

about one of the worst human tragedies in recent memory—the crisis in Darfur.

For 4 long years the world has watched as thousands of innocent victims have been murdered, tortured, and raped—their villages burned, their livelihoods stolen. More than 2 million people have been chased from their homes—many trapped in dangerous refugee camps for almost 5 years.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle and in the international community have repeatedly called for greater U.S. and global action. President Bush has rightly called the situation in Darfur genocide. British Prime Minister Gordon Brown has said, “Darfur is the greatest humanitarian crisis the world faces today.”

And U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has made ending the crisis one of his top priorities.

His efforts and those of many others led to 2 promising breakthroughs earlier this year.

First, the various parties agreed to start peace talks. With more and more rebel groups involved in the violence, a long-term political settlement will be vital in bringing stability to the region.

Second, the U.N. Security Council voted to deploy a 26,000-member peacekeeping force to bring the ongoing carnage to an end and help create an atmosphere for such negotiations.

Under pressure from the international community, the Sudanese government—notorious for its delays, denials, and obstruction—grudgingly accepted this new force.

Despite these assurances, we had many reasons to be skeptical of the regime’s true intentions.

For example, Sudan has appointed its own former minister of interior, Mr. Ahmed Harun, to lead a committee to investigate human rights abuses and also to help oversee the deployment of the peacekeeping force.

Mr. Harun is wanted by the International Criminal Court for war crimes.

As interior minister, Mr. Harun helped fund, recruit, and arm the Janjaweed militia which was directly involved in perpetuating the genocide in Darfur.

Mr. Harun’s place in on trial in The Hague, not investigating violence he helped perpetuate.

Equally troubling are the continued attacks on international aid workers, fissures in the peace agreement between North and South Sudan, and continued violence in Darfur.

While the Khartoum government thumbs its nose at the international community, thousands of innocent victims remain trapped in sprawling refugee camps—their lives horribly uprooted, their families traumatized with fear and dislocation.

And now, tragically, it appears that the Sudanese government was never serious about the U.N. peacekeeping force. With only 3 weeks until the de-

ployment is scheduled to begin the Sudanese government is back to its old tricks.

A few weeks ago, the U.N.’s top peacekeeping official, Jean-Marie Guéhenno, told the Security Council that obstacles created by the Sudanese Government were jeopardizing the deployment of the new peacekeeping force.

In particular, Sudan is now objecting to the deployment of non-African peacekeepers.

Sudan’s obstruction is madness and must not be tolerated.

In fact, 13 former world leaders and current activists, including former President Jimmy Carter, former U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, Bangladeshi microfinance champion Muhammed Yunus, and Archbishop Desmond Tutu have called for the immediate deployment of the peacekeeping force.

This group of “Elders” noted in a recent report that the residents of Darfur, as well as Sudanese elsewhere, are desperate for the peacekeepers to arrive.

The stakes are too high and the humanitarian crisis has dragged on too long to allow any further backsliding by the Sudanese Government.

That is why I believe it is time to increase the pressure on the Sudanese Government.

Earlier this year I introduced 2 versions of legislation that would increase economic pressure on the Sudanese regime. Each of those bills supported state and local divestment efforts, and therefore would allow each of us to do our part to end the madness in Darfur by selling off any investments in companies that support the Sudanese regime.

I am pleased that Senator DODD, as chairman of the Banking Committee, adopted ideas from these bills into the Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act of 2007—a bill the Senate passed last week and the House just moments ago passed by a unanimous vote of 411 to 0.

I thank him, as well as Ranking Member SHELBY and others who have worked on this bill—especially Senators CORNYN and BROWBACK, who joined me as lead sponsors of the legislation I originally introduced.

I hope Congress’s support for this bill sends the Government of Sudan an important message—that its brazen delays and obstruction of an internationally sanctioned peacekeeping force in Darfur can no longer be tolerated.

