheric allies, by San Antonio Express-News editorial board (*San Antonio Express-News*, May 17, 2007) (view)

“ "For these allies, it's a worthy affirmation of their years of hard work developing their economies in honest terms. It also will strengthen their democracies, as Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice told Congress Thursday. That in turn will lessen the appeal of tinpot dictators like Venezuela's Hugo Chavez, who offer poor countries goodies in lieu of free trade." ”

From Free Trade Sunlight, by Investor's Business Daily editorial board (*Investor's Business Daily*, May 11, 2007) (view)

“ "Good idea, right? Not to Democrats, who said Friday that they'll oppose the pact on human rights grounds until they "see concrete evidence of sustained results on the ground in Colombia." What Colombians think about their president and his policies is apparently meaningless. Mr. Uribe replied that he isn't interested in "a relationship wherein the U.S. is master and Colombia a slave republic"; good for him." ”

From Trade Double-Cross, by The Wall Street Journal editorial board (*The Wall Street Journal*,

July 5, 2007) (view)

“ "With the Doha global trade round in danger of failure, FTAs become the only trade-expanding game in town. The alternative to U.S. trade leadership is a proliferation of regional deals that could hurt U.S. economic interests and lead to protectionist blocs of the kind that Señor Chávez wants to promote." ”

From Free Trade and Security, by The Wall Street Journal editorial board (*The Wall Street Journal*, July 11, 2006) (view)

“ "Some trade bills are so obviously beneficial and unobjectionable that there's no excuse for letting them languish. This is the case with a raft of measures that would extend trade preferences for poor countries -- preferences due to expire at the end of the year." ”

From Can't Be Bothered, by The Washington Post editorial board (*The Washington Post*, December 5, 2006) (view)

“ "Results of existing trade agreements have demonstrated that trade liberalization is sound policy for the U.S. economy. Western Hemisphere countries participating in free-trade agreements with us have experienced strong economic growth, job creation and poverty reduction. For these countries, fiscal stability has improved; reducing reliance on foreign assistance has allowed stable financial markets to emerge, increasing the availability of credit for consumer goods and housing." ”

From Trade creates U.S. jobs, prosperity for allies, by Mel Martinez (*The Miami Herald*, December 4, 2006) (view)

“ "Anti-trade groups argue, as always, that they are trying to protect workers, not defeat trade pacts. In fact, they would encumber the deals with protections that are impractical in developing countries facing myriad economic and political challenges." ”

From New push for 'fair trade' puts U.S. economy at risk, by USA Today editorial board (*USA Today*, December 12, 2006) (view)

“ "The danger for the United States is that if it abandons these Latin advocates of open markets, the beneficiaries will be radical supporters of Venezuela's Chávez. Already Chávez is pumping an estimated \$2 billion in discounted oil to poor Latin American countries. The United States, by contrast, is providing just \$1.3 billion in development assistance." ”

From The Democrats Dither on Trade, by David Ignatius (*The Washington Post*, August 5, 2007) (view)

Against this position

“ "But 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." ”

From Why the Rush on Trade?, by Harold Meyerson (*The Washington Post*, November 7, 2007)
(view)

Mixed on this position

No results

Retrieved from

"https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Peru-United_States_Free_Trade_Agreement/_Agreement_should_be_ratified&oldid=3898"

This page was last edited on November 17, 2006, at 14:29.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.