

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 BROWNEBACK 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

build one of his company's key manufacturing facilities. Five decades later, the technology and family of employees at IBM Essex have come to define Northern Vermont as much as the snowy winters, short summers and Yankee ingenuity that lured Tom Watson to the Green Mountains in the first place.

The Essex Junction plant has been an integral part of IBM's global strategy since its inception. In what has to be considered an incredible "run," IBM Essex has been a worldwide leader in the development, design and manufacture of semiconductor technology for the past 50 years. That is quite an achievement in the cyclical and volatile semiconductor industry and a testament to the tens of thousands of Vermonters—and newly minted Vermonters—who have worked tirelessly to maintain this world-class status for the past five decades. That has meant adroitly adopting strategies and new manufacturing processes over the years. The plant has transformed itself from a general semiconductor manufacturing facility to a high-end specialty logic semiconductor manufacturing facility. This growth—and this change—was possible with the vision and dedication of the designers, engineers, inventors and technicians who work along the banks of the Winooski River.

IBM, its partners and clients have literally and figuratively altered the economy of Chittenden County and Vermont for generations to come. From software companies big and small, to cutting-edge nano-technology engineering firms, the businesses attracted to IBM and the companies started by former IBM employees have created high-paying jobs and a culture of innovation that are envied across the New England region.

During my 30 years representing Vermont in the United States Senate, I have worked frequently with IBM's corporate leadership, IBM's local leadership and many of the frontline employees. The federal government recognizes that IBM Essex is a national asset: a world class domestic production facility with the highest reputation for ingenuity and productivity and quality. That is why the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) invested millions in the mask house in Vermont. And that is why it made complete sense for the federal government to select Essex Junction as a "Trusted Foundry" to design and produce critical semiconductors resulting in orders as high as \$600 million over the next decade.

The innovation at IBM Essex has played an important role in helping IBM lead the nation in patent creation for more than a decade. Last year alone, 360 patents came directly from the IBM Essex Junction facility—making it one of IBM's top five patent-producing facilities. The fostering and protection of intellectual property is important not only to Vermont but to the nation. During my tenure in the Senate I have made reforms of our patent laws a high priority and I'll continue to press that cause as the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The technology sector has changed dramatically over the past five decades. That IBM Essex has successfully maintained world class leadership despite all of these changes is simply incredible. IBM Essex designs and manufactures microchips for some of the world's leading computer, communications and consumer products companies. Products and technology from IBM in Vermont have helped make computers and electronic products smaller, faster, cheaper and more reliable.

I would venture to say that Tom Watson's vision for IBM in Vermont has turned out to be a great success. On behalf of all Vermonters, I offer everyone who has made IBM Essex a success a heartfelt thank you,

for job after job, done well. Congratulations on fifty years of innovation and prosperity.

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE KEVIN ORR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a special man who died in the line of duty in Utah—Uintah County Sheriff's Detective Kevin Orr. His wife Holley and their four children, Tyler, Kaylee, Jessica, and Ashlee, were in Washington, DC this week to participate in a ceremony where Detective Orr's name was added to the National Peace Officers Memorial. The Orr family had the opportunity to join with other survivors of law enforcement officers to commemorate their loved ones' lives and sacrifices.

I had the pleasure of meeting with the Orr family as they were paying respects to him through his addition to the National Peace Officers Memorial. Many from his extended family visited with me in my office, including Kevin's parents, Eugene and Claudia Orr, and Holley's parents, Glen and Dixie Hartle. Extended family members who were also visiting included Eric Hartle, Lisa Howe, Julie Luceor, Jolynn Orr, Jeffrey Orr, Larry Orr, Damon Orr, and Jason Pazour. Their loss is tragic, but their unity as a family is unbreakable.

Detective Orr sustained fatal injuries in November 2006 when he joined in a search for a missing 25-year-old woman. The helicopter he was riding in hit an unmarked power line hanging across the Green River and plummeted to the ground. Sadly, Detective Orr lost his life early the next morning as a result of the injuries he sustained in the accident.

At the time of his death, Detective Orr had worked for the Uintah Sheriff's Department for 11 years and was known for his dedication and commitment to law enforcement and the people he served. In 1999 he was named Uintah County Deputy of the Year for the example he set and the work he performed. He spent several years working with people in the Drug Court, making a difference in the lives of many who passed through the program. One young woman who had been a participant in Drug Court stated that she owed her life to Kevin. He believed in people and wanted to see them succeed and become happier, more productive citizens.

I was touched by what retired Vernal police officer Robert Roth said about Kevin. He stated: "He was the caliber of person that lived his life as an example to all of us . . . We traditionally think of gun battles or car chases, but it's about service. Some of us are willing to die for that cause and some of us have."

When I met with Kevin's family this week, I was touched by their humble, courageous spirits and their commitment to the legacy he left behind as a valiant law enforcement officer. It reminded me of a quote I have always appreciated by an unknown source that

says: "You make a living by what you get, but you make a life by what you give."

Mr. President, Officer Orr was willing to give it all to help others. He truly epitomized the ideals of sacrifice and service. I know that his family misses him and grieves for their loss, but I also know that they can find great peace and comfort from the example he left behind. He was a valiant, dedicated public servant and his influence will be felt by many generations.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RETIREMENT OF JAMES F. AHRENS

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the distinguished career of James F. Ahrens, who will soon retire as head of the Montana Hospital Association. Jim Ahrens has been a mainstay of Montana's health care community for over two decades, and I know that I speak for that community when I say that his presence as the head of MHA will be missed.

Jim Ahrens has served as president of MHA . . . An Association of Montana Health Care Providers, for nearly 21 years. Health care has changed a lot since the mid-1980s, in good ways and bad. Our scientists have developed remarkable new treatments. Yet, as ranks of the uninsured grow, many Americans can't take advantage of those treatments. We have prevented Medicare's trust fund from going broke. Yet the program still faces serious long-term fiscal challenges. We have enacted the most significant change Part D—in Medicare's history. Yet the new benefit has been marred by early administrative missteps.

As a key player in health care over the last two decades, I have relied on Jim to gain a better understanding of these ever-changing events. I have also come to know Jim as a close personal friend. When it comes to Jim, I don't have any 'and yets.' I can think of no better example than that than his work on the Critical Access Hospital program.

Back in the late 1980s, a citizens' task force came up with the idea of a limited service hospital for rural and frontier areas. This new type of hospital would provide access to primary care in the most remote stretches of the country, while receiving a break from the strict regulatory requirements governing hospitals and health facilities. The Montana Legislature took the recommendations for this new type of facility and created a special licensure category.

As incoming leader of MHA, Jim's job was to bring the concept to life. Having just moved from Chicago to run the Montana Hospital Association, he hit the ground running. Jim worked with the Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services to develop a demonstration project for this