CONGRATULATING OLIVET NAZARENE UNIVERSITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Olivet Nazarene University on its 100th-year anniversary.

Olivet Nazarene University was founded by a group of families led by Edward Richards and Orla Nesbitt in

1907, first as a grade school and later as a liberal arts college. From humble beginnings, the university has endured bankruptcy, fire, a change of location to Bourbonnais, and tornado devastation to become the fine institution of higher learning that it is today. Olivet Nazarene University has grown as a liberal arts institution, with additional locations now throughout the greater Chicago area and in Hong Kong.

The university also has the distinction of serving as the summer home of the Chicago Bears. Olivet has hosted the NFL team for its training camp since 2002.

Currently, 4,400 undergraduate and postgraduate students attend the university. Olivet Nazarene offers these students 100 undergraduate fields of study, nearly 20 master’s degrees, non-traditional adult degree completion programs, and a doctor of education in ethical leadership.

Olivet Nazarene University has graduated many notable alumni who have given back to the university, the State of Illinois, and this country in significant ways. An estimated 30,000 Olivet Nazarene University alumni live and work around the world, including Georgia Southwestern State University president Kendall A. Blanchard and Ticketmaster cofounder Cecil Crawford.

Olivet Nazarene University sets a standard of affordable excellence, with a cost below average for private colleges nationwide. Approximately 96 percent of traditional undergraduates receive a total of \$24.9 million in scholarships and grants.

I congratulate Olivet Nazarene University, its president, Dr. John C. Bowling, and all the staff on 100 years of service to their students and alumni, the State of Illinois, and our Nation.

FARM BILL CONFERENCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak about an issue that may come up during the negotiations between the House and the Senate to reconcile the farm bill.

The bill we passed last week in the Senate included a sense-of-the-Senate resolution addressing trade in sweeteners between parties to the North American Free Trade Agreement, also known as NAFTA.

Apparently, some view this language as just a placeholder for new language that will be inserted in conference.

Even more troubling, the new language that is being contemplated would call for managed trade in sweeteners between the United States and Mexico.

The issue of trade in sweeteners between the United States and Mexico has a long history.

For years, Mexico put up barrier after barrier to our exports of high fructose corn syrup.

It started in 1998. That year, Mexico imposed an antidumping duty order on imports of high fructose corn syrup from the United States.

We challenged that order, and we won. In 2001, a dispute resolution panel determined that Mexico was out of compliance with its obligations under NAFTA.

The appellate body of the World Trade Organization reached a similar conclusion.

The antidumping duty order on our high fructose corn syrup was inconsistent with Mexico's obligations under the WTO.

Mexico finally lifted its antidumping duties in 2002. But that same year, Mexico imposed a 20 percent tax on soft drinks flavored with high fructose corn syrup.

This soda tax was designed specifically to discriminate against high fructose corn syrup imported from the United States.

As a result of this unfair discrimination, our exports of high fructose corn syrup to Mexico fell dramatically.

We challenged Mexico's discriminatory tax at the World Trade Organization.

In 2006, the appellate body determined that this tax was inconsistent with Mexico's obligations under the WTO.

Mexico complied with the WTO decision earlier this year by repealing its discriminatory soda tax.

Now, after years of pressuring Mexico to drop its unfair barriers to our exports of high fructose syrup, we're finally at a good spot.

Mexico has eliminated both its antidumping duty order and its discriminatory tax.

We are on the verge of seeing high fructose corn syrup start to flow freely across our border.

Starting January 1, 2008, Mexico is obligated to provide duty-free access to our exports of high fructose corn syrup under NAFTA.

That is why I am so concerned. This new language being contemplated for the farm bill could disrupt our legitimate expectations of free trade in high fructose corn syrup next year.

If instead of free trade we end up with managed trade, it could significantly impede our exports of high fructose corn syrup to Mexico.

Under a managed trade regime, we would presumably limit the amount of sugar that we import from Mexico.

