

have parroted the elegant theories of 18th century economist Adam Smith.

But the trade agreements into which we have entered in recent years are not simply reductions in tariffs, as Adam Smith envisioned. If these agreements were just reductions in tariffs, they could be implemented by a bill that is only one or two pages long. Of course, that is not the case. These agreements are lengthy. The bills that implement them are so massive as to be almost bullet proof. And the reason is that they go far beyond merely lowering tariffs. As Thea Lee wrote in the *Wall Street Journal*:

We should all understand by now that modern, (post-NAFTA) free-trade agreements are not just about lowering tariffs. They are about changing the conditions attached to trade liberalization, in ways that benefit some players and hurt others. These are not your textbook free-trade deals. These are finely orchestrated special-interest deals that boost the profits and power of multinational corporations, leaving workers, family farmers, many small businesses, and the environment more vulnerable than ever.

Increasingly, some who blindly accepted these trade agreements in the past now are beginning to read the fine print. They recognize the role these agreements have played in our skyrocketing trade deficits and the loss of millions of jobs. They understand that if we are to have a sustainable trade policy, then we must dramatically alter the NAFTA model of trade on which our recent trade agreements are based.

The agreement announced last week does not do that. And until our trade agreements better reflect a more sustainable relationship with our trading partners as well as the broader interests of our own national priorities—keeping businesses and good-paying jobs here, ensuring strong protections for our environment, our food safety, and even the ability of our democratic institutions to set those national priorities—I will continue to oppose them.

DARFUR

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senators MENENDEZ and BROWNBACK this week in introducing a resolution that recognizes the unique diplomatic and economic leverage that China possesses, and that offers that country a rare opportunity to be a force for peace in the troubled Darfur region of Sudan.

By now, we are all aware of the devastation being wrought upon the innocent people of Darfur. Over the past 4 years, hundreds of thousands of people have been killed and more than 2.5 million displaced as a result of the ongoing and escalating violence caused by the Sudanese Government, associated Janjaweed militia attacks, and even the numerous rebel factions. Congress declared the Sudanese Government's atrocities to be genocide nearly 3 years ago, and my colleagues and I have been actively demanding that the United States do everything in its power to

bolster the hard-working but inadequate African Union peacekeeping mission, support the efforts of courageous humanitarian workers, hold those responsible accountable for their actions, and persuade all parties to commit to a legitimate political resolution that can end the conflict and ensure people can safely and voluntarily return to their homes.

Although I am frustrated that the United States' efforts to achieve these key objectives have been inadequate, I am even more upset by the Sudanese Government's persistent obstruction of all efforts to address Darfur's deep security, humanitarian, and political crises. The United States and other Western governments have made significant political and material investments in Sudan in an attempt to bring peace to that conflict-torn country, but as long as Khartoum continues to thwart its international obligations and pursue its violent campaign, these investments will not bring Sudan closer to peace.

All parties agree that the tipping point in Sudan will come when the government there sees the costs of continuing to break existing promises and obstruct new agreements as greater than the benefits it can achieve by doing so.

The country perhaps best positioned to affect the calculus of this cost-benefit analysis is China. Over the last decade, Beijing's energy firms have invested between \$3 billion and \$10 billion in the Sudanese energy sector, and China now exports seventy percent of Sudan's oil. China recently cancelled over \$100 million in Sudanese debt and is building roads, bridges, an oil refinery, a hydroelectric dam, government offices and a new \$20 million presidential palace. With these debt savings and oil revenues, Sudan has doubled its defense budget in recent years, spending 60 percent to 80 percent of its oil revenue on weapons—arms mostly made in China. I was very disturbed to see that the chief of Sudan's armed forces was so warmly welcomed in Beijing last week and promised increased military exchanges and cooperation.

Eleven States, half a dozen cities, and more than 30 academic institutions across the United States have decided to divest from companies that do business with the Sudanese Government. Many of these companies are Chinese, which sends a signal to both Beijing and Khartoum that Americans—and others around the world—are willing to put their money where their mouths are when it comes to defending the people of Darfur.

Africa can benefit from Chinese investment, but China's increasingly important role on the continent also carries responsibilities. As the 2008 summer Olympics in Beijing approach, China is keen to be perceived as a key player on the world stage, but that means it needs to play by the rules. According to a recent Amnesty International report, China is, and I quote

“allowing ongoing flows of arms to parties to Sudan that are diverted for the conflict in Darfur and used there and across the border in Chad to commit grave violations of international law.” This is, I note, also in violation of the U.N. arms embargo.

Recently, China has begun to play a more constructive role in Sudan, by offering to contribute an engineering unit to the U.N.-led peacekeeping force that awaits admission into Darfur and by appointing a special representative to Africa who will focus specifically on the Darfur issue. These are notable, and welcomed developments, but they are not sufficient. We need to see a substantial policy shift in China's relationship with Khartoum that is reflected in both their public and their private efforts. China must send an unequivocal message that the relentless violence is unacceptable—and it must do so by working collaboratively and constructively with the rest of the international community to ensure a consistent message.

The resolution introduced today urges China to be more constructive, consistent, and collaborative in its policy towards Sudan. It is our hope that through political messages like this resolution, diplomatic communication through formal and informal channels, and economic signals sent by the divestment campaign, China will be persuaded to take advantage of the unique opportunity it possesses to change the political calculus of the government in Khartoum so that the equation results in peace for the people of Darfur.

IBM CELEBRATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I proudly tell my friends in the Senate about an impressive milestone in the history of Vermont business. This winter marked 50 years since IBM President Tom Watson Jr. opened a manufacturing plant in Essex Junction. Today, IBM is Vermont's largest private employer and one of the foundations to a growing technology sector throughout our State.

Many events have and will be planned to celebrate the many achievements IBM and its workforce have made in the Green Mountain State. Most recently, Vermont Business Magazine ran a collection of news pieces and special features in its April 2007 issue about IBM's history in Vermont.

I ask unanimous consent that an op-ed I wrote recognizing the successes that IBM and Vermont have enjoyed during the past 50 years be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Vermont Business Magazine, Apr. 2007]

IBM'S 50 YEARS OF INNOVATION AND EVOLUTION

(By Senator Patrick Leahy)

In 1957, then IBM President Tom Watson Jr. selected Vermont's Essex Junction to