And in response, Mexico would presumably limit imports of high fructose corn syrup from the United States.

Simply put, managed trade could reverse all the gains we have made over the years to get Mexico to take our high fructose corn syrup.

Corn farmers and high fructose corn syrup producers in Iowa and other States would, of course, be harmed by any import restrictions imposed by Mexico as a result of managed trade.

And managed trade could well result in Mexico further violating its obligations under NAFTA.

Many of my colleagues complain, legitimately, when our trading partners fail to comply with their international trade obligations.

The last thing we should do is give Mexico an excuse to violate its NAFTA obligations, particularly when it would harm U.S. agricultural producers.

The current language in the Senate-passed bill does not call for managed trade.

The current language would not likely induce Mexico to impose further restrictions on our exports of high fructose corn syrup.

As a Senator from Iowa, as well as the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee and a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I have worked hard over the years to get a fair deal for agriculture when it comes to international trade.

In particular, I have put considerable effort into opening foreign markets to our exports of agricultural products.

Too often our trading partners have imposed barriers to U.S. farm exports. And too often those barriers are in violation of international trade obligations.

Those barriers harm American farmers and agricultural producers.

Whether it is unfair restrictions on U.S. beef exports to Japan and Korea, or under restrictions on U.S. corn exports to Europe, it is imperative that we focus our efforts to remove barriers to trade.

With effort, we have been successful in getting our trading partners to remove such barriers.

That is the case with Mexico's treatment of high fructose corn syrup, as I have described.

We can't go backwards.

Our corn farmers and our producers of high fructose corn syrup are counting on us.

I will be working hard to see that the current language on trade in sweet-

eners is retained without change in the conference report to the farm bill.

Free trade in high fructose corn syrup with Mexico is long overdue.

I yield the floor.

FURTHER CHANGES TO S. CON. RES. 21

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, section 207(c) of S. Con. Res. 21, the 2008 budget resolution, permits the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the section 207(b) discretionary spending limits and allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for legislation reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee that provides a certain level of funding for fiscal year 2008 for four program integrity initiatives. The initiatives are continuing disability reviews and supplemental security income redeterminations, Internal Revenue Service tax enforcement, health care fraud and abuse control, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews.

On July 23, 2007, I revised both the discretionary spending limits and the allocation to the Senate Appropriations Committee for discretionary budget authority and outlays to reflect that the committee had reported legislation that met the conditions of 207(c) for the four program integrity initiatives. The total amount of that adjustment was an additional \$1,042 million in budget authority and \$699 million in outlays for fiscal year 2008.

The level of funding provided for each of the program integrity initiatives in H.R. 2764, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008, however, is lower than the levels mandated by section 207(c). Consequently, I am reversing the adjustments made on July 23, 2007, to both the discretionary spending limits and the allocation to the Senate Appropriations Committee for discretionary budget authority and outlays.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following revisions to S. Con. Res. 21 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008—S. CON. RES. 21; FURTHER REVISIONS TO THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 207(c) TO THE ALLOCATION OF BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS TO THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE AND THE SECTION 207(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

In Millions of Dollars	Current Allocation/Limit	Adjustment	Revised Allocation/Limit
FY 2008 Discretionary Budget Authority	954,095	-1,042	953,053
FY 2008 Outlays	1,029,097	-699	1,028,398

CHANGES TO S. CON. RES. 21

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, section 301(a) of S. Con. Res. 21, the 2008 budget resolution, permits the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation that authorizes the State Children's Health

Insurance Program, SCHIP. Section 301 authorizes the revisions provided that certain conditions are met, including that such legislation maintains coverage for those currently enrolled in SCHIP and that it not worsen the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 or the pe-

riod of the total of fiscal years 2007 through 2017.

In addition, section 304(b)(2) of S. Con. Res. 21 permits the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels for legislation that both increases the reimbursement rate for physician services under section